United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 2017 No. 2

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 4, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GLENN THOMPSON 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 3, 2017, 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, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

JUMP-START AMERICA

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, last November, the American people spoke loud and clear about wanting real change in Washington. The American people want Washington to work for them—no more empty promises and no more talk.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want their government to act, and Congress' time to act is now. I come here today to offer a solution to an issue that has been discussed, but not truly acted on, for decades. Time and time again, from Congress to Congress, lawmakers come down to this floor to talk about the need for tax reform.

As a current small business owner for all of my working life, I understand what is killing small businesses firsthand. Since I came to Congress, I have been outspoken on the need to reform our Tax Code, and I have a proposal to make it happen. My tax reform plan will simplify our Tax Code. It will give job creators the tools they need to succeed and empower America's greatest asset—the American worker. My tax reform plan will do exactly what its name says it will do—jump-start America.

Today, the Internal Revenue Code is often called complicated, uncompetitive, and unfair; and rightfully so. According to the Tax Foundation, Federal tax laws and regulations have grown to more than 10 million words in length. Imagine how much easier tax season would be for all of us if we shrank our individual income tax thresholds to two brackets. What if our Tax Code actually put American taxpayers first, in other words, treated us like a customer?

The United States has the highest corporate tax rate in the free world. Sure, deductions, exclusions, and tax credits occasionally lower that rate, but these add further to the Tax Code's complexity, and they allow carve-outs for special interests.

To those who believe our corporate tax rate is okay the way it is, I ask you to consider why American companies are moving their headquarters overseas. In order to incentivize these companies to return their investments in expansion and employment back home in America, my plan will implement a permanent tax holiday to allow repatriation of funds at 5 percent.

While the corporate tax rate is putting the United States at a disadvantage in the global economy which we all live, the most unfair tax facing many Americans is inheritance tax. The death tax, as it is more commonly referred to, is a form of double taxation that can take a generation's worth of sweat equity and hard work and destroy it if a family business, for example, is passed down to a next of kin.

That is what nearly happened to me after the death of my parents. Fortunately for me, I was able to gather the resources to keep my father's business afloat. Many of my friends have not been so lucky.

We cannot force owners and operators to sell off parts of a business just so the Federal Government can collect a few extra dollars equal to less than 1 percent of Federal revenue. Especially considering our government is running a huge deficit and a $20 trillion national debt, I would argue that the private sector is a much better steward of budgeting, investing, and creating return on investment than the Federal Government. That is why Jump-Start America will repeal the death tax once and for all.

These are a few of the notable reforms of Jump-Start America that I talk about on the road in Texas and nationwide. Jump-Start America has gained the support of Americans for Tax Reform and former Congressional Budget Office Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin. It was called ''a good plan'' by the Cato Institute.

As a small business owner, I can tell you my plan will put people back to work, encourage business and individuals to spend money they didn't have before, and grow the economy. It is a thing called the American Dream. While Jump-Start America is a small business perspective on tax reform, it will benefit every American individually and our Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, especially the newer Members, to familiarize themselves with my plan as we work to implement an aggressive pro-

Printed on recycled paper.

growth agenda under new leadership on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

In God We Trust.

FUNDING OUR PORTS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, during this last Presidential election year, there was a tremendous amount of discussion about the Nation's infrastructure and the need for investment to make America more competitive and move goods and our citizens more efficiently.

There wasn't a lot of particular discussion about ports, but they are an incredibly important part of our infrastructure. More than $470 billion of exports went through America's ports. Three-quarters of our exports are waterborne through these ports around the United States.

Now, the Corps of Engineers says that, of our 59 busiest ports depicted here, they are fully available less than 35 percent of the time, and that is even before we begin to deal with the larger cargo ships that are going to be coming through the expanded Panama Canal to the Southeast and other ports in the United States, and that is because of a lack of funding.

Now, obviously, that is a very difficult problem. We are estimating about a $20 billion shortfall over the next 10 years in funding. Where, oh where, could Congress find that money? Actually, we already have it.

Now, Congress, in its wisdom in 1986, with the cooperation and consent of shipping interests, imposed a tax, an ad valorem tax, on the value of imports. It is a very small tax, but it adds slightly to the cost of any good that any American buys every day that is imported.

Now, Americans are paying the tax and Congress is stealing the money. Yep, that is true—for stupid purposes, no less. We are pretending to make the deficit smaller by collecting twice as much tax as we invest in our ports.

Meantime, we are forgoing the investment that is needed in those ports to become even more efficient and more competitive in the world economy. Congress is collecting the tax, yet the Budget Committee and the appropriators here in the Republican House are saying: Let's hide that money over here. We will put it in the Treasury harbor maintenance trust fund. Don't worry. It's there. Some day we might spend it.

Nine billion dollars today—$9 billion—that would address half of the long-term shortfall in our ports. This could be an incredible boon for shippers, for American competitiveness, and for jobs in this country. We don't have to levy a new tax. All we have to do is spend the tax that is being collected from the American people by jacking up the price of imported goods for the purpose for which it is lawfully intended.

Now, the appropriators don't like it because, hey, they don't get to mess around with it, and the Budget Committee doesn't like it because that means they either have to look like they have another half a billion dollars a year of deficit or they would have to raise some funds somewhere else to spend somewhere else.

But the point is this money should be spent as intended. So today I am sending a letter to President-elect Trump. He has said time and time again he wants to invest in our infrastructure. Obviously, it is going to be a little longer term before we get to surface because we are going to have to raise additional revenues there to deal with our crumbling roads, bridges, and transit systems.

But for our ports, we don't have to wait. Day one, he can send a message to Congress saying: Hey, get off your butts down there and spend that money for the purpose for which the tax was collected. Stop gouging the American taxpayers and shorting our ports.

It's time to do things a little differently around here, and I am hopeful that the President perhaps will tweet about this and get some action out of the Republican majority like he did yesterday in reversing them on a rather drastic change to the rules of the House.

RELIEF FROM EXCESSIVE EXECUTIVE ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER of Florida). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 8 years, President Barack Obama has used his pen and phone to create a fourth branch of government that overreaches through executive orders and Federal rules and regulations. But today is a new day—a day when this Congress begins to dismantle this fourth branch of government and drain the swamp in Washington.

Through the entirety of this President's administration, Republicans have fought against out-of-control growth of Federal bureaucracy and rules and regulations that have suffocated the American economy. The last time I checked, the President's job was to enforce existing laws and work with the elected Members of Congress whose responsibility it is to pass laws as the people's representatives. Instead, I believe he has undermined not only our Constitution but also the American people through this executive power grab.

It is time to get rid of the Washington-knows-best, top-down, one-size-fits-all rules like the EPA's waters of the U.S., the Clean Power Plan, the Department of Labor's overtime rule and restrictions on your retirement savings. These regulations have consequences, and what these bureaucrats do have, consequences. In 2015 alone, the Federal Government leveled 3,400 regulations on Americans. Those regulations cost us $1.9 trillion in lost productivity and growth—a cost of $15,000 per American household.

Now, for the first time during my tenure serving the Second Congressional District of Missouri, Congress has a unique opportunity. This week we will pass a bill that I have had the pleasure of cosponsoring and voted for twice before—the REINS Act, and I expect it to become law. The REINS Act puts power back in the hands of the people as Congress—the people's House—can implement an up-or-down vote on any new major rule before they can take effect. Congress should decide what rules are necessary for our constituents—not unelected bureaucrats.

We will also pass this week the Midnight Rules Relief Act which will allow Congress to stop the Obama administration's last minute regulations from taking effect as they turn out the lights and head out the door.

The American people spoke loud and clear: They want results. They are tired of working harder for less money and tired of wondering how they will make ends meet at the end of every month. They have had enough and are tired of the constant chipping away of their freedoms.

Taken together, these two bills clearly demonstrate that this Republican Congress is unified and will work with President-elect Trump to help alleviate the day-to-day burdens felt by Americans across the country. By passing these bills, we are demonstrating that we are listening to our constituents and we are telling them that their elected representatives are in charge, not Washington bureaucrats.

□ 1015

DON'T ABANDON AMERICANS IN NEED OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Mary and her son, two of my constituents from the Lakeview community of Chicago. Mary wrote to me on her son's behalf, expressing their deep appreciation for the Affordable Care Act and what the law has meant for their family.

In 2001, Mary's son was diagnosed with a rare autoimmune disease called Addison's disease. It occurs when your body produces insufficient amounts of certain hormones produced by your adrenal glands. When left untreated, Addison's disease can be life-threatening.

At the time of his diagnosis, Mary's son was fully insured through his employer. Then, in 2011, Mary's son left his employer to pursue the American Dream of entrepreneurship and start a small business on his own. Leaving his employer to bravely chase the American Dream meant leaving behind his insurance coverage, too. He did not anticipate being denied coverage due to a preexisting condition.

Up to this point, because of treatment covered by his insurance plan, he had been able to work to provide for himself and to live independently. As he got his new business off the ground, he went uninsured and, as a result, encountered several crises with his health. He avoided going to the doctor due to high costs and eventually ended up in the emergency room. As we all know, preventable emergency visits are a major contributor to the overall high healthcare costs that harm the entire system.

Thanks to the President and Congress passing the Affordable Care Act, Mary's son was finally able to obtain affordable care when the health insurance marketplace first opened in October 2013.

Mary wrote me to share her son's story. He is one of tens of millions of Americans who have directly benefited from the ACA's improvements to coverage, consumer protections, costs, and quality. Today, Mary is fearful of what the repeal of ACA will mean for her son.

Unfortunately, despite having 7 years to produce an alternative, the majority has failed to offer a true replacement. And what about the parts of the ACA that share bipartisan popularity?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle and the President-elect insist they will craft a plan that maintains popular parts of the law, while rejecting the less popular components. Of course, that sounds great, but there is one real problem: they have offered absolutely no way to pay for any of it.

In reality, repeal and replace is more simply repeal and go back to before—tearing down a much-needed house before a new one is built, back to a time when 47 million Americans—nearly 18 percent of the population—were uninsured. Mary's son and countless others like him cannot afford to go back in time. Repealing ACA will leave 20 million Americans, including her son, without affordable health insurance, effectively disrupting their care and potentially putting their lives at risk.

To remind us all of the high stakes riding on the ACA repeal, Mary wrote, saying: ''As a former Republican and now an Independent voter, I am speaking from my heart. The 2016 election result has me truly frightened for the health of my son and for my husband and me.''

Repealing the Affordable Care Act will create a chaotic situation that will put real lives in danger. We all share in the responsibility to protect the health care of all Americans. Empty rhetoric of repealing the ACA is dangerous, but when transformed into real legislative action, it can be catastrophic for the constituents that elected us to serve and represent them in this body.

On behalf of Mary's son and other Americans in districts across the country, I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to abandon their efforts to strip health care from those who need it and, instead, work with us to make our country a healthier place for all.

FAIRCHILD CHALLENGE PROGRAM

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an innovative educational program in my south Florida community called the Fairchild Challenge.

As a nonprofit founded in 2002, this no-cost, environment-focused annual competition based at the world-renowned Fairchild Tropical Botanic Garden, located in my district, invites students from around the world to participate from a young age as active and thoughtful members of society.

The Fairchild Challenge focuses attention on conservation of the environment, while introducing students to the importance of STEM: science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

In the 2014–2015 school year, over 153,000 participants were involved in the program. High-performing schools are eligible for cash prizes, while participating students may earn college scholarships.

Through innovative programs like the Fairchild Challenge, students are sure to be conscious of the benefits of conserving our environment and may more readily engage in the STEM fields that will better prepare them for the future.

Congratulations to all the student participants of the Fairchild Challenge. Hats off especially to the board members, staff, and the many volunteers of the Fairchild Tropical Botanic Garden, and most especially to Mr. and Mrs. Greer, the heart and soul of these beautiful botanical gardens.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CLYDE HOLLOWAY

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a true servant of the people. Many knew him as a former schoolbus driver, the chairman of the Louisiana Public Service Commission, or a successful nursery owner in Forest Hill, Louisiana.

Some of you here today knew him as former Congressman Clyde Holloway. Mr. Holloway was one of the first Republicans in Louisiana to be elected to Congress since Reconstruction. Serving from 1986 to 1993, Mr. Holloway was a trailblazer for other Republican lawmakers in our great State.

On August 16, 2016, I, along with many Louisianans, were saddened to hear of the news of Mr. Holloway's passing. Clyde left a legacy among his constituents of always looking out and representing their best interests.

I stand before you today to pay tribute to Mr. Holloway and the life he lived. He fought the good fight. He finished his course. I urge you today to join me and my constituents in honoring the life of Clyde Holloway by charting our course to lead and represent the best interests of the people who entrusted their leadership to us today.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BOBBY SMITH

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man whose life was a living definition of courage.

In 1986, working as a Louisiana State trooper, Bobby Smith, from Buckeye, Louisiana, was shot in the face and blinded in the line of duty. He not only lost his sight, but also lost the career that he deeply loved.

Never one to succumb to adversity, Bobby earned a Ph.D., authored books, and set out on a path of helping others. In 2001, he organized the Foundation for Officers Recovering from Traumatic Events. This foundation helped provide training and counseling to law enforcement individuals, firefighters, emergency services personnel, and their families going through tough times from various traumatic events.

Bobby's will to help others would carry him through his personal challenges as he traveled across the United States and throughout the world literally sharing his story and lifting up others. Before his death in October of this year, Mr. Smith had addressed and touched the lives of over 1 million people.

Many who knew Bobby would often hear him say, ''I see. I see.'' Today, as we remember Bobby Smith, let us not be blinded by our own tragedies, adversities, and obstacles in our lives, but let us also have the courage that Bobby had to look beyond and see the beauty of life and see the good in others.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LANDON WEAVER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to mourn the loss of Pennsylvania State Trooper Landon Weaver, who was killed in the line of duty on Friday, December 30.

Trooper Weaver had been on patrol for 1 year with the Pennsylvania State Police. He was investigating a domestic incident in Juniata Township, Huntingdon County, in Pennsylvania's Fifth District, when the situation turned deadly and he was fatally shot by the suspect. Flags throughout Pennsylvania are flying at half-staff in honor of Trooper Weaver being taken from us too soon.

I rise today to speak about who Trooper Landon Weaver was: a son, a brother, a husband, a friend, a hero.

Trooper Weaver's law enforcement career had just begun. He was 23 years old, and he married his high school sweetheart, Macy, in June. They graduated from Central High School in

Martinsburg in 2012, and he went on to study criminal justice at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. He was proudly on the dean's list.

In December 2015, he enlisted to join the Pennsylvania State Police Academy in Hershey, Pennsylvania. He graduated from the State Police Academy in June, was assigned to Troop G of the Pennsylvania State Police, and served at the Huntingdon Barracks. He loved his family, and he loved being a police officer.

Trooper Weaver attended Zion Lutheran Church and enjoyed spending time with his family, and especially his wife, Macy. To him, family was everything.

Trooper Weaver is the 97th member of the Pennsylvania State Police to be killed in the line of duty.

In addition to his wife, he is survived by his parents, Eric and Christine Weaver of East Freedom; his brother, Larett Weaver of East Freedom; his paternal grandparents, Merrill and Christine D. Weaver; as well as other family members and friends. He grew up in a small town where there is a deep sense of community. Many hearts are broken over this tragic, senseless situation.

One of Trooper Weaver's teachers at Central High School in Martinsburg remembered Trooper Weaver from his days as a student. Teacher Joe Logan said Trooper Weaver was a ''great kid'' whom you could call on during times of need and he would be there. He said he was ''beside himself with grief and sadness.''

He went on to say: ''He would do anything for you. He was humble, dedicated, and a loving person to his wife and family. You'd be proud to call him a colleague or friend.''

Trooper Weaver was one of Pennsylvania's finest. He was committed to his family, to his profession, and to the community that he loved. His dedication to service embodies the values of law enforcement officers across the Nation. Our law enforcement officers risk their lives every day to help people.

Trooper Weaver put on his uniform that day and went to work like he had done so many days before, knowing that any moment he could be in harm's way. That is a commitment our officers make to serve and protect the public and uphold the law. That is the commitment that Trooper Weaver made to serve the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

May we all honor Trooper Weaver's memory. He was a young man just starting out in life. He was a newlywed with so much to look forward to. In one moment, he was gone.

On behalf of the Congress of the United States and the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I offer my sincere condolences and prayers to his family, especially to his wife, Macy, during this tragic and difficult time. He risked his life to keep all of us safe.

Trooper Landon Weaver is a hero who was taken from us too soon. May we mourn his loss and honor his memory. May God bless Landon Weaver and his family.

MINERS' PENSION

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

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in this new year, we must make things right for our miners and their widows. We must act now to keep the promise. We must honor their work in the mines by protecting the pensions and healthcare benefits they worked their whole lives to earn.

We must pass legislation I have cosponsored to protect these hard-earned benefits for families like Rita Blankenship of McDowell County who wrote me asking for help. Here is what she said: ''My husband was promised healthcare coverage in 1975 when he went to work in the mines and joined the union. I am asking if you could do everything possible to get this passed so we will have health care,'' she wrote.

These miners and their families deserve no less than what they worked their entire lives to earn: the peace of mind that comes with a pension and secure health care.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting legislation to protect our miners, their widows, and their families. We owe it to them to keep our word.

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 30 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EMMER) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We thank You for the joy, excitement, and ceremony of yesterday, when the 115th Congress convened. It was a celebration of the ongoing American experiment of participatory democracy and the peaceful shifting of power.

Today begins the work of that Congress, when the difficulties facing our Nation, and some communities especially, come into focus. We ask again an abundance of Your wisdom for the Members of the people's House.

May we be forever grateful for the blessings our Nation enjoys and appropriately generous with what we have to help those among us who are in need.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE of Texas 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

JIMMY BURNSED, RETIRING CHAIRMAN OF BRYAN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Jimmy Burnsed, who has served as chairman of the Bryan County Board of Commissioners for the past 12 years.

On December 31, 2016, he officially retired from serving on the board. Beyond serving as chairman, Mr. Burnsed has dedicated an admirable amount of his life to public service. Nearly 40 years ago, he began serving on the City Council for Garden City, Georgia, before serving 4 years as mayor. In 1989, he moved from Garden City to Bryan County. In 2005, he ran and was elected chairman of the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Burnsed's accomplishments on the board since that time are numerous. He worked to build a new administrative building for the county to hold meetings and other events; he managed and planned the infrastructure for Bryan County, which has grown more than 50 percent in size during his tenure; and he helped to upgrade Bryan County's trails, parks, and recreation centers. Mr. Burnsed always put the community first and performed his duties in a way that would make any constituent very proud.

Jimmy Burnsed, you will be greatly missed.

ETHICS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, just a few hours after they attempted to kill the independent Office of Congressional Ethics and strip it for parts, Republicans backed down in the face of public outrage. It speaks volumes that the first thing Republicans attempted to do was weaken ethical standards and that they only changed course once their efforts were exposed to the public. This is not what the American people sent us here to do.

It seems that, contrary to rhetoric, Republicans don't want to drain the swamp. They want to fill it up. This is wrong, and it is critical that Members of Congress be accountable and adhere to the highest ethical standards.

In the weeks ahead, it is critical that all of us hold the majority accountable and prevent them from going back to the days when thinly veiled bribes, kickbacks, and worse were commonplace in this town.

We need more ethical reforms in Congress, not less. That is why I have introduced the ETHICS Act, to require every Member of Congress to undergo the same annual ethics training that their staffs have to complete. That is why I am asking Members of both parties to demand better from our elected officials than what we saw over the last 48 hours.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SPEAKER PAUL DAVIS RYAN

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the first day of the 115th Congress, the House of Representatives elected PAUL DAVIS RYAN to serve as Speaker of the House. I have been grateful to serve with Speaker RYAN, a proven conservative, throughout my service in Congress and can attest to his commitment to conservative values with innovative thoughtfulness.

Under Speaker RYAN's leadership, House Republicans last year passed meaningful legislation providing greater outreach service for veterans, reinforcing local control of education, ending the 40-year ban on crude oil exports, combating the opioid epidemic, passing the National Defense Authorization Act, and enacting sweeping mental health reform.

Speaker RYAN also launched A Better Way, a bold policy agenda that presents meaningful initiatives for restoring a confident America by presenting solutions to address poverty, grow our economy to create jobs, defend the Constitution, improve health care by repealing the failing ObamaCare, reform the Tax Code, and strengthen the military.

I was grateful to cast my vote for Speaker RYAN, and I look forward to working with him, President-elect Donald Trump, and Vice President-elect MIKE PENCE in the new Congress to deliver policies of limited government and expanded freedom for American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

DON'T UNDERMINE HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICANS

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I spent 10 years of my professional life working in health care, both during and after the Affordable Care Act passed, so let me tell you what a Republican repeal would mean.

It would mean raising prescription drug costs on Illinois seniors by more than $1,000 every year by reopening the Medicare doughnut hole.

It would mean returning to the days when insurance companies could discriminate against women by charging them more than men for basic care.

It would mean telling diabetics, survivors of a heart attack, or even babies with a birth defect that they aren't qualified for healthcare coverage because of their preexisting condition.

It would mean denying cancer patients lifesaving care after they have reached their lifetime limit on their insurance policy.

Republicans have talked about repealing the Affordable Care Act for almost 7 years, but they have no plan for replacement. Again and again, we have heard that repealing ObamaCare will make America great again. Well, I say it will make America sick again.

Please, let's work together. Don't undermine the health of millions of Americans.

THIS STATE DEPARTMENT BETRAYS ISRAEL

(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, the anti-Semitic United Nations has struck a new low, demanding that Israel prohibit Jews from settling in the West Bank. Guess who was supportive of this absurd resolution in betrayal of our closest ally? The United States.

Once again, this administration is on the wrong side. It has alienated what few international friends we have. Secretary of State John Kerry arrogantly declared: ''Israel can either be Jewish or democratic; it cannot be both.''

Mr. Speaker, let's think about that statement. The United Nations' mandate separating Jews from Palestinians in the West Bank is segregation. Segregation is not democratic.

The United States and the U.N. have no legal business telling a sovereign nation where people should live or shouldn't live in that country. Who in the world do we think we are? Would we approve of the U.N. telling us that one race or ethnic group could not live in one region of the United States? Absolutely not.

Thankfully, this State Department will soon be clearing their desks at Foggy Bottom—and good riddance. It is time for a new State Department that supports America's friends and not our enemies.

And that is just the way it is.

SECOND AVENUE SUBWAY OPENING

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, residents in New York City had a special reason to celebrate as this new year began. The very first new subway in over 60 years and the largest subway in the country opened its doors and carried passengers at 12 noon on New Year's Day. This new line is expected to carry over 200,000 travelers a day, reducing commute time, reducing costs, operating with efficiency, and boosting small businesses.

It is a project that has been on the books for over a century and one that I fought for every single day that I have been in Congress. It is the gift that keeps on giving. It has already generated over 16,000 new jobs. It has spurred over $840 million in good wages. The regional plan says that it is responsible for over $2.5 billion in new economic activity. They just opened their doors.

Let's work together and support other good, important infrastructure projects in our country. It is good for Americans; it is good for America.

HONORING OUR NATION'S SERVICEMEN AND -WOMEN

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the first time in the 115th Congress to recognize the brave servicemen and -women who tirelessly defend our great Nation.

Every day, our men and women in uniform make tremendous sacrifices to protect the many freedoms we enjoy both at home and abroad. They spend time away from their families, miss birthdays, anniversaries, and funerals, and are frequently required to put themselves in harm's way to fight for this great Nation.

In particular, I would like to recognize Jason Braun, who will be deploying to the Middle East in the coming

days. A Minnesota resident, Jason is a member of the West Metro Fire-Rescue District and is a dedicated husband to my director of operations and scheduler, Kate Braun.

I want to thank Jason; his wife, Kate; and all of the members of our Armed Forces and their families for their continued sacrifice and service to our country. Their dedication to freedom is what makes this country great. I wish all of our servicemembers overseas a safe and speedy deployment.

HOW THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT WORKS FOR CONSTITUENTS

(Ms. JUDY CHU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Kalwis Lo, a young man from my district in San Gabriel, California, who told me how his life was saved by the Affordable Care Act.

When he was just out of college, Kalwis was shocked when he was diagnosed with stage III Hodgkin lymphoma. He learned that this disease would end his young life if ignored, but was actually easily treatable in the early stages.

No longer covered by his university, he applied to every type of health insurance he could, but he was denied every single time because of his preexisting condition. He knew that through insurance coverage he could get the chemotherapy treatments that could save his life, but with each denial, he felt more and more desperate.

Then Kalwis learned about the Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan under the Affordable Care Act. This plan made insurance accessible to anyone that had been denied due to a preexisting condition. Thankfully, California was one of the States participating in the program. Finally, Kalwis got the chemotherapy he needed. He is one of millions of Americans given the promise of their lives back thanks to the Affordable Care Act.

OBAMACARE

(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 because we made a promise to the American people, and we are going to keep it.

ObamaCare is an unpopular and failed law collapsing under its own weight. Polls have shown it; rising premiums have proven it; and, in November, the voters said it loud and clear. It is time to repeal ObamaCare and replace it with more choices, lower costs, and real protections for patients. Already, we are working to end this damaging law and take control away from Federal bureaucrats and give it back to the people of this country.

One year ago, we sent an ObamaCare repeal bill to the President's desk; but, not surprisingly, he vetoed it. In a few weeks, this Congress will again send a repeal bill to the President's desk. This time, we will have a President who will sign it.

Mr. Speaker, healthcare decisions should be made by patients and their doctors. American families should have access to health insurance they can actually afford. That is why we will repeal ObamaCare and replace it with real reforms.

□ 1215

HELPING OUR CONSTITUENTS GET AHEAD

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, I am Congressman RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHI from the Eighth District of Illinois. I have the honor to represent the hardworking families of Chicago's west and northwest suburbs. My constituents, like so many other Americans, are finding it harder and harder to get ahead.

Creating good-paying jobs is my number one job, and growing and strengthening the middle class is my primary mission. I believe working and middle class families must be able to earn a living wage, have quality health care, and educate their children well.

These challenges are not insurmountable, but we must address them immediately. We need to make sure that working and middle class families can achieve economic security. I believe that, if you work hard and play by the rules, you and your children can and should succeed in America. I look forward to working with all of my colleagues in this Chamber to make that a reality.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF SOUTHEAST TEXAS SOLDIERS

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor two young men who gave their lives in service to the State of Texas and the United States when their Apache helicopter crashed in Galveston Bay, Texas, during a training mission last week in my congressional district.

My deepest sympathies go out to the families of Army Chief Warrant Officer 2 Lucas Lowe of Daisetta, Texas, a resident of the 36th Congressional District, which I represent, and Army Chief Warrant Officer 3 Dustin Mortenson of League City, Texas.

The heartbreaking loss of these two fine Texas Army National Guard pilots, assigned to the First Squadron 149th Attack Reconnaissance Battalion of the 36th Infantry Division, has been felt throughout our southeast Texas community. Both men tragically leave behind a wife and family. Chief Warrant Officer Lucas Lowe's wife, Kami, was also pregnant with twins due next month, in February.

As a former Texas Guardsman myself, my prayers remain with all those who have been impacted by this terrible tragedy. As the U.S. Congressman for District 36, it is my commitment and duty to the families to see that they get the support they need during this very difficult time.

Please keep these families in your thoughts and your prayers. May God bless these two soldiers, their families, and all who serve their country.

DON'T MAKE AMERICA SICK AGAIN

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow my colleague and my neighbor in Texas to regret the loss of our two National Guardsmen from the 36th Division. The 36th Division is a historic division, Texas division, T-Patchers, and to lose two of our soldiers is tragic.

But I am on the floor today to talk about health care. The Republican majority has taken the first legislative step to make America sick again. The first step was to take away health care from tens of millions of Americans, including premium increases for millions more in America. The second action lights the fuse on the dangerous legislative process that threatens to cut Medicare, Medicaid, and health tax credits that Americans are now benefiting from.

There should be no reform without a replacement because we may never have a replacement, but we have millions of Americans who will lose their healthcare coverage because of the actions of this House. Let's don't make America sick again.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE CENTRAL HIGH BAND

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Little Rock Central High School's flag line and marching band for participating in the events marking the 75th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor in Hawaii.

Known as the Stereophonic Storm of the Mid-South, Central's flag line and marching band joined several high school bands across the Nation at the annual Waikiki holiday parade to commemorate this historic moment.

Led by band director Brice Evans, the school's trip lasted an entire week, giving our students the chance to having an unforgettable experience by meeting Pearl Harbor survivors and enjoying Thanksgiving in Hawaii.

With their seemingly limitless enthusiasm and spirit, the Central High

School band continues to represent themselves with determination and dedication that make all Arkansans proud. As a long time friend and supporter of all things for Central High, congratulations. I look forward to following the band's continued success.

WE CAN REBUILD TRUST

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, our Constitution lists few, if specific, qualifications for the office we now hold. Article I, section 2 states that we must be at least 25 years old, we must have been a citizen for the past 7 years, and we must live in the State we represent.

In ''The Federalist Papers,'' Alexander Hamilton and James Madison wrote that ''Under these reasonable limitations, the door of this part of the federal government is open to merit of every description, whether native or adoptive, whether young or old, and without regard to poverty or wealth, or to any particular profession of religious faith.''

In a phrase, our body is to represent the American people in all of its opinions, complexities, and riches; and I believe we do. For in a free nation such as ours, no single person can represent the people as a whole. In this body, I proudly work with colleagues on the left and the right, from every region and State, people who profess different faiths, have had different careers, and embody the experiences of the American people. No gathering in this Nation is more like its people than in this House. We are joined together in representing not only our constituents but our country.

Mr. Speaker, we now have a high and honorable task set before us. First, we must take our practical principles that we have built up by the hard experience of generations who have come before us, and we must apply them to a changing future. Our mission is not to return to the past, nor to destroy it, but rather to build upon it.

And then we must direct the desires of the people into action. Millions of Americans long ignored have rejected a future of limits and slow decline. We have heard their voices. But history will not judge us by how well we hear but how well we act.

The unemployment rate has steadily declined and ticked down to 4.9 percent, but what is more important is that our labor participation rate is only 62.7 percent. Outside of the Obama years, that is the lowest labor force participation rate since 1978.

The reason our unemployment rate is dropping isn't because people are finding jobs. They have no prospects for stable and meaningful work. The American people have unrivaled talent and ability, but it is not being used. If we are looking for a reason behind the message that the American people sent us in November, this is a good place to start.

And for so many who have work, things aren't much better. Millions of Americans, especially those in the heartland and struggling neighborhoods in our big cities, aren't sharing in America's prosperity. In fact, the bottom half of the economic distribution in America hasn't felt any of the economic growth from the 1970s on. These people spend their whole lives working and never have the chance to move up.

We have had the wisdom to listen to all of the American people, especially those being left behind. Now let us have the courage to lead. Let us have the courage to define the people's desires in law. And as we go about our daily business, Mr. Speaker, we should remember not only that we have great purpose, but we also have great power loaned to us directly from the American people.

Our Republic, and the liberties we hold dear at this time, are threatened by bureaucracies, subject to no authority but their own will. They cannot be controlled by the people and are increasingly unrestrained by the people's representatives. This is not a partisan concern. Congress has a duty to act as a unified body in defense of our Article I powers because, unlike the bureaucracy, we are accountable to the people.

That is why I have scheduled this House to tackle this problem starting today through a two-step approach. First, as I have long said, structure dictates behavior. We need to fix the structure in Washington that deprives the people of their power.

Second, we will repeal specific regulations that are harmful to the American people, costing us time, money, and, most importantly, jobs. To begin to get to the root of this problem, we will pass the REINS Act that will require Congress to approve every major regulation produced by the administrative state. And unlike the bureaucracy, if the people don't like what they see, they can vote us out of office.

Then next week, we will take a look at the Regulatory Accountability Act, which will require agencies to choose the least costly option available and will end judicial deference to agencies, which puts the American people at a disadvantage in the courtroom.

But it is not just how rules are made. It is what rules are made too. The President continues to unilaterally impose regulations on his way out the door. So while we haven't yet determined what needs to be repealed first, I expect to start with swift action on at least the stream protection rule and methane emissions standards, both of which limit our energy production.

This process won't be completed quickly, but as we remove harmful regulations and change the structure of Washington, draining the bureaucratic swamp that undermines the will of the people, we can rebuild trust between the people and their government again. And not only that, within the renewed and responsive structure of a truly representative government, we can restore that hope held by so many generations before, that hope that has defined America's character since before our Nation was founded. It is the American Dream so that we and our children can find more meaning, security, purpose, and success than those who have come before us.

Restoring that dream is the purpose of this body in the 115th Congress. The American people expect this country to be great again. Here and now, we will move us toward that greatness.

THE MEDIA COULD PLAY A POSITIVE ROLE

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the national liberal media continue to promote a divided America. This is largely a result of their chosen candidate not winning the Presidential election. Since 91 percent of the media's coverage of President-elect Trump was negative, it is no surprise that they still see America in a negative light.

But the media could play a much more constructive role. They could report the good news that Americans are more confident about the future than they have been in 20 years. They could report on President-elect Trump's ability to attract individuals of competence and experience to his administration. They could report on his fresh approach and new ideas for, yes, making America great again.

Let's hope the media will put aside their bias and give the American people the facts, untainted by personal animosity. If they do, our country will be better for it.

CONGRESS SHOULD CONDEMN U.N. ANTI-ISRAEL RESOLUTION

(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 in solidarity and support for one of America's greatest friends and allies, but one the Obama administration has sadly abandoned in its last days in office: the State of Israel.

Since September of 2015 alone, in Israel, 42 people have been killed in terrorist attacks, and 602 people, including four Palestinians, have been injured. Yet, last month, the United Nations Security Council felt the need to condemn Israel with a misguided resolution the United States should have vetoed.

In fact, as long as Israel has been part of the U.N., it has been treated with little respect and almost openly disdained. In 2016, there were more resolutions regarding Israel at the U.N.

than there were regarding Syria, North Korea, Iran, South Sudan, and Russia combined. That is simply an unacceptable way to treat the only peaceful democratic state in the region.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join together in sending a strong, bipartisan message this week to rebuke this misguided resolution so we can get back on a path to a peaceful solution to conflict in the Middle East.

□ 1230

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). 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 on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

APPROVING LOCATION OF MEMORIAL TO COMMEMORATE MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WHO SERVED IN SUPPORT OF OPERATION DESERT STORM OR OPERATION DESERT SHIELD

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 3) approving the location of a memorial to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 3

Whereas subsection (b)(1) of section 8908 of title 40, United States Code, provides that the location of a commemorative work in the area depicted as ''Area I'' on the map described in subsection (a) of that section shall be deemed to be authorized only if approved by law not later than 150 days after the date on which Congress is notified that the subject of the commemorative work is of preeminent historical and lasting significance to the United States;

Whereas section 3093 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 113–291) authorized the National Desert Storm Memorial Association to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has notified Congress of the determination of the Secretary of the Interior that the subject of the memorial is of preeminent historical and lasting significance to the United States and may be located in Area I: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the location of the commemorative work authorized by section 3093 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 113–291) to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield, within Area I, as depicted on the map described in section 8908(a) of title 40, United States Code, is approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the joint resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 3 by Congressman ROE of Tennessee authorizes the National Desert Storm War Memorial Association to consider sites along or near the National Mall for a memorial to honor the members of Armed Forces who served on Active Duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield.

Under the Commemorative Works Act, any memorial proposed to be located on Federal land along or near the National Mall must be approved by Congress after the Secretary of the Interior determines that the proposed work is ''of preeminent historical and lasting significance to the United States.''

The Secretary of the Interior has recommended that the Desert Storm War Memorial Association be authorized to consider sites in Area I for the memorial, and this resolution would provide Congress' approval of the Secretary's recommendation. Congress provided initial authorization for the Desert Storm and Desert Shield Memorial in 2014, and the memorial is to be funded solely by private donations.

History will no doubt continue to debate the political decisions that stopped our forces before they reached Baghdad, but it has already recorded and judged the effectiveness, the heroism, and the devotion of our Armed Forces and their commanders in the field who utterly vanquished the largest army in the Middle East in just 100 hours and who liberated the people of Kuwait from a hideous and sadistic occupation.

This memorial will do more than honor the 382 Americans who gave their lives in the gulf war and ensure that they will not be forgotten. After all, as Lincoln said at Gettysburg:

The honor they earned on the battlefield cannot be added to or detracted by us, and long after our words are forgotten, their deeds will be remembered and celebrated.

But this monument will also remind future generations at home and abroad, friend and foe, of what American Armed Forces can do to rescue and protect the weak, and vanquish and punish the guilty, when competently commanded in the field and backed by the full resolve of the American people in a righteous cause.

I urge adoption of the measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, following the invasion and occupation of Kuwait by Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein, the United States and the international community demanded the immediate withdrawal of Iraqi forces under the threat of military action. After Saddam Hussein defied calls to withdraw from Kuwait, the United States, along with a broad coalition of European, regional, and global allies, began Operation Desert Shield, followed by Operation Desert Storm, a 100-hour land war which expelled the Iraqi forces from Kuwait.

Approximately 700,000 members of the American Armed Forces served as part of Operation Desert Storm and Operation Desert Shield. Of those, 293 died in theater and 148 were killed in action.

The 2015 National Defense Authorization Act authorized the National Desert Storm and Desert Shield War Memorial Association to establish a memorial as a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia. This honors the members of the American Armed Forces who served and those who made the ultimate sacrifice in support of our country.

The joint resolution before us today approves the general location of the memorial so that it is in close proximity to the National Mall and other nationally significant war memorials, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

This resolution is an opportunity for the country to come together and thank the servicemembers who fought in the Gulf, those whose lives have been forever changed by their experience in this war, and those who did not return.

I support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), the author of this measure.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this very important procedural measure to site the memorial to honor the men and women who served and died in Operation Desert Storm and Desert Shield in Area I of the National Mall.

On August 2, 1990, Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait and, in less than 24 hours, dominated nearly 30 percent of the world's oil supply, swiftly setting his sights on neighboring Saudi Arabia. Recognizing Saudi Arabia's importance to the region, President George Herbert Walker Bush launched Operation Desert Shield, the deployment of American combat forces to Saudi Arabia, and ordered Saddam Hussein to remove Iraqi troops from Kuwait by January 15, 1991. With Kuwait still occupied after the deadline passed, over half a million United States armed services members led coalition forces in the liberation of Kuwait—Operation Desert Storm.

Of the roughly 600,000 American troops who were deployed in both Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm, 294 died in theater, of which 148 were killed in action. The United States currently lacks a national memorial dedicated to the valor and sacrifices made by those members of our Armed Forces who fought honorably in Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that no Federal funds will be spent to build this memorial. All funds will be raised privately by the National Desert Storm War Memorial Association. We must honor the men and women who fought honorably and valiantly in support of these operations and memorialize those who gave a life to free another.

The establishment of this memorial was authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2015. Passing this resolution is simply the next step in the process for site selection. The Secretary of the Interior has confirmed the historical value of the proposed memorial and deemed it worthy of being constructed in Area I of Washington, D.C., which includes the areas around other monuments to great American heroism.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, many of us in this Congress know many of the people who served in Desert Storm and Desert Shield, many personal friends of mine did, and many paid the ultimate sacrifice. It is time now we honor those heroes of this country.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 3.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAXPAYERS RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 71) to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 71

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 ''Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act''.

SEC. 2. INVENTORY OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1122(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

''(1) DEFINITION OF PROGRAM.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'program' means an organized set of activities by one or more agencies directed toward a common purpose or goal.'';

(3) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking ''IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2012, the Office of Management and Budget shall'' and inserting ''WEBSITE AND PROGRAM INVENTORY.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) include on the website—

''(i) a program inventory that shall identify each program of the Federal Government for which there is more than $1,000,000 in annual budget authority, which shall include—

''(I) any activity that is commonly referred to as a program by a Federal agency in communications with Congress, including any activity identified as a program in a budget request;

''(II) any activity that is commonly referred to as a program by a Federal agency in communications with the public, including each program for which financial awards are made on a competitive basis; and

''(III) any activity referenced in law as a program after June 30, 2019; and

''(ii) for each program identified in the program inventory, the information required under paragraph (3) or paragraph (4), as applicable.'';

(4) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''INFORMATION.—Information for each program described under paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''INFORMATION FOR LARGER PROGRAMS.—Information for each program identified in the program inventory required under paragraph (2) for which there is more than $10,000,000 in annual budget authority'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (C);

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D);

(D) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) an identification of the program activities that are aggregated, disaggregated, or consolidated as part of identifying programs;

''(B) for each program activity described in subparagraph (A), the amount of funding for the current fiscal year and previous 2 fiscal years;

''(C) an estimate of the amount of funding for the program;'';

(E) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated, by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) an identification of the statutes that authorize the program and any major regulations specific to the program;

''(F) for any program that provides grants or other financial assistance to individuals or entities, for the most recent fiscal year—

''(i) a description of the individuals served by the program and beneficiaries who received financial assistance under the program, including an estimate of the number of individuals and beneficiaries, to the extent practicable;

''(ii) for each program for which the head of an agency determines it is not practicable to provide an estimate of the number of individuals and beneficiaries served by the program—

''(I) an explanation of why data regarding the number of such individuals and beneficiaries cannot be provided; and

''(II) a discussion of the measures that could be taken to gather the data required to provide such an estimate; and

''(iii) a description of—

''(I) the Federal employees who administer the program, including the number of full-time equivalents with a pro rata estimate for full-time equivalents associated with multiple programs; and

''(II) other individuals whose salary is paid in part or full by the Federal Government through a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or another form of financial award or assistance who administer or assist in any way in administering the program, including the number of full-time equivalents, to the extent practicable;

''(G) links to any evaluation, assessment, or program performance reviews by the agency, an Inspector General, or the Government Accountability Office (including program performance reports required under section 1116) released during the preceding 5 years; and

''(H) to the extent practicable, financial and other information for each program activity required to be reported under the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note).''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) INFORMATION FOR SMALLER PROGRAMS.—Information for each program identified in the program inventory required under paragraph (2) for which there is more than $1,000,000 and not more than $10,000,000 in annual budget authority shall, at a minimum, include—

''(A) an identification of the program activities that are aggregated, disaggregated, or consolidated as part of identifying programs;

''(B) for each program activity described in subparagraph (A), the amount of funding for the current fiscal year and previous 2 fiscal years;

''(C) an identification of the statutes that authorize the program and any major regulations specific to the program;

''(D) for any program that provides grants or other financial assistance to individuals or entities, a description of the individuals served by the program and beneficiaries who received financial assistance under the program for the most recent fiscal year; and

''(E) links to any evaluation, assessment, or program performance reviews by the agency, an Inspector General, or the Government Accountability Office (including program performance reports required under section 1116) released during the preceding 5 years.

''(5) ARCHIVING.—After the end of each fiscal year, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall archive and preserve the information included in the program inventory required under paragraph (2) relating to that fiscal year.''.

(b) EXPIRED GRANT FUNDING.—Not later than February 1 of each fiscal year, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall publish on a public website the total amount of undisbursed grant funding remaining in grant accounts for which the period of availability to the grantee has expired.

SEC. 3. GUIDANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) GUIDANCE.—Not later than June 30, 2018, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget—

(1) shall prescribe guidance to implement this Act, and the amendments made by this Act;

(2) shall issue guidance to agencies to identify how the program activities used for reporting under the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) are associated with programs identified in the program inventory required under section 1122(a)(2)(C)(i) of title 31, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a);

(3) may issue guidance to agencies to ensure that the programs identified in the program inventory required under section 1122(a)(2)(C)(i) of title 31, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), are presented at a similar level of detail across agencies and are not duplicative or overlapping; and

(4) may, based on an analysis of the costs of implementation, and after submitting to Congress a notification of the action by the Director—

(A) exempt from the requirements under section 1122(a) of title 31, United States Code, an agency that—

(i) is not listed in section 901(b) of title 31, United States Code; and

(ii) for the fiscal year during which the exemption is made, has budget authority (as defined in section 3 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 622)) of not more than $10,000,000; and

(B) extend the implementation deadline under subsection (b) by not more than 1 year.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall be implemented not later than June 30, 2019.

SEC. 4. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. 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 materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill brought to us by lead sponsor Mr. WALBERG of Michigan who has done considerable work on this not only at this point, but in Congresses of the past. We have cosponsorship from a number of people on both sides of the aisle—five members within the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act.

This bill is a bipartisan and bicameral effort to provide more information about Federal programs and their activities online. The American people deserve to know what their government does with their hard-earned dollars. The Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act will make it easier to evaluate Federal Government spending by requiring Federal agencies to identify their programs, provide basic information like what their programs do, how they perform, and how much they cost. Agencies must do a better job of managing their programs and identifying areas where taxpayer dollars are wasted.

The Government Accountability Office is tasked with reporting on duplication and continues to find new areas of duplication across the government. In 6 years, GAO has identified 250 areas and 637 corrective actions in those areas to reduce fragmentation, overlap, or duplication or address other opportunities for financial benefits. While only 41 percent of recommended corrective actions have been taken, GAO estimates this progress will result in approximately $125 billion in financial benefits and savings over 15 years.

While GAO's work has been invaluable, their ability to look comprehensively at the Federal Government is inherently limited because of the poor reporting by agencies about their activity. Quite simply, Mr. Speaker, without better data, billions more will be lost.

Current law, specifically the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act, requires agencies to report all their programs, their funding, and their performance information to the Office of Management and Budget. However, OMB's current inventory is incomplete and provides inconsistent information. This makes it more difficult and time consuming to identify areas of waste and inefficiency.

The Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act establishes an across-the-board definition for ''program'' and requires the publication of detailed information on each Federal program. This change will allow American taxpayers and Federal watchdogs to better evaluate the effectiveness and utility of government programs.

The Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act, Mr. Speaker, is an important and necessary step forward for the government in providing programs that are accountable, effective, and efficient.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Senator LANKFORD for his work on the Senate companion bill in the last Congress, which will be reintroduced in future weeks. I also thank Representative COOPER of Tennessee for his continued bipartisan support and cosponsorship on this issue.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act builds upon two existing laws that came through the Oversight and Government Reform Committee: the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010 and the DATA Act, which was signed into law in 2014.

□ 1245

The Obama administration launched the performance.gov Web site to implement the GPRA Modernization Act, and this bill would enhance the information available through that Web site.

The bill would require the Office of Management and Budget to make available on a central Web site an inventory of all Federal agency programs that have a budget authority of more than $1 million.

I thank Representative WALBERG for making changes to help address those concerns in the version of the bill before us today. It is important that we continue to work together to ensure the bill will work as intended.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is important the Federal Government convey to taxpayers how it is spending their hard-earned money. That is why I rise in support of H.R. 71, the Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act.

For Federal programs authorized to spend over $1 million, this bipartisan bill would make more information available and accessible online so that taxpayers may see where their money is being spent and how the program is performing. For each Federal program meeting these requirements, the government would need to make public several key pieces of information that are of interest to many of my constituents, including funding levels for the program, Federal laws that authorize the program, regulations related to the program, the results of performance reviews that measure the program's effectiveness, and any overlap of the program with another Federal program.

Simply put, this bill would help alleviate waste and prevent taxpayer dollars from being spent on unnecessary, ineffective, or duplicative programs.

I thank Congressman TIM WALBERG and Congressman JIM COOPER for their continued leadership on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill did pass the House without any objection in the last session, and I would, once again, urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill.

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

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

I am thankful for the good work by Mr. WALBERG and Mr. COOPER, who also serve on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. I thank Mr. CLAY and, certainly, Mr. CUMMINGS.

In the 114th Congress, this bill was able to pass overwhelmingly in the House by a vote of 413–0—with no opposition. It is truly bipartisan and bicameral. It is a good bill. I thank Senator JAMES LANKFORD of Oklahoma for his work on the Senate side, and we do hope that it will make it swiftly through the Senate.

The Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act provides the public and Congress with increased transparency about Federal programs, including how much they cost and any benefits that they provide. It sounds like a good and worthy thing to do, and it passed the previous Congress. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it here in the 115th Congress, and I am glad it is one of the first things that we are doing.

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 Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 71.

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.

PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY DONATION REFORM ACT OF 2017

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 73) to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 73

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 ''Presidential Library Donation Reform Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2112 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY FUNDRAISING ORGANIZATION REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

''(1) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 15 days after the end of a calendar quarter and until the end of the requirement period described in paragraph (2), each Presidential library fundraising organization shall submit to the Archivist information for that quarter in an electronic searchable and sortable format with respect to every contributor who gave the organization a contribution or contributions (whether monetary or in-kind) totaling $200 or more for the quarterly period.

''(2) DURATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The requirement to submit information under paragraph (1) shall continue until the later of the following occurs:

''(A) The Archivist has accepted, taken title to, or entered into an agreement to use any land or facility for the Presidential archival depository for the President for whom the Presidential library fundraising organization was established.

''(B) The President whose archives are contained in the deposit no longer holds the Office of President.

''(3) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PUBLISHED.—The Archivist shall publish on the website of the National Archives and Records Administration, within 30 days after each quarterly filing, any information that is submitted under paragraph (1), without a fee or other access charge in a downloadable database.

''(4) SUBMISSION OF FALSE MATERIAL INFORMATION PROHIBITED.—

''(A) INDIVIDUAL.—

''(i) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any person who makes a contribution described in paragraph (1) to knowingly and willfully submit false material information or omit material information with respect to the contribution to an organization described in such paragraph.

''(ii) PENALTY.—The penalties described in section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply with respect to a violation of clause (i) in the same manner as a violation described in such section.

''(B) ORGANIZATION.—

''(i) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any Presidential library fundraising organization to knowingly and willfully submit false material information or omit material information under paragraph (1).

''(ii) PENALTY.—The penalties described in section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall apply with respect to a violation of clause (i) in the same manner as a violation described in such section.

''(5) PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for a person to knowingly and willfully—

''(i) make a contribution described in paragraph (1) in the name of another person;

''(ii) permit his or her name to be used to effect a contribution described in paragraph (1); or

''(iii) accept a contribution described in paragraph (1) that is made by one person in the name of another person.

''(B) PENALTY.—The penalties set forth in section 309(d) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(d)) shall apply to a violation of subparagraph (A) in the same manner as if such violation were a violation of section 316(b)(3) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441b(b)(3)).

''(6) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—The Archivist shall promulgate regulations for the purpose of carrying out this subsection.

''(7) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) INFORMATION.—The term 'information' means the following:

''(i) The amount or value of each contribution made by a contributor referred to in paragraph (1) in the quarter covered by the submission.

''(ii) The source of each such contribution, and the address of the entity or individual that is the source of the contribution.

''(iii) If the source of such a contribution is an individual, the occupation of the individual.

''(iv) The date of each such contribution.

''(B) PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARY FUNDRAISING ORGANIZATION.—The term 'Presidential library fundraising organization' means an organization that is established for the purpose of raising funds for creating, maintaining, expanding, or conducting activities at—

''(i) a Presidential archival depository; or

''(ii) any facilities relating to a Presidential archival depository.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 2112(h) of title 44, United States Code (as added by subsection (a))—

(1) shall apply to an organization established for the purpose of raising funds for creating, maintaining, expanding, or conducting activities at a Presidential archival depository or any facilities relating to a Presidential archival depository before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall only apply with respect to contributions (whether monetary or in-kind) made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), who has championed this effort for quite a while. He is passionate about this, and he has poured his heart and soul into it.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I thank the chairman for yielding to me and for his support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is very simple, bipartisan legislation that would require organizers of Presidential libraries to disclose the identities of donors and the amounts they give. It wouldn't limit any donations; it would simply require disclosure. I introduced this legislation several Congresses ago because I felt then and feel now that the public should be made aware of possible conflicts of interest that sitting Presidents can have or may have while raising funds for their libraries.

First of all, I thank Ranking Member CUMMINGS for again cosponsoring this very important legislation and making it bipartisan. The legislation is so bipartisan that, after the first time we passed the bill—and it passed 392–3—it was taken over, at my request and with my agreement, by then-Chairman Waxman, who made it his bill. We passed it once again, and we passed it in the last Congress by a simple voice vote, so there is a lot of support for this bill. In the Senate, it was introduced by Mr. CARPER and Mr. Coburn, when he was in the Senate. We need to get some

more interest over there, and I think we are going to be able to do that in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we do not know who these donors to the Presidential libraries are or what interests they may have on any pending policy decisions that are to be made. I think that our government needs to operate in the open, not with secrecy. This legislation will apply to all future Presidential libraries and mandate, regardless of party, that the names of the donors and the amounts they contribute be disclosed. I would like to add that this legislation will apply to President Trump's future Presidential library. This will require him to disclose more than any other President has ever had to disclose before. This will be an unprecedented disclosure, and it falls in line with his stated desire to drain the swamp. Any sitting President has a great deal of power. Funds should not be raised for a Presidential library in his honor without some type of public disclosure.

I decided to introduce this bill after news reports surrounding a proposed Presidential library exposed that foreign governments from the Middle East were making very large donations. Then, in 2007, The Washington Post reported that President Clinton's Presidential library raised a substantial percentage of the cost of its facility with foreign contributions. However, this is not a partisan issue. I have introduced this and supported this legislation under both Democratic and Republican Presidents. The Presidential Library Donation Reform Act of 2017 would bring clarity to the process of planning and building these Presidential libraries.

In 2013, Sunlight Foundation Policy Director Daniel Schuman endorsed an earlier version of this bill during a hearing in front of our House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, where he said it ''would provide valuable information on special interests whose donations put them in close proximity with Presidents.''

Even Richard Cohen, the very liberal columnist for The Washington Post, once said about this bill: ''But surely it would be anything from interesting to illustrative to just plain damning to see what names are on that list and for what amounts.'' Our citizens have the right to know the details of these fundraising activities.

This bill has been introduced by the Center for Media and Democracy; the Center for Responsive Politics; the Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, often known as CREW; Common Cause; Public Citizen; the Society of Professional Journalists; and many others.

USA Today wrote a very favorable editorial about this bill, and it has been mentioned favorably in many publications across the years. I think it is a bill that everybody on both sides of the aisle can support, and I ask my colleagues to support this very bipartisan legislation.

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

I thank my long-time friend Representative DUNCAN and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for sponsoring this bill. Representative DUNCAN first sponsored a bill to improve Presidential libraries 17 years ago. I hope we can now, finally, get this important legislation enacted.

The Presidential Library Donation Reform Act would make the process for building Presidential libraries more transparent. Presidential libraries have become increasingly more expensive as they have evolved into multipurpose centers. The George W. Bush Presidential Center cost an estimated $250 million to build, and President Bush raised, approximately, $500 million for the building and an endowment for his library, museum, and institute.

Under current law, there is no requirement to disclose the identities of those who donate to a Presidential library and to a President while he is still in office. He is able to raise an unlimited amount of private donations. Requiring the disclosures of donors would help prevent the trading of political favors in exchange for donations.

This bill would require organizations that raise money to build Presidential libraries to disclose the identity of any individual who donates more than $200. The National Archives and Records Administration would then be required to post the donation information online. The bill would also create criminal penalties for individuals who report false information on donations and for fundraising organizations that omit donation information.

As was mentioned earlier, a group of 15 good government organizations, including CREW and the Sunlight Foundation, sent a letter that urged the House to support this bill. Here is what they wrote:

> Under the current opaque system, Presidents raise funds privately to establish their Presidential libraries.
>
> These efforts, which often begin long before they leave office, are unregulated and undisclosed, creating opportunities for—or the appearance of—influence peddling. Improved transparency would help reduce the appearance of impropriety and help deter any inappropriate behavior.

This bill was approved, without opposition, by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and it passed the House last year without opposition. I urge every Member of this body to support this bill.

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

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

As has been highlighted here by Mr. CLAY and by me, there is good bipartisan work that has gone on for far too long. It is time to pass this bill. I really do appreciate the good work Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee has done and the work of Ranking Member CUMMINGS of Maryland.

The Presidential Library Donation Reform Act of 2017 is the type of good-government, bipartisan legislation that is perfect to be one of the first bills to pass out of the 115th Congress. Last Congress, this legislation passed through the committee by regular order and passed the House of Representatives without opposition.

President Franklin Roosevelt established the first Presidential library in 1939. Since then, every former President since Herbert Hoover has had a library dedicated to his Presidential records. Each of the 13 current libraries is managed and operated by the National Archives and Records Administration at an annual cost of roughly $75 million. While these facilities are operated at taxpayer expense, the construction of these libraries is privately financed through donations.

As the volume of records for each President has increased over the years, so have construction costs. For example, when it opened in 2004, the Clinton Presidential Center, in part, cost approximately $165 million.

□ 1300

Nine years later, the George W. Bush Presidential Center, which opened in 2013, cost about $250 million. The Chicago Tribune has reported that President Obama's library might cost as much as $500 million.

Despite these escalating costs, there are no transparency requirements for Presidential library fundraising organizations. Here, transparency is important and very much needed.

This bill will require Presidential library fundraising organizations to disclose to the National Archives contributions in excess of $200 in any fiscal quarter in a searchable and sortable format. In turn, the National Archives will post this data online.

This disclosure requirement would end once control of a library facility is transferred to the National Archives. This ensures compliance costs of this legislation are minimal for both fundraising organizations and the National Archives.

This legislation is bipartisan. It is not intended to target any one individual. The Presidential Library Donation Reform Act has passed the House four times since 2002, with overwhelming support with both Democratic and Republican majorities in place at the time.

I would like to, again, highlight and thank my colleague, Representative DUNCAN. I do appreciate his efforts on this. I do hope that the 115th Congress is the time that the Senate will see fit to pass this bill to the President's desk.

I have no additional speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I just urge this body to adopt the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 73.

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 ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2017

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 70) to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 70

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Federal Advisory Committee Act Amendments of 2017''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Ensuring independent advice and expertise.
Sec. 3. Preventing efforts to circumvent the Federal Advisory Committee Act and public disclosure.
Sec. 4. Increasing transparency of advisory committees.
Sec. 5. Managing Federal advisory committees.
Sec. 6. Comptroller General review and reports.
Sec. 7. Application of Federal Advisory Committee Act to Trade Advisory Committees.
Sec. 8. Definitions.
Sec. 9. Technical and conforming amendments.
Sec. 10. Effective date.
Sec. 11. No additional funds authorized.

SEC. 2. ENSURING INDEPENDENT ADVICE AND EXPERTISE.

(a) BAR ON POLITICAL LITMUS TESTS.—Section 9 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''MEMBERSHIP;'' after ''ADVISORY COMMITTEES;'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

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

''(b) APPOINTMENTS MADE WITHOUT REGARD TO POLITICAL AFFILIATION OR ACTIVITY.—All appointments to advisory committees shall be made without regard to political affiliation or political activity, unless required by Federal statute.''.

(b) MINIMIZING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—Section 9 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is further amended by inserting after subsection (b) (as added by such subsection (a)) the following:

''(c) PUBLIC NOMINATIONS OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS.—Prior to appointing members to an advisory committee, the head of an agency shall give interested persons an opportunity to suggest potential committee members. The agency shall include a request for comments in the Federal Register notice required under subsection (a) and provide a mechanism for interested persons to comment through the official website of the agency. The agency shall consider any comments submitted under this subsection in selecting the members of an advisory committee.

''(d) DESIGNATION OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS.—

''(1) An individual appointed to an advisory committee who is not a full-time or permanent part-time officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be designated as—

''(A) a special Government employee, if the individual is providing advice based on the individual's expertise or experience; or

''(B) a representative, if the individual is representing the views of an entity or entities outside of the Federal Government.

''(2) An agency may not designate committee members as representatives to avoid subjecting them to Federal ethics rules and requirements.

''(3) The designated agency ethics official for each agency shall review the members of each advisory committee that reports to the agency to determine whether each member's designation is appropriate, and to redesignate members if appropriate. The designated agency ethics official shall certify to the head of the agency that such review has been made—

''(A) following the initial appointment of members; and

''(B) at the time a committee's charter is renewed, or, in the case of a committee with an indefinite charter, every 2 years.

''(4) The head of each agency shall inform each individual appointed to an advisory committee that reports to the agency whether the individual is appointed as a special Government employee or as a representative. The agency head shall provide each committee member with an explanation of the differences between special Government employees and representatives and a summary of applicable ethics requirements. The agency head, acting through the designated agency ethics official, shall obtain signed and dated written confirmation from each committee member that the member received and reviewed the information required by this paragraph.

''(5) The Director of the Office of Government Ethics shall provide guidance to agencies on what to include in the summary of ethics requirements required by paragraph (4).

''(6) The head of each agency shall, to the extent practicable, develop and implement strategies to minimize the need for written determinations under section 208(b)(3) of title 18, United States Code. Strategies may include such efforts as improving outreach efforts to potential committee members and seeking public input on potential committee members.''.

(c) REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING FACA.—Section 7(c) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting ''promulgate regulations and'' after ''The Administrator shall''.

(d) ENSURING INDEPENDENT ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 8—

(A) in the section heading, by inserting ''INDEPENDENT ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS;'' after ''RESPONSIBILITIES OF AGENCY HEADS;'';

(B) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(C) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) The head of each agency shall ensure that the agency does not interfere with the free and independent participation, expression of views, and deliberation by committee members. Each advisory committee shall include a statement describing the process used by the advisory committee in formulating the advice and recommendations when they are transmitted to the agency.''; and

(2) in section 10—

(A) in the section heading, by inserting ''; CHAIR'' after ''ATTENDANCE''; and

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

''(g) The Chair shall not be an employee of the agency to which the advisory committee reports, unless—

''(1) a statute specifically authorizes selection of such an employee as the Chair; or

''(2) the head of the agency directs an employee to serve as the Chair.''.

SEC. 3. PREVENTING EFFORTS TO CIRCUMVENT THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT AND PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.

(a) DE FACTO MEMBERS.—Section 4 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) TREATMENT OF INDIVIDUAL AS MEMBER.—An individual who is not a full-time or permanent part-time officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be regarded as a member of a committee if the individual regularly attends and participates in committee meetings as if the individual were a member, even if the individual does not have the right to vote or veto the advice or recommendations of the advisory committee.''.

(b) SUBCOMMITTEES.—Section 4 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is further amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) APPLICATION.—The provisions of this Act or of any rule, order, or regulation promulgated under this Act shall apply to each advisory committee, including any subcommittee or subgroup thereof, except to the extent that any Act of Congress establishing any such advisory committee specifically provides otherwise. Any subcommittee or subgroup that reports to a parent committee established under section 9(a) is not required to comply with section 9(f).''.

(c) COMMITTEES CREATED UNDER CONTRACT.—Section 3(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended in the matter following subparagraph (C) by adding at the end the following: ''An advisory committee is considered to be established by an agency, agencies, or the President if it is formed, created, or organized under contract, other transactional authority, cooperative agreement, grant, or otherwise at the request or direction of an agency, agencies, or the President.''.

(d) ADVISORY COMMITTEES CONTAINING SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Section 4 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by subsections (a) and (b) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Committee members appointed as special Government employees shall not be considered full-time or permanent part-time officers or employees of the Federal Government for purposes of determining the applicability of this Act under section 3(2).''.

SEC. 4. INCREASING TRANSPARENCY OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

(a) INFORMATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 11 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 11. DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to each advisory committee, the head of the agency to which the advisory committee reports shall make publicly available in accordance with subsection (b) the following information:

''(1) The charter of the advisory committee.

''(2) A description of the process used to establish and appoint the members of the advisory committee, including the following:

''(A) The process for identifying prospective members.

''(B) The process of selecting members for balance of viewpoints or expertise.

''(C) The reason each member was appointed to the committee.

''(D) A justification of the need for representative members, if any.

''(3) A list of all current members, including, for each member, the following:

''(A) The name of any person or entity that nominated the member.

''(B) Whether the member is designated as a special Government employee or a representative.

''(C) In the case of a representative, the individuals or entity whose viewpoint the member represents.

''(4) A list of all members designated as special Government employees for whom written certifications were made under section 208(b) of title 18, United States Code, a copy of each such certification, a summary description of the conflict necessitating the certification, and the reason for granting the certification.

''(5) Any recusal agreement made by a member or any recusal known to the agency that occurs during the course of a meeting or other work of the committee.

''(6) A summary of the process used by the advisory committee for making decisions.

''(7) Detailed minutes of all meetings of the committee and a description of committee efforts to make meetings accessible to the public using online technologies (such as video recordings) or other techniques (such as audio recordings).

''(8) Any written determination by the President or the head of the agency to which the advisory committee reports, pursuant to section 10(d), to close a meeting or any portion of a meeting and the reasons for such determination.

''(9) Notices of future meetings of the committee.

''(10) Any additional information considered relevant by the head of the agency to which the advisory committee reports.

''(b) MANNER OF DISCLOSURE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the head of an agency shall make the information required to be disclosed under this section available electronically on the official public website of the agency and to the Administrator at least 15 calendar days before each meeting of an advisory committee. If the head of the agency determines that such timing is not practicable for any required information, such head shall make the information available as soon as practicable but no later than 48 hours before the next meeting of the committee. An agency may withhold from disclosure any information that would be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

''(2) WEBSITE AVAILABILITY.—The head of an agency shall make available electronically, on the official public website of the agency, detailed minutes and, to the extent available, a transcript or audio or video recording of each advisory committee meeting not later than 30 calendar days after such meeting.

''(3) GRANT REVIEWS.—In the case of grant reviews, disclosure of information required by subsection (a)(3) may be provided in the aggregate rather than by individual grant.

''(c) PROVISION OF INFORMATION BY ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide, on the official public website of the General Services Administration, electronic access to the information made available by each agency under this section.

''(d) AVAILABILITY OF MEETING MATERIALS.—Except where prohibited by contractual agreements entered into prior to the effective date of this Act, agencies and advisory committees shall make available to any person, at actual cost of duplication, copies of advisory committee meeting materials.''.

(b) CHARTER FILING.—Subsection (f) of section 9 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), as redesignated by section 2(a) of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

''(f) No advisory committee shall meet or take any action until an advisory committee charter has been filed with the Administrator, the head of the agency to whom any advisory committee reports, and the standing committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives having legislative jurisdiction of such agency. Such charter shall contain the following information in the following order:

''(1) The committee's official designation.

''(2) The authority under which the committee is established.

''(3) The committee's objectives and the scope of its activity.

''(4) A description of the duties for which the committee is responsible, and, if such duties are not solely advisory, a specification of the authority for such functions.

''(5) The agency or official to whom the committee reports.

''(6) The agency responsible for providing the necessary support for the committee.

''(7) The responsibilities of the officer or employee of the Federal Government designated under section 10(e).

''(8) The estimated number and frequency of committee meetings.

''(9) The period of time necessary for the committee to carry out its purposes.

''(10) The committee's termination date, if less than two years from the date of the committee's establishment.

''(11) The estimated number of members and a description of the expertise needed to carry out the objectives of the committee.

''(12) A description of whether the committee will be composed of special Government employees, representatives, or members from both categories.

''(13) Whether the agency intends to create subcommittees and if so, the agency official authorized to exercise such authority.

''(14) The estimated annual operating costs in dollars and full-time equivalent positions for such committee.

''(15) The recordkeeping requirements of the committee.

''(16) The date the charter is filed.

A copy of any such charter shall also be furnished to the Library of Congress.''.

SEC. 5. MANAGING FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

(a) COMMITTEE MANAGEMENT OFFICERS.—Subsection (c) of section 8 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), as redesignated by section 2(d) of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

''(c) The head of each agency that has an advisory committee shall designate an Advisory Committee Management Officer who shall—

''(1) be a senior official who is—

''(A) an expert in implementing the requirements of this Act and regulations promulgated pursuant to this Act; and

''(B) the primary point of contact for the General Services Administration;

''(2) be responsible for the establishment, management, and supervision of the advisory committees of the agency, including establishing procedures, performance measures, and outcomes for such committees;

''(3) assemble and maintain the reports, records, and other papers (including advisory committee meeting materials) of any such committee during its existence;

''(4) ensure any such committee and corresponding agency staff adhere to the provisions of this Act and any regulations promulgated pursuant to this Act;

''(5) maintain records on each employee of any such committee and completion of training required for any such employee;

''(6) be responsible for providing the information required in section 7(b) of this Act to the Administrator; and

''(7) carry out, on behalf of that agency, the provisions of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to the reports, records, and other papers described in paragraph (3).''.

SEC. 6. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW AND REPORTS.

(a) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review compliance by agencies with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended by this Act, including whether agencies are appropriately appointing advisory committee members as either special Government employees or representatives.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit to the committees described in subsection (c) two reports on the results of the review, as follows:

(1) The first report shall be submitted not later than one year after the date of promulgation of regulations under section 7(c) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 2(c).

(2) The second report shall be submitted not later than five years after such date of promulgation of regulations.

(c) COMMITTEES.—The committees described in this subsection are the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 7. APPLICATION OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT TO TRADE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

Section 135(f)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(f)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''subsections (a) and (b) of sections 10 and 11 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act'' and inserting ''subsections (a) and (b) of section 10 and subsections (a)(7), (a)(8), (a)(9), (b)(2), and (d) of section 11 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act''.

SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) The term 'special Government employee' has the meaning given that term in section 202(a) of title 18, United States Code.''.

SEC. 9. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 7(d)(1) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''the rate specified for GS–18 of the General Schedule under section 5332'' and inserting ''the rate for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315''; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking ''handicapped individuals (within the meaning of section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794))'' and inserting ''individuals with disabilities (as defined in section 7(20) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 705(20)))''.

SEC. 10. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 11. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.

No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. 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 materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Committee on Ways and Means for their work on this bill; and I include committee exchanges of letters into the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 4, 2017.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ, I am writing with respect to H.R. 70, the ''Federal Advisory Committee Act Amendments of 2017,'' which was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

H.R. 70 involves issues that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite the House's consideration of H.R. 70, the Committee on Ways and Means will not assert its jurisdictional claim over this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding and agreement that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in die bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 70, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, January 4, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 3, 2017, H.R. 70, the Federal Advisory Committee Act Amendments of 2017, was introduced by Rep. Wm. Lacy Clay (D–MO–1). The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on Ways and Means.

I ask that you allow the Ways and Means Committee to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Ways and Means represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that the primary sponsor is actually the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY). I reserve the balance of my time in order to allow Mr. CLAY to speak first on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

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

Let me begin by thanking the chairman for his understanding and his support of this legislation. I certainly appreciate it, and I am sure it will make the Federal Government run more efficiently.

I rise in strong support of the Federal Advisory Committee Act Amendments. I have introduced this bill in previous Congresses, and it passed the House last year without opposition.

The FACA was originally enacted in 1972. It is intended to ensure that committees that provide advice to Federal agencies and the President operate with transparency.

Advisory committees provide the government with recommendations on a wide range of issues. For example, the EPA relies on the expertise of the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee to provide technical advice on setting national air quality standards.

The bill we are considering today would strengthen FACA to make Federal advisory committees more transparent and to make agencies more accountable in how they select and use these committees. Agencies currently can avoid the requirements of FACA by conducting advisory committee business through subcommittees. This bill makes it clear that FACA applies to subcommittees as well as parent committees.

The bill also clarifies that a committee set up by a contractor is subject to FACA if it is formed under direction of the President or an agency.

Under FACA, agencies would be required to disclose how advisory members are chosen, whether they have financial conflicts of interest if they are appointed to provide their own expertise, and who they work for if they are representing a specific interest.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I hope the Senate will take it up quickly and send it to the President.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Again, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) for his good work on this. The Federal Advisory Committee Act Amendments of 2017 was introduced by Representative CLAY to help improve the governance and transparency of the Federal advisory committees. Last Congress, this bill passed through the committee by regular order and passed the House.

Congress acknowledged the merits of using advisory committees to acquire viewpoints from business, academic, and other interests when it passed the original act back in 1972. While not necessarily well-known, Federal advisory committees are small bodies of people who provide advice, guidance, and recommendation to Federal policymakers on a wide range of topics.

All told, in fiscal year 2015, there were roughly 1,000 Federal advisory committees, and they held roughly 7,400 meetings at a cost to the American taxpayers of more than $369 million. Now, this strikes me personally as an exceptionally high number. It is a large amount of money. We need to learn more about them, and I personally would help champion to reduce the number of overall Federal advisory committees.

We have some 2 million Federal employees, I think, who are highly capable, motivated, and compensated to provide this work. It is good to get outside perspective; but, at some point, we are going to have to look at the cost, the size, and the scope of this as well. Nevertheless, we have to make sure that we are getting the most of these taxpayer dollars.

Some agencies believe the FACA requirements are cumbersome and resource intensive. We could certainly streamline this. This reduces the ability of committees to focus on substantive issues in a timely fashion.

Both governmental agencies and private groups say the 1972 act does not do enough to require agencies to promote openness and transparency with regard to Federal advisory committees. The bill works to address these problems and bring transparency to the Federal advisory committees and the Federal agency decisionmaking process.

The bill provides needed transparency for how committee members are selected in several ways. First, the bill requires members to be selected without political affiliation. The bill also authorizes agency heads to require members to fully disclose any conflicts of interest. You would think that that would be common sense but something that we actually need to put into this bill and make sure that we understand that.

In addition, the bill allows these individuals who regularly attend and participate in committee meetings to be considered as a member, even if they are not allowed to vote.

The bill also improves transparency of committee activities. This is done by increasing the independence of these committees and making sure its advice, information, and recommendations are a judgment of the committee and not the agency.

The bill also increases transparency by requiring each agency to make available on their Web site the committee and its activities.

I urge our Members to support this. It has wide support and has had it in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. I urge its passage. I again thank Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONNOLLY, and others who were working on this issue.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a colleague, friend, and cohort on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) for his leadership on this very important piece of legislation. I also thank the distinguished chairman of our full committee for his leadership in moving this through.

The Federal Advisory Committee Act Amendments of 2017, I think, fall under the umbrella of good government, which the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, at its best, strives to promote on a bipartisan basis. I am proud, as Mr. CLAY indicated, to be an original cosponsor of the bill.

We welcome consideration of the Federal Advisory Committee Act Amendments, which would improve the transparency and accountability of Federal advisory committees, often arcane, Byzantine parts of the government most of the public can't access.

This crucial piece of legislation ensures that the selection process of advisory committee members takes place without regard to political affiliation and requires the disclosure of potential conflicts of interest.

The Federal Advisory Committee Act, FACA, enacted on October 6, 1972, formalized the process for establishing, operating, overseeing, and terminating Federal advisory committees. Federal advisory committees provide a mechanism for government officials to gain knowledge from Federal and non-Federal experts on key policy matters. FACA ensures Federal advisory committees, however, are both transparent and accessible.

FACA was enacted in response to concerns that Federal advisory committees were becoming increasingly common but had little oversight or accountability. The then-House Committee on Government Operations listened to concerns over the lack of transparency and formalized a governance process for these advisory bodies by establishing the Committee Management Secretariat within the General Services Administration to monitor compliance with the new law. The intent of that law was to make Federal advisory committees more accountable, more transparent, balanced, and independent from the influence of special interests.

This bill before us today, inspired by Mr. LACY's leadership, will help strengthen the independence of those advisory committees by requiring members to be selected without regard to partisan affiliation. It is imperative that the recommendations and guidance of the committees be provided free of political influence, pressure, and intervention.

The bill closes the loophole that allows subcommittees to operate outside of the regulations of FACA. It also improves the transparency of advisory committees by requiring agency heads to obtain conflict of interest disclosures from all committee members serving as individual experts.

H.R. 2347 builds upon the accountability of the advisory committees by explicitly stating that committees established by contractors must comply with the law and that individuals who regularly attend and participate as if they are members are considered members regardless of their ability to vote.

This bill also calls on the Government Accountability Office to review and report regularly on agency compliance.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Virginia an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, last Congress, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform reported this bill favorably by unanimous consent.

I urge my colleagues to continue Congress' longstanding support of oversight, accountability, and transparency and vote for this thoughtful and important piece of legislation.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I would urge the House to adopt this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a good piece of legislation. I again thank Mr. CLAY and Mr. CONNOLLY for their work on this, and I urge its passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 70.

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

GAO ACCESS AND OVERSIGHT ACT OF 2017

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 72) to ensure the Government Accountability Office has adequate access to information.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 72

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 ''GAO Access and Oversight Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. ACCESS TO CERTAIN INFORMATION.

(a) ACCESS TO CERTAIN INFORMATION.—Subchapter II of chapter 7 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 721. Access to certain information

''(a) No provision of the Social Security Act, including section 453(l) of that Act (42 U.S.C. 653(l)), shall be construed to limit, amend, or supersede the authority of the Comptroller General to obtain any information or to inspect any record under section 716 of this title.

''(b) The specific reference to a statute in subsection (a) shall not be construed to affect access by the Government Accountability Office to information under statutes that are not so referenced.''.

(b) AGENCY REPORTS.—Section 720(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''or planned'' after ''action taken''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, the congressional committees with jurisdiction over the agency program or activity that is the subject of the recommendation, and the Government Accountability Office before the 61st day after the date of the report; and''.

(c) AUTHORITY TO OBTAIN RECORDS.—Section 716 of title 31, United States Code, is amended in subsection (a)—

(1) by striking ''(a)'' and inserting ''(2)''; and

(2) by inserting after the section heading the following:

''(a)(1) The Comptroller General is authorized to obtain such agency records as the Comptroller General requires to discharge the duties of the Comptroller General (including audit, evaluation, and investigative duties), including through the bringing of civil actions under this section. In reviewing a civil action under this section, the court shall recognize the continuing force and effect of the authorization in the preceding sentence until such time as the authorization is repealed pursuant to law.''.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 7 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 720 the following:

''721. Access to certain information.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

□ 1315

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. 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 Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Committee on Ways and Means for their work on the bill, and I include the committee exchange of letters into the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, January 4, 2017.
Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 3, 2017, H.R. 72, the GAO Access and Oversight Act of 2017, was introduced by Rep. Earl L. ''Buddy'' Carter (R–GA–1). The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on Ways and Means.

I ask that you allow the Ways and Means Committee to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Ways and Means represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, January 4, 2017.
Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ, I am writing concerning H.R. 72, the ''GAO Access and Oversight Act of 2017.'' This bill amends access to the National Directory of New Hires (42 U.S.C. 653(I)) which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. As a result of your having consulted with me concerning the provision of the bill that falls within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree not to seek a sequential referral so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that, by forgoing consideration of H.R. 72 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and we will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. The Committee on Ways and Means also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), the original cosponsor of the bill. I want to thank the gentleman for his championing this bill through.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 72, the GAO Access and Oversight Act of 2017.

The GAO is one of the most important tools taxpayers and Congress have to keep the Federal Government accountable. Without complete information, GAO is limited in their ability to prevent waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement.

This bill clarifies that GAO has access to data, such as the National Directory of New Hires, which will better equip GAO to audit key Federal programs on behalf of taxpayers. Every day, GAO handles the government's most sensitive information in a responsible manner, and GAO provides trusted recommendations for improving the Federal Government's operations.

The Federal Government reported $137 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2015, the largest ever reported. Total improper payments for the Federal Government over the past 10 years exceeds $1 trillion. This bill will increase the effectiveness of GAO to help reduce improper payments, dollars that could be used to better fund the programs that ultimately serve the people. This bill takes an important step forward by providing GAO with an additional tool to ensure GAO's effectiveness in preventing fraud, waste, and abuse.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

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

GAO provides an invaluable aid to Congress in conducting our constitutional duty to oversee and evaluate the executive branch. To do its job effectively, GAO needs timely access to agency documents, materials, and other information.

The bill before us would ensure GAO's access to the National Directory of New Hires, a valuable database of wage and employment information. Access to this database would assist GAO in its improper payment and fraud work, as well as its evaluation of programs in which eligibility is means tested. The bill would also explicitly provide GAO with standing to pursue litigation if an entity in the executive branch improperly denies the GAO access to information.

Mr. Speaker, similar bills have passed the House by wide margins in a number of previous Congresses. These are needed reforms. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 72, the GAO Access and Oversight Act of 2017, and its chief sponsor, Mr. BUDDY CARTER of Georgia.

We have a duty to ensure that taxpayer money is spent efficiently and effectively. One of the key ways we carry out this duty is through the key watchdog of the government, the Government Accountability Office. The GAO has a proven track record of excellence, and we rely heavily on this group, thousands of professionals who pour their heart and soul into diving deep into organizations and understanding how they function. But as this bill states, we need some more openness and transparency.

In the past 6 years alone, it has identified more than 200 areas of duplication, overlap, and fragmentation. They have made recommendations on 600 actions to make our government more effective and efficient. We need to listen to them and understand them. We also, I would argue, Mr. Speaker, have a duty and an obligation to give them the tools and access that they need in order to do their jobs even better. We must put GAO in the best position possible to rout out and deter waste, fraud, and abuse.

Today, we have an opportunity to better arm the GAO by clarifying its right to access data contained in the National Directory of New Hires. This gives GAO access to the most up-to-date data to ensure Federal program dollars go to the folks Congress intended to receive them. Doing so, we will help GAO better investigate potential fraud and improper payments, including those overextended disability insurance programs. The GAO's objectives are hindered without access to the data, and taxpayer dollars are not as well protected.

This bill has previously received overwhelming support in the House, and it is time for us to finish the job and pass the bill to the Senate and get it to the President's desk.

On September 16, the House approved this important bill by a vote of 404–0. The language in this bill was also included in bipartisan legislation that was approved unanimously by the full House in the 113th Congress. Again, it is time to send this bill to the President.

I would like to thank my colleagues, and Representative BUDDY CARTER in particular, for sponsoring this legislation and believing in it so wholeheartedly. I would also like to thank Senator BEN SASSE of Nebraska as the lead sponsor in the United States Senate.

I urge passage of this bill. I have no additional speakers.

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 Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 72.

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.

THOROUGHLY INVESTIGATING RETALIATION AGAINST WHISTLEBLOWERS ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 69) to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide modifications to authorities relating to the Office of Special Counsel, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 69

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 ''Thoroughly Investigating Retaliation Against Whistleblowers Act''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(a)(2) of the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 (5 U.S.C. 5509 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) $24,119,000 for fiscal year 2017 and $25,735,000 for each of fiscal years 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021 to carry out subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 5, United States Code (as amended by this Act).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be deemed to apply beginning on October 1, 2016.

SEC. 3. ACCESS TO AGENCY INFORMATION.

Section 1212(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5)(A) In carrying out this subchapter, the Special Counsel is authorized to—

''(i) have access to any record or other information (including a report, audit, review, document, recommendation, or other material) of any agency under the jurisdiction of the Office of Special Counsel, consistent with the requirements of subparagraph (C); and

''(ii) require any employee of such an agency to provide to the Office any record or other information during an investigation, review, or inquiry of any agency under the jurisdiction of the Office.

''(B) With respect to any record or other information made available by an agency under this subchapter, the Office shall apply a level of confidentiality to such record or information at the level of confidentiality applied to the record by the agency.

''(C) With respect to any record or other information described under subparagraph (A), the Attorney General or an Inspector General may withhold access to any such record or other information if the disclosure could reasonably be expected to interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, but only if the Attorney General or applicable agency head submits a written report to the Office of Special Counsel describing the record or other information withheld and the reason for the withholding.''.

SEC. 4. WHISTLEBLOWER PROVISIONS.

Section 1213 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''15 days'' and inserting ''45 days'';

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in the matter before subparagraph (A), by striking ''such as'' and inserting ''including''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) if any disclosure referred to an agency head under subsection (c) is substantiated in whole or in part by the agency head, a detailed explanation of the failure to take any action described under paragraph (5).''; and

(3) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

''(5) If an agency head submits a report to the Special Counsel under subsection (d) that includes a description of any agency action proposed to be taken as a result of the investigation, the agency head shall, not later than 180 days after the date of such submission, submit a supplemental report to the Special Counsel stating whether any proposed action has been taken, and if the action has not been taken, the reason why it has not been taken.''.

SEC. 5. TERMINATION OF CERTAIN OSC INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1214(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6)(A) Within 30 days of receiving an allegation from a person under paragraph (1), the Special Counsel may terminate an investigation under such paragraph with respect to the allegation, without further inquiry or an opportunity for the person to respond, if the Special Counsel determines that—

''(i) the same allegation, based on the same set of facts and circumstances—

''(I) had previously been made by the person and previously investigated by the Special Counsel; or

''(II) had previously been filed by the person with the Merit Systems Protection Board;

''(ii) the Office of Special Counsel does not have jurisdiction to investigate the allegation; or

''(iii) the person knew or should have known of the alleged prohibited personnel practice earlier than the date that is 3 years before the date Special Counsel received the allegation.

''(B) If the Special Counsel terminates an investigation under subparagraph (A), not later than 30 days after the date of such termination the Special Counsel shall provide a written notification stating the basis for the termination to the person who made the allegation. Paragraph (1)(D) shall not apply to any termination under such subparagraph.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1214 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking ''The Special Counsel'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (6), the Special Counsel''; and

(2) in subsection (a)(1)(C), in the matter before clause (i), by inserting ''or paragraph (6)'' after ''paragraph (2)''.

SEC. 6. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) OSC ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Section 1218 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1218. Annual report

''(a) The Special Counsel shall submit an annual report to Congress on the activities of the Special Counsel. Any such report shall include—

''(1) the number, types, and disposition of allegations of prohibited personnel practices filed with the Special Counsel, and the cost of allegations so disposed of;

''(2) the number of investigations conducted by the Special Counsel;

''(3) the number of stays or disciplinary actions negotiated by the Special Counsel with agencies;

''(4) the number of cases in which the Special Counsel did not make a determination whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that a prohibited personnel practice has occurred, exists, or is to be taken within the 240-day period specified in section 1214(b)(2)(A)(i);

''(5) a description of the recommendations and reports made by the Special Counsel to other agencies pursuant to this subchapter, and the actions taken by the agencies as a result of the reports or recommendations;

''(6) the number of—

''(A) actions initiated before the Merit Systems Protection Board, including the number of corrective action petitions and disciplinary action complaints so initiated; and

''(B) stays and stay extensions obtained from the Board; and

''(7) the number of prohibited personnel practice complaints that result in—

''(A) a favorable action for the complainant, categorized by actions with respect to whistleblower reprisal cases and all other cases; and

''(B) a favorable outcome for the complainant, categorized by outcomes with respect to whistleblower reprisal cases and all other cases.

''(b) The report required by subsection (a) shall include whatever recommendations for legislation or other action by Congress the Special Counsel may consider appropriate.''.

(b) OSC PUBLIC INFORMATION.—Section 1219(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(1) a list of any noncriminal matter referred to an agency head under section 1213(c), together with—

''(A) the applicable transmittal of the matter to the agency head under section 1213(c)(1);

''(B) any report from agency head under section 1213(c)(1)(B) relating to such matter;

''(C) if appropriate, not otherwise prohibited by law, and with the consent of the complainant, any comments from the complainant under section 1213(e)(1) relating to the matter; and

''(D) the Special Counsel's comments or recommendations under section 1213(e)(3) or (4) relating to the matter;''.

SEC. 7. ESTABLISHMENT OF SURVEY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Special Counsel shall design and establish a survey pilot program under which the Office shall conduct, with respect to fiscal years 2018 and 2019, a survey of individuals who have filed a complaint or disclosure with the Office. The survey shall be designed to gather responses from the individuals for the purpose of collecting information and improving customer service at various stages of the review or investigative process. The results of the survey shall be published in the annual report of the Office.

(b) SUSPENSION OF OTHER SURVEYS.—During fiscal years 2018 and 2019, section 13 of Public Law 103–424 shall have no force or effect.

SEC. 8. PENALTIES UNDER THE HATCH ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7326 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 7326. Penalties

''An employee or individual who violates section 7323 or 7324 shall be subject to—

''(1) disciplinary action consisting of removal, reduction in grade, debarment from Federal employment for a period not to exceed 5 years, suspension, or reprimand;

''(2) an assessment of a civil penalty not to exceed $1,000; or

''(3) any combination of the penalties described in paragraph (1) or (2).''.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any violation of section 7323 or 7324 of title 5, United States Code, occurring after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 9. REGULATIONS.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Special Counsel shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to perform the functions of the

Special Counsel under subchapter II of chapter 12 of title 5, United States Code, including regulations necessary to carry out sections 1213, 1214, and 1215 of such title, and any functions required due to the amendments made by this Act. Such regulations shall be published in the Federal Register.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. 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 Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM), the lead sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today on behalf of our legislation to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel for an additional 5-year period to protect whistleblowers, Federal employees who have the courage to come forward to expose waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government and who are so important to our oversight responsibilities here in Congress.

The Office of Special Counsel performs a variety of important responsibilities. Chief amongst them is investigating retaliation against whistleblowers from the executive branch agencies, as well as other prohibited personnel practices. Once again, this is vitally important to the work we perform in the Government Reform and Oversight Committee and ensures greater accountability from the executive branch to Congress.

We are proud of the support this bipartisan bill has received from the whistleblower community and from those who care deeply about our efforts to perform effective oversight in our Federal Government.

Since the last authorization expired in 2007, there are a number of necessary reforms for the OSC as the role of the Office continues to grow and evolve. By enacting this legislation, we can ensure the Office of Special Counsel will have access to Federal agency records that are absolutely necessary to perform their duty of protecting Federal employees who had the courage to speak up about malpractice, mismanagement, and fraud in the Federal Government.

I think we can all agree how unfortunate it is that some executive agencies continue to stonewall the Office of Special Counsel in order to prevent them from investigating retaliatory actions against whistleblowers, even going so far as to invoke executive privilege when dealing with the OSC. Common sense tells us that this is unacceptable. If the Office of Special Counsel isn't granted the access to the information it needs, there is no way it can properly conduct the duties authorized by Congress.

This bill also takes important steps to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Office of Special Counsel, such as allowing OSC to use a simplified process to reduce duplicative complaints to better focus their limited resources on allegations and investigations, and instituting a commonsense 3-year statute of limitations after which document recovery and witness recollections can be difficult to obtain.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks, I would like to specifically highlight the important work the Office of Special Counsel performed recently in their exposure of the mismanagement and abuse of our veterans at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Two whistleblowers at the VA hospital in Phoenix, Arizona, recently came forward with information regarding inadequate mental health treatment in employee training at their facility. They were later retaliated against by management. OSC was able to ensure that they received a new job at a nearby facility under different management. Just last month, the VA issued a report in response to OSC's investigation detailing the changes they had made to improve mental health care at that VA facility.

Incidents like these serve as a great reminder that hardworking taxpayers are tired of corruption in the Federal Government.

I would also like to note the excellent work of the current special counsel, Carolyn Lerner, who is a breath of fresh air in this role.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is this committee, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, needs more whistleblowers in the Federal Government, not less; and the best way to ensure government employees come forward to expose waste, fraud, and abuse is to ensure that they will be protected. This legislation will enable OSC to do exactly that on behalf of all hardworking American taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

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

I rise in support of this bipartisan bill which reauthorizes the Office of Special Counsel. The OSC serves as a safe harbor for Federal whistleblowers to disclose wrongdoing. OSC also works to protect Federal employees and applicants for Federal employment from prohibited personnel practices.

The bill would make clear that OSC is entitled to access agency information in its investigations. This bill would also allow OSC to hold agencies more accountable from whistleblower retaliation. Under this bill, if any agency substantiates a whistleblower disclosure from OSC but fails to take a recommended corrective action, the agency must explain why it failed to take the action.

This legislation would strengthen the tools available to OSC for addressing and correcting retaliation and discrimination in the Federal workplace. It is more important than ever for the Office of Special Counsel to have the tools it needs to protect the Federal workforce.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

First, let me note in the last Congress this legislation passed out of committee by regular order and passed the House on January 11, 2016.

The Office of Special Counsel is tasked with protecting Federal employees from prohibited personnel practices, including reprisals on whistleblowers. Whistleblowers are an indispensable part of helping Congress identify waste, fraud, and abuse at Federal agencies. Information provided by these brave folks can result in investigations and legislation that changes the way we conduct ourselves in government.

As the agency tasked with protecting whistleblowers, the OSC is vital to make sure these individuals feel comfortable coming forward and that they are offered protections. The agency has been busy. From 2013 to 2015, OSC's caseload increased from 4,500 cases open to more than 6,100. That increase coincided with multiple scandals within the Veterans Administration, as Mr. BLUM of Iowa has highlighted.

In fiscal year 2016, OSC projected nearly 2,500 cases from just the VA—2,500 cases at just the Veterans Administration. This reauthorization will ensure the OSC has adequate funding to continue protecting whistleblowers in the VA and other agencies as well. The majority of the OSC funding goes directly to hiring employees who work to protect whistleblowers.

□ 1330

The bill also makes substantive improvements to current law to ensure the OSC can carry out its mission more effectively. Those reforms cover a few areas, ensuring agencies cooperate with the OSC, clarifying OSC's investigative procedures and making sure Congress receives clear information on whistleblower reprisal throughout the Federal Government.

With this bill, the OSC has clear authority to access agency records and to conduct its investigations. For its part, the OSC must treat those records in the same manner of confidentiality as the agency would, alleviating concerns about disclosure of sensitive information.

The bill also gives OSC needed flexibility to focus on claims that deserve our attention. It will allow the agency to terminate duplicative claims already being pursued by the Merit Systems Protection Board and claims that

exceed statutory timeframes. Agencies will also be required to submit reports detailing what actions they take as a result of these OSC investigations—something in Congress that we should be paying attention to. This reporting provision requires agencies to admit any failures in holding people accountable and gives Congress much-needed transparency.

Finally, the bill codifies OSC's practice under the current special counsel of disclosing to Congress results and statistics. Codifying this transparency ensures the practice will continue and allow for easier oversight of these activities.

In order to help protect the whistleblowers and reform the Federal agencies, I would urge our colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 69.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), who is the ranking member of the Government Operations Subcommittee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my friend, Mr. CLAY, for his leadership and for his kindness.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Thoroughly Investigating Retaliation Against Whistleblowers Act—a mouthful, but it captures what we are trying to do.

I certainly appreciate Mr. BLUM's efforts to advance legislation that authorizes the Office of Special Counsel and protects whistleblowers in the Federal Government, an effort the Oversight and Government Reform Committee strives to promote when we are at our best on a bipartisan basis, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the bill.

I welcome consideration of this bill which would reaffirm Congress' commitment to whistleblowers, upholding the Oversight and Government Reform Committee's obligation to protect those whistleblowers that help identify mismanagement, waste, and fraud at Federal agencies and to support the oversight work of Congress. That is Congress at its best.

With the enactment of the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989, OSC became an independent agency within the executive branch. Its mission is to safeguard the merit system of protecting Federal employees from prohibitive personnel practices, especially reprisal from whistleblowing. OSC provides employees a mechanism for disclosing wrongdoing in government agencies and provides advice on the Hatch Act, which restricts political activity by government employees generally.

OSC enforces employment rights under the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 for Federal employees who serve or have served in the uniformed services. Congress last reauthorized OSC for the period 2003 to 2007. Due in part to Congress' emphasis on transparency in government, OSC has experienced significant growth in its caseload since its last reauthorization. In the past 5 years, that caseload has increased, Mr. Speaker, by 58 percent.

This bill reauthorizes the agency from 2016 through 2020 and makes several important changes to assist OSC in carrying out its vital mission. The bill codifies OSC's current practice of providing important performance metrics in its annual reports to the Congress and requires additional metrics to support congressional oversight of its effectiveness.

Last Congress, this bill was successfully passed out of our committee on, I believe, a unanimous basis. I urge my colleagues to continue Congress' longstanding tradition of support for oversight, accountability, whistleblower protection, and transparency, and vote in the affirmative for the Thoroughly Investigating Retaliation Against Whistleblowers Act.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I would just urge the body to adopt the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill, H.R. 69. We have had four good champions led by Mr. BLUM of Iowa in our committee who have helped put this together: Mr. MEADOWS of North Carolina, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, and Mr. CUMMINGS, the ranking member out of Maryland. All four have come together as original cosponsors here in the 115th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 69.

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.

MIDNIGHT RULES RELIEF ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 21.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 5(b) of House Resolution 5, I call up the bill (H.R. 21) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for ''midnight rules'', and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(b) of House Resolution 5, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 21

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 ''Midnight Rules Relief Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. EN BLOC CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTIONS OF DISAPPROVAL PERTAINING TO "MIDNIGHT RULES".

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 801(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) In applying section 802 to rules described under paragraph (1), a joint resolution of disapproval may contain one or more such rules if the report under subsection (a)(1)(A) for each such rule was submitted during the final year of a President's term.''.

(b) TEXT OF RESOLVING CLAUSE.—Section 802(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting after ''resolving clause of which is'' the following: ''(except as otherwise provided in this subsection)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''In the case of a joint resolution under section 801(d)(4), the matter after the resolving clause of such resolution shall be as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the following rules: the rule submitted by the ____ relating to ____; and the rule submitted by the ____ relating to ____. Such rules shall have no force or effect.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in and additional clauses describing additional rules to be included as necessary)''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Speaker, Federal bureaucrats are continuously creating new and more complicated and costly burdens on hardworking Americans in the form of unnecessarily burdensome regulations. Clearly, some regulation is necessary to protect public safety, set general rules of the road, and accomplish other important goals.

However, despite the fact that these goals can often be accomplished with relatively simple guidance, Washington bureaucrats seem more determined than ever to create the most complicated puzzles they can imagine, regardless of the compliance costs for small businesses or the new and innovative products entrepreneurs are forced to shelve in order to comply with these overly complicated regulations.

Bureaucrats also don't seem to care that American families face higher prices for goods and have fewer job opportunities when employers are unnecessarily forced to factor wasteful costs of complying with overly burdensome regulations into their bottom lines.

That is why, at the very beginning of the 115th Congress, we are prioritizing legislation to remove unnecessary regulatory burdens. Doing so is one of the fundamental steps we can take to make America more competitive again

and put more Americans back to work again.

Today, our specific focus is on reforming regulations that are hastily cobbled together in the waning weeks and months of an outgoing administration. These regulations are particularly susceptible to abuse and, thus, have an even greater potential to undermine job opportunities, wages, and American competitiveness.

As the Obama administration rushes to a close, Americans' freedom and prosperity are increasingly threatened by one of the most abusive features of modern bureaucracy—midnight regulation.

Midnight regulation is one of the most vexing problems in Washington's overreaching regulatory system. Administration after administration, there is a spike in rulemaking activity during the last year of a President's term—particularly between election day and Inauguration Day, but even in the months before then.

These successive waves of midnight regulation present deeply troubling issues. First and foremost, because outgoing administrations are no longer accountable to the voters, they are much more prone to issue midnight regulations that fly in the face of the electoral mandate the voters just gave the new, incoming administration.

Waves of midnight rules can also be very hard for Congress or a new administration to check adequately. As a new Congress and President begin their terms, both understandably must be focused on implementing the new priorities within the mandates the voters have given them. That doesn't always leave time to focus on cleaning up all of the last acts of the departing administration.

In addition, the Congressional Review Act currently allows Congress to disapprove of regulations—including midnight regulations—only one at a time. A wave of midnight regulations can easily overwhelm Congress' ability to use one-rule-at-a-time resolutions as an effective check.

Finally, it is well-documented that the rush by outgoing administrations to impose midnight rules before the clock strikes 12 leads to more poorly analyzed rules with lower quality and lower benefits.

The Obama administration has imposed more runaway regulation than any other in memory, and its midnight rulemaking period is no exception. When the House considered this legislation in the wake of last November's election, the administration had issued or planned to issue at least 180 midnight rules within the scope of this bill, including multiple billion-dollar rules and more than 20 major rules imposing $100 million or more in costs per year.

In the intervening weeks, these figures have rapidly ballooned to the 226 midnight rules issued or planned. During just the week of December 12, the administration issued 18 midnight regulations, imposing over $2 billion in new costs. But this is not a partisan issue. Administrations of both parties have issued midnight rules in the past.

The Judiciary Committee has been searching for an effective solution to this problem for some time, and I applaud our colleague, Mr. ISSA, for offering the Midnight Rules Relief Act to respond to the need. This bill offers a simple and powerful means to stop the problem of abusive midnight rules—allowing Congress to disapprove of any and all midnight regulations in one fell swoop by one en bloc disapproval resolution under the Congressional Review Act.

Any outgoing administration understanding that it has this Sword of Damocles hanging over its head will surely hesitate much more before abusing midnight rules. Further, once enabled to dispatch of all improper midnight rules with one simple resolution, Congress and succeeding administrations would be free to focus more of their energies on the voters' new priorities, rather than the mess left by midnight rules.

The relief offered by the bill, moreover, is highly flexible. No set number of regulations would have to be covered by a resolution. No category of regulation would have to be included in or excluded from a resolution. On the contrary, any midnight rule disapproval resolution could be sweeping or narrow, depending on how many rules merited inclusion.

Finally, the Midnight Rules Relief Act offers a solution that is not intrusive upon legitimate executive branch authority. An outgoing administration remains free to conduct necessary rulemaking activity up to the stroke of midnight on Inauguration Day. It then falls to Congress to respond swiftly and surgically to the results, to accept the good and excise the bad.

This is truly a better way to govern. That is why the reform embodied in this bill is featured in Speaker RYAN's Better Way agenda.

I thank Mr. ISSA for his work on this important legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual measure that is being brought forward under unusual circumstances. To begin with, this measure would, believe it or not, empower our Federal legislature to undo virtually every regulation submitted to the Congress since mid-June of last year through the end of 2016 last year. The bill accomplishes this—every regulation—by authorizing Congress to disapprove these rules through a single joint resolution, thereby depriving Members to consider the merits of each individual regulation. This presents a number of problems.

□ 1345

As the administration has stated, with a threat of veto of an identical bill that was considered last November, the legislation ''would create tremendous regulatory uncertainty, potentially impose additional costs on businesses, and represent a step backwards for applying sound regulatory principles to protect public health, safety, the environment, and other critical aspects of society.''

This, in my view, is a cynical way of trying to legislate. For those concerned about the continued improvement of clean air and clean water, if we care about the safety of the toys we give our children, if we care about the environment, then we must oppose this bill.

I urge my colleagues to join me. There hasn't been any deliberative process on the bill recently. It is amazing to me that we have such opposition to the bill. It would be overwhelming to put in the over 150 labor organizations, consumer organizations, environmental organizations, and others who have openly asked us to oppose this bill.

If that isn't enough, we have the business community itself in opposition. The American Sustainable Business Council, which represents over 200,000 businesses—and I have a partial list of them—also opposes this measure. It is one of the rare instances in which I have brought to the floor legislation that is opposed by both labor and by business as well.

It is a little bit of an insult that this bill is being considered, on top of that, under a closed rule. There can be no amendments to this measure.

I am in a state of surprise that on the second day of a new Congress we would come forward with a measure that could potentially jeopardize public health and safety in so many different ways.

I think that the opposition to this measure is so overwhelming that I am surprised that without hearings, without an opportunity for amendment, we are now considering a measure that has this much opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Consumer Reports dated January 3, 2017.

CONSUMER REPORTS,
Washington, DC, January 3, 2017.

U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Consumer Reports and its policy and mobilization arm, Consumers Union, strongly urge you to vote no on H.R. 21, the so-called ''Midnight Rules Relief Act.'' This bill would severely undermine accountability to the public regarding important protections and safeguards.

Although the rules targeted by this legislation were finalized relatively recently, many have been under development for several years. Consumers Union has provided public comment on several of these regulations that were designed to protect consumers against unsafe products, dishonest business dealings, and other hazards in the marketplace that place their health, safety, or well-being at risk. Agency experts carefully examined these hazards and considered various alternative approaches to address them. They sought input and guidance from businesses, consumer organizations, outside scientific and legal experts, and the public at

large, and ultimately developed final rules, explaining publicly the basis and rationale for the adopted approach.

The federal law known as the Congressional Review Act (CRA) already permits a regulation carefully developed over many years to be erased by Congress, in a rushed process that does not reflect the same level of expertise or careful consideration. Congress could even rescind a rule for reasons that might be based not on any broader interests of the public, but on the narrower, private special interests of those seeking to avoid having appropriate obligations imposed on their profit-making activities.

The potential for the CRA to be employed in the service of special interests is at least somewhat held in check by the fact that the law currently requires separate congressional action for erasing each regulation. A regulation considered for erasure under the CRA must be brought to the House and Senate in its own separate resolution, given its own debate and vote, and sent to the President for its own signature or veto. All officials involved in considering whether to erase the regulation and its protections are thus put on record, and can be held accountable for their positions and the consequences. Perhaps for this reason, there has only been one regulation rescinded under the CRA in its 20-year history.

This important accountability check would be removed under the ''Midnight Rules Relief Act.'' By allowing erasure of multiple regulations en bloc, this bill would enable Members of Congress and the President to evade public accountability for what Gould be ill-considered, politically motivated decisions that result in devastating consequences. Under the bill, no Member would ever have to be on record regarding any specific regulation being erased. In fact, any Member who actually wants to cast a more selective vote, to erase certain regulations but not others, would be unable to do so.

We are somewhat encouraged that the House Majority, after initially acting behind closed doors to weaken the Office of Congressional Ethics, has reversed course in light of major concerns raised about the impact on congressional accountability. We urge all Members to also recognize the damaging effects that this bill would have on accountability and on the ability of the American public to trust their elected representatives. We strongly urge you to vote no on the ''Midnight Rules Relief Act.''

Sincerely,

LAURA MACCLEERY,
Vice President, Consumer Policy and Mobilization Consumer Reports.
GEORGE P. SLOVER,
Senior Policy Counsel, Consumers Union.
WILLIAM C. WALLACE,
Policy Analyst, Consumers Union.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Midnight Rules Relief Act.

Recently, impossible opportunities exist for this body to reassert its authority and work on behalf of the American people. The Midnight Rules Relief Act would provide Congress with an important tool to begin the process of dismantling the onerous regulatory burdens imposed over the past 8 years.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, I have dedicated considerable time over the past 2 years to closely monitoring the growth of the administrative state. The estimated regulatory costs across all years of the Obama administration are staggering. However, the regulatory onslaught in its final year alone—disastrous—shows the damage already done and the greater impact that will fall on our economy.

In 2016, 401 regulations were finalized. The total compliance cost for this period exceeds $164 billion and amounts to nearly 121 million paperwork hours. That is 401 regulations and $164 billion. This is only during the final year of the Obama administration. It is no wonder that the American people sought a new, more promising direction for our country.

Finally, the Congress has an opportunity to act to protect the American people and repeal many of these crushing regulations. For us in Congress, we cannot forget what these numbers represent. For my constituents and for Americans across the country, the billions in dollars of costs imposed on the economy represent jobs lost, routine bills that cannot be paid, and the American Dream slipping from their grasp.

The true story of this regulatory onslaught is told by workers at shuttered stores, factories, and power plants across the country. Their concerns and fears are ours. As this current administration exits, we must remain vigilant to last-ditch efforts at crippling our economy.

On top of those in recent months, a number of new regulations may still be finalized in a hurried, nontransparent fashion. The American people are concerned that our current regulatory process ignores the balancing of costs and benefits and the regulatory impact on their lives. From what we have seen over the past 8 years, it is clear that they should be.

Starting this week, Congress has an opportunity to reassert its constitutional authority and act for all Americans. The Midnight Rules Relief Act is a well-advised measure that gives Congress the ability to quickly examine and eliminate the mass of regulations promulgated in recent months. This has been done by both Republican and Democrat administrations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a senior colleague, to speak on the measure before us.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 21, the Midnight Rules Relief Act.

This irresponsible legislation would enable Congress to wipe out hundreds, or even thousands, of regulations enacted during the final year of the President's term in office, in one fell swoop, with little examination, no deliberation, and little regard to their impact on public health or safety.

Members from both sides of the aisle have expressed concern in recent years over rules adopted during a Presidential transition period—typically, the last 60 to 90 days of the President's term. But this legislation differs greatly from previous legislation that I and others have introduced in the past to deal with this problem.

For example, the Midnight Rule Act, which I introduced in the 110th and 111th Congresses, would have merely delayed the implementation of rules submitted to Congress within the final 90 days of a President's term, with appropriate exceptions for imminent threat to health and safety, enforcement of criminal laws, implementation of an international trade agreement, and national security.

This proposal was a response to concerns with last-minute rulemaking under the George W. Bush administration, which was roundly criticized at the time for allowing insufficient time for public comment, ignoring public comments, and otherwise departing from accepted rulemaking practices.

My bill would have given an incoming President 90 days to determine if any rules issued should not go forward. This measure would have allowed legitimate regulatory reform to proceed on schedule while putting the power to review and overturn controversial new rules into the hands of the newly elected administration.

The legislation before us today, however, goes much further and creates a process to simply erase the last months of an outgoing administration's regulatory agenda.

Under the Congressional Review Act, Congress can overturn a regulation issued by the executive branch through a disapproval resolution that must be signed by the President. This bill would allow Congress to package these disapproval resolutions together and eliminate dozens, hundreds, or even thousands, of regulations all at once, with little debate over the merits of any individual rule.

Under the CRA, agencies would be prevented from proposing similar rules ever again, absent explicit congressional authorization. You would have a rule terminated with no debate because it is one of a thousand rules done away with in one resolution. You can't even look at it again.

The Republican majority has waged an all-out assault on the regulatory process, trying to add hurdle after hurdle on the ability to issue regulations that protect public health and safety. Not content to grind the gears of rulemaking to a halt, they now want to eliminate wholesale those regulations that have gone through the exhaustive rulemaking process—a process that often takes many years to complete.

Even more concerning, this bill would apply to rules issued in the last 60 legislative days of a President's

term. Not calendar days, but legislative days.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. NADLER. Given how little we worked last year, this would mean that any regulation issued by the Obama administration, stretching back to June 13, 2016, could be canceled in one sweeping motion, with hardly any consideration given to the merits of any individual regulation.

Article II of the Constitution provides that a President shall serve a 4-year term. But the Republicans seem to believe that this doesn't apply to President Obama. Somehow, when he was reelected by broad majority in 2012, he was given only a 3-year term. The Senate refused to consider a Supreme Court nominee and, under this bill, his entire regulatory agenda for the last 6 months could be undone in an instant.

While I am sympathetic to the need for an incoming administration to review regulations issued in the closing days of an outgoing administration, this bill goes much further and allows for a rushed and partisan process that could undermine critical health and safety regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this irresponsible and dangerous legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, floor debate is both for the people in the room and the people watching.

Many of the new Members have not yet voted on a substantive piece of legislation. So, Mr. Speaker, I reach out with a little piece of history—a large piece of history, perhaps—for the freshmen of both parties.

First of all, this legislation is bipartisan. It is sponsored by both Republicans and Democrats.

Second of all, when Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, and I were 16 years younger, in March of 2001, it was the last and only time that the underlying law allowed for a regulation to be repealed. It was prominently called ergonomics. It was repealed. I had the honor of voting for that as a freshman.

Since that time, in spite of the many regulations that some people don't like in one party or another, we have not seen fit to have a joint resolution repeal a regulation.

So let's talk about what it takes to do that. It takes both Houses of the Congress and the President of the United States to repeal a regulation created by a bureaucrat, or many bureaucrats—a regulation that may or may not be consistent with the law passed by this body, by the Senate, and by a President in this or a previous Congress.

Again, for the freshmen, we are the body that creates laws, and we do so through a complex and difficult procedure. We pass it out of the House or Senate. We then pass it out of the other body. If the President signs it, it then still is subject to court challenge.

□ 1400

Now, let's go through the regulatory process: Proposed by a bureaucrat, given a period of time in which dissenters may be 100 percent, and still it becomes law if this body does not act. So now that gives you a little feel for the underlying law. Used once on a bipartisan basis to take back an unpopular regulation that has never been resubmitted under both 8 years of a Republican and 8 years of a Democrat in the White House, and I repeat, the regulation that was previously recalled was so in error that it has never been redone in 16 years by two Presidents.

Now, let's talk about the bill we have before us today. We all know that the House is a body that, when it wants to, can move fairly quickly, and the Senate is a body that seemingly moves quickly only in recess. The fact is that the Senate takes a long time, and we have many regulations that may or may not be considered now or in the future.

All this legislation does is allow for us to dispose of one or more regulations in an expedited fashion in this body and have it seen in the same form in the Senate. Nothing more than that. It doesn't change the underlying law. It doesn't change the fact that the House, the Senate, and a President must concur on taking back what is essentially a law—that is what a regulation is—created by bureaucrats not elected by any of us. So let's keep it as simple as that.

For the freshmen of either party, when you go to make a vote on this, remember, we are not changing the underlying law. Only one regulation under the underlying law has ever been repealed, and it was bipartisan in both the House and the Senate when it was repealed. It has been 16 years, and the few that will likely be considered under this act and the underlying law will be just that, a relatively few regulations that are believed to be unnecessary and for which the House, the Senate, and the President concur.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the passage of the so-called Midnight Rules Relief Act of 2017, H.R. 21. Let's not get it twisted. This is a mundane area that we are in, administrative review processes and how we are going to deal with regulations coming out of Federal agencies. This is a mundane topic, but it has real world implications.

The bottom line is this is not a jobs bill. The American people sent Congress here to work on jobs and to work on economic security for Americans, and the first item of business out of this brand-new Congress is to gut the House Office of Congressional Ethics. Now, why would they want to do that? It was because they liked the idea of the fox guarding the henhouse. They wanted to put themselves in control over the henhouse once again, and the American people called them on it, and so they had to withdraw it.

So what do they do? Today they come back with not a jobs bill but a regulatory bill, an antiregulatory bill, something that protects the health, safety, welfare, and well-being of Americans—little ones, elderly, workers, people who are consumers. They want to gut regulations.

Now, what regulations do they want to gut? They will tell you, by the way, that gutting regulations helps to enhance job creation, but nothing can be further from the truth when you consider that under the last 8 years of President Obama, where we have had regulatory regimes established under the Affordable Care Act and also Dodd-Frank, we have created 15.6 million new jobs over 81 straight months of private sector job growth. Unemployment is now approaching 4 percent, which is basically full employment. And wages are going up for Americans. And so despite the Affordable Care Act and Dodd-Frank, you have got Americans that are prospering.

What do the Republicans want to do? They try to trick you into believing that they are going to create more jobs by removing regulations. What regulations do they want to do away with? It is the Affordable Care Act and Dodd-Frank. So they want to reward their campaign contributors, Wall Street fat cats, with this legislation that will enable them to create conditions that will be similar to the ones that President Obama inherited when he walked into the Presidency 8 years ago. And you can't fail to remember how bleak and bad the economy was.

The economy was in the tank. President Obama brought it back. Dodd-Frank brought it back. And millions—20 million more Americans now have health insurance than they had back then. And the cost of premiums for working people who had insurance through their jobs, the rate of increase has gone to the lowest level over the last 50-plus years. That is real benefits.

What the Republicans want to do, they have said they are going to repeal and replace ObamaCare. They don't have anything to replace it with. They just simply want to repeal it, and that is the regulation that they seek to get at with this bill, H.R. 21, Midnight Rules Relief Act of 2017. This is an attempt to bring the standard of living that Americans have come to enjoy to a halt. It is going to impact negatively our ability to be secure in our personal finances.

New data from the American Community Survey indicates that the number of uninsured Americans continues

to decline every year. What happens when our rural hospitals close and when all the people from throughout the State have to converge on the emergency rooms of the urban hospitals, and it is uncompensated care? Who pays for it? You pay for it.

Let's not get this legislation twisted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute of my time to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. This is an attack on your ideals. I ask that my colleagues vote against this legislation.

Mr. ISSA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I won't be long. There is nothing mundane about what we are doing here. Every day in America, Congress passes a law maybe, but every working day in America, the bureaucracy passes regulations. The fact is, the American people know that the so-called regulatory state that has developed during the last half century means that, whether Congress is in session or not, new laws are being created, new rules that cause people in real America, working people and their companies, to have to figure out what new hurdle they have to jump over just to earn a living.

That is what we are talking about here, that at least when those are grossly exceeded under the underlying law and intention of Congress, Congress—the House, the Senate—in concert with the President, may, in fact, use the same tool, essentially the making of law, in this case to rescind to law.

I just want to again speak to the younger Members who may not know the history of this. All we are really talking about here in this act is, in fact, a law created to take away a regulation. What we are going to vote on will allow for, one, two, half a dozen regulations, if there were that many that we think are wrong, through our normal lawmaking process, in many ways, to be rescinded. The House has to vote a majority, the Senate has to vote a majority, and the President has to sign it. There really isn't a whole lot of difference between that and any other legislative business that we do here.

Now, I have worked with JOHN CONYERS both as a minority member and as my chairman. He is a good man. In this case, I believe that if he looked more broadly at the question of Congress' responsibility to review laws made outside of this body that he would support me. Notwithstanding not getting his support in this case, we do have both Republicans and Democrats on this bill. I expect that on the vote, in both the House and the Senate, it will be bipartisan, and any piece of regulatory law that would come before this body and the Senate, I am confident, would have bipartisan support in order to rescind a bad regulation.

So I think for those who are concerned about the regulations somehow running amok, no regulation will be rescinded under this law any different than any normal piece of legislation passed out of the House and the Senate and signed by the President.

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

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

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from California for pointing out how innocent this measure is, and I am astounded by his feeling that regulations shouldn't be examined one by one. Under this measure, 61 regulations could be considered en bloc. To me, just trying to put together two regulations to revoke them would be very, very hard to handle.

What we are talking about here is a bill that would provide special interests with yet another opportunity to block critical lifesaving regulations, and I want to say I have never had so much opposition to a bill brought to my attention before. 150 environmental organizations, consumer organizations, and labor organizations have urged the Members of this body to oppose H.R. 21. It is incredible. And then not only are workers and consumers against this measure as well as environmentalists, businesspeople are against it as well.

I feel like there is some missing part to this thing. The American Sustainable Business Council has over 200,000 businesses. So here is labor and commerce combined, urging Congress not to do this on the second day of a new Congress with all the challenges that are before us, and he says it wouldn't create any problems. It would be okay to put in 1 or 2 or 3 or 5 or 20 or 30 or 40 or 50 or 60. This is incredible. It is not that we are working so hard that we don't have time to examine each one on a particular basis.

□ 1415

Can you imagine this Congress trying to block regulations which would be offered in one bill that could be over 60 different regulations? I mean, it is unthinkable. It is not very practical at all.

When we talk about meat labeling regulations and then in another paragraph or another section there would be standards for school lunch nutrition, they would be combined. My friend from California would say, well, that is no problem. We will take them separately, but they will all come in the same package.

So if you wanted to examine all of these things individually, we could have an instance where the whole Congress could be consumed for weeks or for months trying to figure out why they should block all of these important and sensible safeguards.

Business and labor are joined with us, and, to me, it is beyond comprehension for us to be concerned about not taking them up one at a time. This is worse than a conservative point of view, which I haven't found myself often agreeing with. But just to say let's have unlimited numbers of these blocking provisions all into one is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and chairman in the past, my chairman.

This bill has come up over many years when I served on this subcommittee and was the ranking member and the chair at one time. Mr. ISSA suggested it might only be six or seven regulations. If that was the case, they could take them individually.

There is a process where regulations can be brought before the House, in the Congressional Review Act, and each one studied individually, and the House could overrule them. I can't fathom that they are bringing this bill for just six regulations which they could do individually. But even then, that is wrong to put them all together. We know what is going to happen is they are going to pass. They are going to pass the House. Whether they pass the Senate is another issue.

These are not midnight regulations. These are regulations that go back to last June. So the term ''midnight regulations'' is a misnomer. To say that these are just decisions made by bureaucrats, you would think bureaucrats were something out of a medical dictionary that was highly contagious. Bureaucrats could also be called experts, specialists, dedicated government officials.

There are people who study these issues that, to be implemented, need to be fine-tuned to fit into society, sometimes to protect consumers, sometimes to protect commerce, and it takes years and years and years, often, for these regulations to take effect. Some of them protect animals—the soring industry.

A great majority of this House was in favor of a bill to protect walking horses, but it didn't get a vote because there were some people in this House that were against it and against it so much that they worked to get one of the finest Members I have served with, Ed Whitfield, out of this House. That was despicable. I suspect that same power that might have had that effect could bring that type of regulation up to be nullified. I would fear that, and I would find it wrong in the spirit of Ed Whitfield and fairness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COHEN. I like Ed Whitfield a lot. A lot of us did. He was a great guy. It was wrong, what happened, the way he was forced out because a majority of this House wanted a vote on that and it could be put in this regulation and it would go.

Tobacco regulations, toys, protections for children, all potentially in jeopardy, as well as other regulations protecting four-legged friends.

I can imagine when this comes up and the decision is made which bills to put into this omnibus bill, you are going to have lots of lobbyists coming and wanting the bills that affect them adversely, their industry is put in it, and you are going to have fundraisers right around it. It is going to be a fundraising trough for the Republicans to use and bidding basically on who wants to have their regulation put in our bill and have it nullified. The nullification acts back in the 1830s with John Calhoun are back, not the midnight judges of President Adams.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 13½ minutes remaining.

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

My colleague from Tennessee has been a good friend on many issues. I know he is passionate about regulations and laws that he would like to have passed, and so am I.

All of us in Congress have seen that it is extremely easy—the longer you are here, the more you will see it—it is extremely easy to stop something here. The same is true about those 61 or so regulations. Any combining of regulations, unless they are overwhelmingly disapproved, actually makes them harder to pass. We are not going to put 61 pieces of legislation, each of which has at least one or two or three or a dozen Republicans who vehemently oppose that regulation being rescinded. The fact is it is only the worst of the worst that are going to be stayed through this process and then reevaluated by the new administration.

I will mention, though, for my colleagues on the other side of this debate today, that we do appropriations every year. The American people, and for the freshmen who haven't voted on appropriations yet, think of appropriations as somehow different than the law. It really isn't. Appropriation is simply a law that provides funding.

Every appropriation bill during the entire nearly 8 years of President Obama has been some form of a continuing resolution or an omnibus. But as my colleague from Tennessee knows, every one of those has had dozens to hundreds of laws attached to them. We call them riders. We have terms for them. The fact is that a single appropriations bill, often done just before the end of funding of the government, always—always—has dozens, if not hundreds, of laws attached to it.

So the idea that we don't group together things which are relatively noncontroversial, that will cause someone to still vote for the bill in spite of it being in there, would be to be dishonest to the freshmen who need to know that we do for efficiency bring together things that we can pass en bloc, and we do it all the time—and even major legislation. I dare say, the Affordable Care Act and others are, in fact, multiple pieces of legislation put together in one package.

So lest our freshmen who are about to take their first vote on a piece of legislation—or one that could have a major impact—misunderstand, bringing together multiple pieces into one bill is common, but it is always done in order to gain votes or to maintain votes. In fact, you do it at your folly if you lose votes.

I would say to my friend and colleague from Michigan that there is no likelihood that 61 pieces of regulation will be put together because there is no chance that there would be 61 pieces that even all Republicans would agree should be revoked. I would imagine the number would be less. I suspect that if my bill said 2 or 5 or 10, it would still be opposed for the same reason, which is that it creates inefficiency if there are multiple generally agreed bad pieces of legislation that need to be considered.

Lastly, and I am not closing, but I think this may be one of my closing remarks, for freshmen to understand, this isn't even about the House. We have the procedures in the House where we could put these together. This is about the Senate that can take 60 hours, 60 legislative hours or more, to do one piece of legislation. We know that the Senate has confirmations to do of judges and appointees for the Cabinet, and they have other legislative work, and we cannot afford to have them backed up now or in the future if there are multiple regulations that need to be rescinded.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who, up until recently, was a very active member of the House Judiciary Committee. He is now the ranking member on the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 21, the so-called Midnight Rules Relief Act, which amends the Congressional Review Act. The Congressional Review Act allows Congress to overrule regulations promulgated by the executive branch. That law expects a deliberative approach to considering each and every rule.

H.R. 21 would allow Congress to consider a joint resolution to simultaneously disapprove of multiple regulations all at once when such rules are issued in the last 60 legislative days of a session of Congress during the final year of a President's term. In this case, the 60 legislative days reach-back would apply to rules issued as far back as June of last year, almost 7 months before the end of the President's term. To call rules issued that long ago a midnight rule is a particular misnomer.

This bill puts in place an indiscriminate process to eliminate rules, many of which have been under development for years—or even decades—to protect consumers, working families, and students. This bill denies Congress the opportunity for a careful, individualized, case-by-case review that is appropriate for a reasoned, decisionmaking legislative body.

Under the Congressional Review Act, if a rule is eliminated, such rule can never be taken up again in similar form without additional legislation overriding the restriction, even if the undesirable rule turns out, upon further reflection, to have been the best alternative.

Some of the rules that could be impacted that are just under the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee include the Department of Labor's rule requiring Federal contractors to provide up to 7 days of paid sick leave annually for their employees; the upcoming OSHA rule, which has been under development for 18 years, which would protect workers from exposure to beryllium, a metal that can cause lung disease, resulting in a victim essentially suffocating to death; the Department of Education's rule involving the borrower's defense, which helps student borrowers who are defrauded by their universities; and the Department of Education's K–12 accountability rule, which involves the implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act, making sure that all students can graduate ready for success for college and career.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. H.R. 21 is poised to allow wholesale undermining of critical protections for students, workers, taxpayers, and consumers. I, therefore, urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republicans' Midnight Rules Relief Act.

The bill is an unnecessary abdication of legislative responsibility by the Republican-led Congress, and it is very poor public policy. The bill short-circuits open debate and public participation. It is also very wasteful because it jettisons carefully and long-crafted policies that protect American families from threats to their economic security, their health, and their safety.

Under the U.S. Constitution, after Congress passes a law, agencies craft rules to implement that legislation. If Members of Congress want to clarify or change executive branch regulations, they have a responsibility to address the matter in a transparent way and through open, regular order. Republicans don't want to do that, however,

because the public might find out what they are doing.

This Republican scheme sets a dangerous precedent by expanding the ability of the Congress to use the Congressional Review Act to disapprove hundreds of carefully crafted policies at one time and with very little notice or debate. Republicans want to reach back to last May and cherry-pick policies that they do not agree with.

But how will the public know?

That will be difficult; and, in many instances, Republicans do not want the public to know.

I urge my colleagues to reject this power grab by the new Republican Congress. It is just like what they tried to do yesterday with the Office of Congressional Ethics. These policies don't just come out of thin air. There is a long, painstaking process with extensive public comment. Public participation doesn't appear to be a priority in this new Congress, so reject this dark bill. Side, instead, with our democratic principles in America, which include open debate, transparency, fiscal responsibility, and the security of our neighbors.

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

The gentlewoman from Florida, I am sure, is well intended, but there is nothing more transparent than calling up to the floor of this House and debating the removal of regulations that have been found to be excessive or extreme or simply not consistent with the law. That is a transparent process. The term ''regular order,'' in fact, could not be more appropriate to that process. We passed a law nearly three Presidents ago, if you will, that simply called for this procedure.

All I am saying is we should not be mired down, if there are five or six or eight bad regulations, in not combining them together for purposes of getting them disposed of in a timely fashion. I might suggest to everyone that they remember that many of us did not support the regulation change yesterday as to the ethics oversight, because we do believe in transparency and will continue to believe in transparency.

Again, nothing is more transparent than bringing to the House floor the debate about something that is believed to have been wrong done by unelected bureaucrats. ''Bureaucrat'' is not a dirty word, but ''unelected'' fits this process.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a CRS Report that highlights the fact that it would be permissible under this proposed bill that as many as 61 regulations could be bundled into one package and blocked by this bill.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
January 3, 2017.

MEMORANDUM

Subject: ''Major'' Obama Administration Rules Potentially Eligible to be Overturned under the Congressional Review Act in the 115th Congress.

From: Maeve P. Carey, Specialist in Government Organization and Management; Christopher M. Davis, Analyst on Congress and the Legislative Process; Casey Burgat, Research Assistant.

This memorandum lists ''major'' rules issued by federal agencies under the Barack Obama Administration that are potentially subject to consideration under the procedures of the Congressional Review Act (CRA) in the 115th Congress. This is an updated version of a general distribution memorandum released by CRS on November 17, 2016, and previously updated on December 6, 2016.

BACKGROUND ON THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

The CRA is a tool that Congress may use to overturn a rule issued by a federal agency, including, in some cases, rules issued in a previous session of Congress and by a previous President. The CRA requires agencies to report on their rulemaking activities to Congress and provides Congress with a special set of procedures under which to consider legislation to overturn those rules. The CRA, which was enacted in 1996, was largely intended to assert control over agency rulemaking by establishing a special set of expedited or ''fast track'' legislative procedures for this purpose, primarily in the Senate.

Of the approximately 73,000 final rules that have been submitted to Congress since the legislation was enacted in 1996, the CRA has been used to disapprove one rule: the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's November 2000 final rule on ergonomics, which was overturned using the CRA in March 2001. The primary reason the CRA has overturned one rule in the 20 years since its enactment is that under most circumstances, it is likely that a President would veto such a resolution in order to protect rules developed under his own administration, and it may also be difficult for Congress to muster the two-thirds vote in both houses needed to overturn the veto. However, under a specific set of circumstances—a turnover in party control of the White House, particularly a turnover in which the incoming President shares a party affiliation with a majority in both houses of Congress—the CRA is more likely to be used successfully. The March 2001 rejection of the ergonomics rule was the result of that set of circumstances. Similar circumstances will take place in 2017 after the start of the 115th Congress and after President-elect Donald J. Trump is sworn into office.

CRA ''RESET'' MECHANISM

Section 801(d) of the CRA provides that, if Congress adjourns its annual session sine die less than 60 legislative days in the House of Representatives or 60 session days in the Senate after a rule is submitted to it, then the periods to submit and act on a disapproval resolution ''reset'' in their entirety in the next session of Congress'' The purpose of this provision is to ensure that both houses of Congress have sufficient time to consider disapproving rules submitted during this end-of-session ''carryover period.'' This provision applies in every session of Congress, but it is of particular relevance in sessions of Congress that coincide with presidential transitions. This provision allows, for a limited time period, a new Congress to consider a joint resolution disapproving a rule issued late in the previous administration. If introduced and considered at the proper time, such a joint resolution cannot be filibustered in the Senate.

The projected second-session meeting schedules of the House and Senate issued by each chamber's majority leader may be used to estimate the date in 2016 after which final rules submitted to Congress will be subject to the renewed review periods in 2017 described above. The estimated start of the reset period for all rules was determined by counting back from the projected sine die adjournment in the respective chambers—60 days of session in the Senate and 60 legislative days in the House—then taking the earlier of the two dates.

Under this calculation, CRS estimates that agency final rules submitted to Congress on or after June 13, 2016, will be subject to renewed review periods in 2017 by a new President and a new Congress. CRS day count estimates are unofficial and non-binding; the House and Senate Parliamentarians are the sole definitive arbiters of the operation of the CRA mechanism and should be consulted if a formal opinion is desired.

''MAJOR'' OBAMA ADMINISTRATION RULES POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER THE CRA IN 2017

Using this estimated reset date of June 13, 2016, CRS compiled a list of major rules that would fall under this reset period—i.e., rules that could be overturned in the 115th Congress using the CRA.

Table 1 lists the major rules CRS has identified as of January 3, 2017, that could be eligible for the reset mechanism. To identify these rules, CRS used a two-step process. First, CRS consulted the Government Accountability Office's (GAO's) federal rules database to identify major rules that were issued during calendar year 2016 and posted on GAO's website as of January 3, 2017. Second, CRS used LIS's ''Executive Communications'' database to identify when these rules were received in Congress.

MAJOR RULES ISSUED BY THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION THAT ARE POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE FOR DISAPPROVAL UNDER THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT IN THE 115TH CONGRESS

MAJOR RULES LISTED ON GAO'S WEBSITE AS OF JANUARY 3, 2017

Title of Rule (As Published in Federal Register) and RIN Numbers are as follows:

Exemptions To Facilitate Intrastate and Regional Securities Offerings, 3235-AL80; Investment Company Liquidity Risk Management Programs, 3235-AL61; Retention of EB–1, EB–2, and EB–3 Immigrant Workers and Program Improvements Affecting High-Skilled NonImmigrant Workers, 1615-ACO5; Walking-Working Surfaces and Personal Protective Equipment (Fall Protection Systems), 1216-AB80; Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation, 1004-AE14; Investment Company Swing Pricing, 3235-AL61; Establishing a More Effective Fair Market Rent System; Using Small Area Fair Market Rents in the Housing Choice Voucher Program Instead of the Current 50th Percentile FMRs, 2501-AD74; Medicare Program; Revisions to Payment Policies Under the Physician Fee Schedule and Other Revisions to Part B for CY 2017; Medicare Advantage Bid Pricing Data Release; Medicare Advantage and Part D Medical Loss Ratio Data Release; Medicare Advantage Provider Network Requirements; Expansion of Medicare Diabetes Prevention Program Model; Medicare Shared Savings Program Requirements, 0938-AS81.

Medicare Program; CY 2017 Inpatient Hospital Deductible and Hospital and Extended Care Services Coinsurance Amounts, 0938-AS70; Medicare Program; Medicare Part B Monthly Actuarial Rates, Premium Rate,

and Annual Deductible Beginning January 1, 2017, 0938-AS72; Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment and Ambulatory Surgical Center Payment Systems and Quality Reporting Programs; Organ Procurement Organization Reporting and Communication; Transplant Outcome Measures and Documentation Requirements; Electronic Health Record (EHR) Incentive Programs; Payment to Nonexcepted Off-Campus Provider-Based Department of a Hospital; Hospital Value-Based Purchasing (VBP) Program; Establishment of Payment Rates Under the Medicare Physician Fee Schedule for Nonexcepted Items and Services Furnished by an Off-Campus Provider-Based Department of a Hospital, 0938-AS82; Medicare Program; Merit-Based Incentive Payment System (MIPS) and Alternative Payment Model (APM) Incentive Under the Physician Fee Schedule, and Criteria for Physician-Focused Payment Models, 0938-AS69; Medicare and Medicaid Programs; CY 2017 Home Health Prospective Payment System Rate Update; Home Health Value-Based Purchasing Model; and Home Health Quality Reporting Requirements, 0938-AS80; Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, and Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program, 1840-AD19; Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Miscellaneous Refrigeration Products, 1904-AC51.

Medicaid Program; Final FY 2014 and Preliminary FY 2016 Disproportionate Share Hospital Allotments, and Final FY 2014 and Preliminary FY 2016 Institutions for Mental Diseases Disproportionate Share Hospital Limits, 0938-ZB30; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Update For The 2008 Ozone NAAQS, 2060-AS05; Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium-and Heavy-Duty Engines and Vehicles—Phase 2, 2060-AS16; U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Fee Schedule, 1615-AC09; Treatment of Certain Interests in Corporations as Stock or Indebtedness, 1545-BN40; Establishment of the Electronic Visa Update System (EVUS), 1651-ABO8; ONC Health IT Certification Program: Enhanced Oversight and Accountability, 0955-AA00; Clearing Requirement Determination Under Section 2(H) of the Commodity Exchange Act For Interest Rate Swaps, 3038-AE20; Standards For Covered Clearing Agencies, 3235-AL48.

Medicare and Medicaid Programs, Reform of Requirements for Long-Term Care Facilities, 0938-AR61; Child Care And Development Fund (CCDF) Program, 0970-AC67; Establishing Paid Sick Leave For Federal Contractors, 1235-AA13; OCC Guidelines Establishing Standards For Recovery Planning By Certain Large Insured National Banks, Insured Federal Savings Associations, And Insured Federal Branches; Technical Amendments, 1557-AD96; Emergency Preparedness Requirements For Medicare And Medicaid Participating Providers And Suppliers, 0938-A091; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations On Certain Federal Indian Reservations And Ceded Lands For The 2016–17 Season, 1018-BA70; Safety And Effectiveness Of Consumer Antiseptics; Topical Antimicrobial Drug Products For Over-The-Counter-Human Use, 0910-AF69; Head Start Performance Standards, 0970-AC63; Standards Of Performance For Municipal Solid Waste Landfills, 2060-AMO8; Emission Guidelines And Compliance Times For Municipal Solid Waste Landfills, 2060-AS23.

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Fair Pay And Safe Workplaces, 9000-AM81; Medicare Program; Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems For Acute Care Hospitals And The Long-Term Care Hospital Prospective Payment System & Policy Changes & Fiscal Year 2017 Rates; Quality Reporting Requirements For Specific Providers; Graduate Medical Education; Hospital Notification Procedures Applicable To Beneficiaries Receiving Observation Services; Technical Changes Relating To Costs To Organizations & Medicare Cost Reports; Finalization Of Interim Final Rules With Comment Period On LTCH PPS Payments For Severe Wounds, Modifications Of Limitations On Redesignation By The Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board, & Extensions Of Payments To MDHS And Low-Volume Hospitals, 0938-A577; 0938-A588; 0938-AS41; Workforce Innovation And Opportunity Act; Joint Rule For Unified And Combined State Plans, Performance Accountability, And The One-Stop System Joint Provisions; Final Rule, 1205-AB74; Workforce Innovation And Opportunity Act, 1205-AB73; Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System And Consolidated Billing For Skilled Nursing Facilities For FY 2017, SNF Value-Based Purchasing Program, SNF Quality Reporting Program, And SNF Payment Models Research, 0938-AS75.

Medicare Program; Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Prospective Payment System For Federal Fiscal Year 2017, 0938-AS78; Medicare Program; FF 2017 Hospice Wage Index And Payment Rate Update And Hospice Quality Reporting Requirements, 0938-AS79; Margin And Capital Requirements For Covered Swap Entities, 3052-AC69; Medicare Program; FY 2017 Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System—Rate Update, 0938-AS76; National School Lunch Program And School Breakfast Program. Nutrition Standards For All Foods Sold In School As Required By The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act Of 2010, 0584-AE09; Revised Critical Infrastructure Protection Reliability Standards No RIN provided; Amendments To The Commission's Rules Of Practice, 3235-AL87; Disclosure Of Payments By Resource Extraction Issuers, 3235-AL53; Migratory Bird Hunting; Seasons And Bag And Possession Limits For Certain Migratory Game Birds, 1018-BA70; Oil And Gas And Sulfur Operations On The Outer Continental Shelf—Requirements For Exploratory Drilling On The Arctic Outer Continental Shelf, 1082-AA00.

Medication Assisted Treatment For Opioid Use Disorders, 0930-AA22; Department Of Labor Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Catch-Up Adjustments, 1290-AA31; General Administrative Regulations; Catastrophic Risk Protection Endorsement; Area Risk Protection Insurance Regulations; And The Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Basic Provisions, 0563-AC49; Transition Assistance Program (TAP) For Military Personnel, 0790-AJ17; Operation And Certification Of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems, 2120-AJ60; Transit Asset Management, National Transit Database; FTA–2014-0020, 092132-ABO7; Revision Of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery For Fiscal Year 2016, 3150-AJ66; Medicare Program; Medicare Clinical Diagnostic Laboratory Tests Payment System, 0938-AS33; James Zadroga 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund Reauthorization Act, 1105-AB49; Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards For Battery Chargers, 1904-AB57; Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards For Dehumidifiers, 1904-AC81; Removal Of Mandatory Country Of Origin Labeling Requirements For Beef And Pork Muscle Cuts, Ground Beef, And Ground Pork, 0581-AD29.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again with another piece of misguided legislation, but this one will jeopardize the health and safety of the American people to benefit corporate America and polluters.

Let's be clear. The protections that will be overwhelmingly targeted by this measure are not so-called midnight regulations. These are rules that went through significant vetting. There are a host of statutes that govern how regulations are crafted. From the Administrative Procedure Act to the Regulatory Flexibility Act, to the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, to the Paperwork Reduction Act, there are numerous processes to ensure regulations are written in a way that protect the American people while preventing overreach.

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Small Business Committee, I am well acquainted with the need to ensure that the regulatory process is balanced. No one here supports overregulation; but, at the same time, we cannot eliminate safeguards that have a proven record of protecting the American public. This bill also has the potential to create significant regulatory uncertainty for the same small businesses my colleagues say they are trying to help.

At its core, this bill is about enabling the largest and most powerful corporations to run rampant—without accountability. The legislation before us could result in less protections for consumers, and it could strip away workplace protections. We should reject this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 7½ minutes remaining, and the time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

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

I served on the Small Business Committee with Ms. VELÁZQUEZ a long time ago. One thing that we all know is, with regard to that committee, the NFIB—the National Federation of Independent Business—and small business groups alike are something we look at, even NAM—the National Association of Manufacturers—and, of course, the Chamber. All of those organizations support this legislation. They have written letters in support, and I include in the RECORD those letters.

The following is a list of supporters of H.R. 21, the Midnight Rules Relief Act:

American Action Forum, American Center for Law and Justice, American Commitment, American Energy Alliance, American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers, Americans for Prosperity—Key Vote, Americans for Tax Reform, Associated Builders and Contractors, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Concerned Women for America.

Family Business Coalition, FreedomWorks, Heating Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Distributors International

(HARDI), International Franchise Association, Let Freedom Ring, National Association of Electrical Distributors (NAED), National Association of Manufacturers, National Federation for Independent Business, R Street Institute, SBE Council, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

ASSOCIATED BUILDERS AND CONTRACTORS, INC.,
January 4, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of Associated Builders and Contractors (ABC), a national construction industry trade association with 70 chapters representing nearly 21,000 chapter members, I am writing in regard to the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act of 2017 (H.R. 26) introduced by Rep. Doug Collins (R–GA) as well as the Midnight Rules Relief Act of 2017 (H.R. 21) introduced by Rep. Darrell Issa (R–CA).

From 2009 to present, the federal government imposed nearly $900 billion in regulatory costs on the American people which requires billions of hours of paperwork. Many of these regulations have been or will be imposed on the construction industry. ABC is committed to reforming the broken federal regulatory process and ensuring industry stakeholders' voices are heard and rights are protected. ABC supports increased transparency and opportunities for regulatory oversight by Congress and ultimately, the American people.

The Obama administration issued numerous rulemakings that detrimentally impact the construction industry. In some cases, these regulations are based on conjecture and speculation, lacking foundation in sound scientific analysis. For the construction industry, unjustified and unnecessary regulations translate to higher costs, which are then passed along to the consumer or lead to construction projects being priced out of the market. This chain reaction ultimately results in fewer projects, and hinders businesses' ability to hire and expand.

ABC members understand the value of standards and regulations when they are based on solid evidence, with appropriate consideration paid to implementation costs and input from the business community. Federal agencies must be held accountable for full compliance with existing rulemaking statutes and requirements when promulgating regulations to ensure they are necessary, current and cost-effective for businesses to implement.

ABC opposes unnecessary, burdensome and costly regulations resulting from the efforts of Washington bureaucrats who have little accountability for their actions. H.R. 26 will help to bring greater accountability to the rulemaking process as it would require any executive branch rule or regulation with an annual economic impact of $100 million or more to come before Congress for an up-or-down vote before being enacted. Moreover, H.R. 21 will further enhance congressional oversight of the overreaching regulations often issued during the final months of a president's term and help to revive the division of powers.

Thank you for your attention on this important matter and we urge the House to pass the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act of 2017 and Midnight Rules Relief Act of 2017 when they come to the floor for a vote.

Sincerely,

KRISTEN SWEARINGEN,
Vice President of Legislative & Political Affairs.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
January 4, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), I am writing to express manufacturers' support for the passage of H.R. 21, the Midnight Rules Relief Act of 2017, introduced by Congressman Darrell Issa (R–CA).

The NAM is the largest manufacturing association in the United States, representing small and large manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states. Manufacturing employs nearly 12 million men and women, contributes more than $1.8 trillion to the U.S. economy annually, has the largest economic impact of any major sector, and accounts for two-thirds of private sector research and development. The NAM is the leading advocate for a policy agenda that helps manufacturers compete in the global economy and create jobs across the United States.

The Midnight Rules Relief Act of 2017 would amend the Congressional Review Act to provide Congress the authority to consider one joint resolution of disapproval for regulations en bloc as opposed to a single regulation at a time. As the end of an Administration approaches, there is an incentive for federal agencies to issue a significant number of regulations. These are known as midnight rules, and H.R. 21 would allow Congress to effectively respond to regulations that conflict with congressional intent, exceed an agency's statutory authority or are hastily drafted and issued as an Administration prepares its departure.

The problem of midnight rules is not new and is not unique to a particular political party. As an administration attempts to complete its regulatory agenda, an abundance of midnight rules can overwhelm Congress' ability to engage in proper oversight of federal agencies. Midnight rules can be issued without justification and without an agency conducting proper regulatory analysis. Congress should be granted the authority needed to appropriately respond to the issuance of a midnight rules that might not be drafted in accordance with sound regulatory principles.

Manufacturers support a regulatory system that results in regulations that efficiently and effectively achieve policy objectives, and we urge you to support passage of H.R. 21, the Midnight Rules Relief Act of 2017.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ROSARIO PALMIERI.

[From Americanactionforum.org, Jan. 3, 2017]

THE REGULATORY CLEANUP BEGINS

(By Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Patrick Hefflinger)

On Wednesday Vice President-elect Mike Pence is scheduled to meet with House Republicans to discuss Obamacare repeal and replacement plans. Republicans are expected to delay repealing parts of Obamacare to allow for more time to design a replacement health care plan. President Obama is expected to meet with Congressional Democrats on Wednesday as well to discuss plans for defending Obamacare from repeal.

Last week the Department of Justice (DOJ) announced that they had reached final agreements with Swiss banks on the Swiss Bank Program. The program aims to help financial institutions avoid criminal liabilities due to U.S. tax crimes by granting banks non-prosecution eligibility if they meet certain requirements. The Swiss Bank program was initially announced in 2013.

EAKINOMICS: THE REGULATORY CLEANUP BEGINS

The tally has been mounting for years—over 3,000 costly regulations totaling nearly $875 billion in finalized burden costs. As the economy became increasingly festooned with rule making and regulatory drag, conservatives have promised to bring the regulatory state to sanity given the first opportunity. That moment has presumably arrived. Congress returns from the holidays with plans to get started.

Specifically, I expect that the House will begin cleaning up the midnight regulatory onslaught by the Obama administration. Historically, this would have required a regulation-by-regulation use of the Congressional Review Act (CRA). Instead, the House will consider a bill (HR 5982 in the last Congress), which would permit Congress to disapprove multiple midnight rules en banc—in a single resolution.

That takes care of the last-gasp efforts of the outgoing president. But what guarantees better performance in the future? The House will next turn to the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act. With the REINS Act, Congress would have 70 legislative days to approve a major rule with economic impact over $100 million. Only then would it be sent to the president for signature. Without a positive vote, the regulation would not take effect. If enacted, REINS could save more than $27 billion in annual regulatory costs and 11.5 million paperwork burden hours according to AAF research by Sam Batkins.

Passage of the REINS Act (or other, similar, legislation) would insert Congress more firmly into the regulatory process, a significant change that is not done lightly. However, the lesson of the past eight years is that even without executive overreach the regulatory process does not correctly balance benefits and costs; a recalibration of the underlying process is overdue.

SMALL BUSINESS & ENTREPRENEURSHIP COUNCIL,
Vienna, VA, January 3, 2017.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ISSA: The Small Business Entrepreneurship Council (SBE Council) strongly supports the ''Midnight Rules Relief Act.'' This legislation is vital as it provides a needed check against the surge in new and questionable regulatory activity that is flooding into the Federal Register, which will eventually make its way to small businesses.

While ''midnight regulations'' have been a problem across Administrations, what is happening in the current period is staggering. According to the American Action Forum, the current output of midnight rules is up 42 percent over 2008, and 48 percent over 2000. This regulatory surge must be ''checked'' and contained by Congress before it causes permanent damage to the competitiveness of many types of small businesses.

The end-game push on the regulatory front will undoubtedly show that shortcuts were taken in a process meant to protect small businesses. Mercatus Center research found that the quality of analysis suffers during the midnight regulatory period, which means these regulations are ''excessively costly'' or ineffective. Poorly constructed and politically-driven regulation will only create more uncertainty and costs for our nation's struggling small businesses.

Your legislation will provide Congress with needed flexibility in using the Congressional Review Act (CRA) by allowing a CRA resolution to address more than one regulation. This important reform enhances the CRA and allows Congress to use its time efficiently to address the many issues that face our economy and nation.

Thank you for your continued leadership on issues important to entrepreneurs and

small businesses. Please let us know how we can help to ensure the ''Midnight Rules Relief Act'' is signed into law.

Sincerely,

KAREN KERRIGAN,
President & CEO.

[From Townhall, Jan. 4, 2017]

THE HOUSE CAN START REVERSING OBAMA'S REGULATORY OVERREACH

(By Christine Harbin)

President Obama has made a series of executive decisions in his final weeks in office that will undoubtedly harm the economy.

Particularly egregious were his recent announcements on energy and environmental policy: He rejected the permit for the Dakota access pipeline, exempted wind farm companies from killing eagles, abused the Antiquities Act to remove western lands from economic development, and prohibited federal offshore drilling and mineral leases on millions of acres across the country, including 115 million acres off the coast of Alaska.

This flurry of regulatory activity is simply the latest in a long line of overreaches from the Obama White House. The outgoing president has consistently sought ways to enact his agenda unilaterally over his two terms—notoriously ''working around Congress'' in order to do so. A recent report from the American Action Forum found that the Obama administration issued 600 major regulations totaling $743 billion over the course of his presidency. This is an average of 81 major regulations—regulations that exceed $100 million by agency estimates—per year.

Thankfully, the House of Representatives is poised to hit the ground running in slowing the growth of the regulatory state. Representatives will consider two important bills on the floor as one of their first orders of business for the year. Both bills, once passed by the Senate and signed by future President Trump, will bring meaningful relief to the American families and businesses across the country who are currently drowning in red tape.

The first bill, Rep. Darrell Issa's Midnight Rule Relief Act, is particularly important given the onslaught of regulations coming from the White House and the scarcity of available floor time in Congress. It would allow Congress to disapprove of multiple so-called ''midnight rules''—regulations finalized in the waning days of the administration—using a single Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution, as opposed to disapproving of these rules individually. This change will make it easier for Congress to disapprove of the Obama administration's recent spate of economically dangerous actions.

The second bill, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act, is also important. This would require executive agencies to submit ''major'' rules—those with an annual economic impact of $100 million or more—to Congress for review and a clear up-or-down vote before the rules take effect. This would assert Congress's proper role in approving the rules that govern the country, an authority which has been increasingly delegated to executive agencies. It would also encourage more debate among lawmakers about the size and scope of the federal government. Incoming Sen. Todd Young championed this important legislation during his time in the House; it's good to see Rep. Doug Collins introduce it in this new Congress.

Both of these bills received bipartisan support in past Congresses; they may enjoy even more in this current one. Strange bedfellows could emerge in anticipation of the Trump presidency. Democrats in Congress who want to limit the ability of a Republican White House to enact new rules, as well as Republicans who principally support limiting the size and scope of government.

Americans across the county voted for President-elect Donald Trump and a Republican majority in Congress because they are tired of President Obama's harmful regulatory agenda. It's little surprise that President-elect Donald Trump swept rust belt states and the upper Midwest in the recent election—these parts of the country have been devastated by President Obama's regulatory overreach, and they stood to lose even further under the threats of a Hillary Clinton administration.

Congress is right to reverse President Obama's regulatory assault on job creation and economic growth in this county, and it should work closely with President-elect Trump in peeling it back. Representatives should support the two regulatory reform bills when they come up on the floor this week, and they should seek additional efforts to overturn these myriad rules, including future Congressional Review Act resolutions of disapproval and adding appropriations riders that would prohibit funding for implementation of the worst rules, while executive agencies promulgate new rules to eliminate them.

Doing so will send a strong message that lawmakers are willing to stand up to the executive overreach of the past eight years.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, the fact is we are hearing many people talk about important regulations and of their somehow being taken out. Let's understand that regulations can go both ways. These changes and the underlying law can also protect the other way. The fact is now we are in the future. You could have an administration that, in its final days, changes regulations to make them more lenient to large businesses, more lenient to polluters, more lenient to the employers to the detriment of their employees. Regulations can go both ways, and only the most extreme regulations—literally one since the enactment of the underlying legislation—has ever been repealed.

I don't want to belittle my own legislation, but let's understand that there won't be 61 en bloc being brought. There will be some, I hope, and there may be more than one. Yet for Congress to take back, piece by piece, its responsibility and then live up to that responsibility should be all of our goals.

Now, this legislation was limited to midnight rules. Let's understand that midnight rules are the rules done in the waning days of an administration—7-plus years into this administration—and many of these rules, in fact, were enacted after the last vote of the people. I think it is important to understand that, on election day, the American people delivered a resounding message to Washington: stop the regulatory, Big Government onslaught that is killing jobs.

One of my colleagues earlier spoke of the fact that we had had so many jobs—15 million jobs—created in the last 8 years. The percentage of the workforce that is working in America today is the smallest in my lifetime. It is smaller than it was 8 years ago, 16 years ago, or 21 years ago. We are not creating jobs at the rate of our population. We should not have some sort of an accolade for regulations having created a great economy if, in fact, that economy has grown less than 2 percent a year and has not kept up with any historic 8-year period. To me, that is an important part. Although the discussion I just had was about more than regulations, let's understand that the growth of regulations—of lawmaking—is certainly not the creator of jobs.

I think, when we look at the cost—and that is a lot of what we are dealing with in the manager's amendment in this bill—we are dealing with the recognition that we are looking at regulations in light of how much they cost. Now, that cost is based on independent scoring. It is not the administration's scoring and it is not my scoring. It is that of the Congressional Budget Office's, an independent agency that doesn't always give a score I want, but the score is not arrived through partisan activities.

I reach out again to the Members who may not yet know that what we are asking is simply to assert our normal ability in Congress and put together one or more ideas for the efficiency of the body, to send it from here to the Senate, and from the Senate to the President. What we are proposing in this legislation as a small change to the underlying legislation that has been with us for three Presidents is, in fact, consistent with this body's doing its job, in regular order, in the clear light of day.

I think the important message for this piece of bipartisan legislation is: we are taking back a limited amount of our capability, trying to streamline it, and giving the President an opportunity to accept or reject a piece of legislation voted on by a majority of the House and a majority of the Senate before it gets to the President. The President, if he feels we have included even one regulation inappropriately that he would like to retain, would veto our bill.

Lastly, I beg everyone to look at this for what it is, not for what others say it is, because it is simply Congress doing its job in an efficient fashion and consistent with 20-plus years of history and with there being only one piece—one time—when a regulation was withdrawn. No President since that time has tried to produce or has asked Congress to pass a law so as to put into effect a regulation that, on a bipartisan basis, the House, the Senate, and a President thought should go. I urge the support for this bill.

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

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

Pursuant to section 5(b) of House Resolution 5, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. CASTOR of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 21 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 3. EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN RULES THAT PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION BY INSURANCE ISSUERS ON THE BASIS OF GENDER OR PREEXISTING CONDITION OR THAT MAKE HEALTHCARE MORE AFFORDABLE FOR WORKING AMERICANS.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall apply in the case of any rule that pertains to the prevention of—

(1) discrimination by health insurance issuers and group health plans on the basis of preexisting conditions or gender, including in the form of higher premiums for women or loss of benefits such as mammograms, cervical cancer screenings, prenatal care, and commonly prescribed contraception; or

(2) higher premiums or out-of-pocket costs for seniors for prescription drugs under prescription drug plans under the Medicare program under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 2 U.S.C. 1395w–101 et seq.).

Mr. ISSA (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 California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment provides an important safeguard for the economic security of American families by maintaining the consumer-friendly protections in the Affordable Care Act for, one, the cost-saving provisions in Medicare of lower prescription drugs for our parents and our grandparents; and, two, the vital consumer protection that prohibits insurance companies from denying coverage because someone has a preexisting condition like cancer, asthma, or diabetes.

The Affordable Care Act, which Republicans say they want to repeal without a replacement bill in sight, provided these very important consumer protections for all Americans not just for the 20 million Americans who gained health insurance through the marketplace or HealthCare.gov, but for the vast majority of Americans who are covered through Medicare, which is about 43 million Americans, and for the folks who have health insurance through their jobs, which is about 155 million Americans.

□ 1445

Here is what the Affordable Care Act has done for those folks: One, Medicare is stronger. The Affordable Care Act strengthened the Medicare fund, extending its life by over a decade. In addition, Medicare enrollees have benefited from huge savings in prescription drug costs. They have also saved through preventative screenings for breast and colorectal cancer, cardiovascular disease, and diabetes; that when they go to the doctor's office now, there is no cost, there is no charge. That is the Affordable Care Act.

So if Republicans aren't careful in their zeal to repeal the Affordable Care Act, they, in essence, will be asking our parents and grandparents to pay more, a whole lot more for their prescription drugs.

Let me get a little local here. I represent the State of Florida where about 18 percent of Floridians rely on Medicare for their health care. Because of the Affordable Care Act, it has started to close the doughnut hole. Repeal it now and that stops. That goes away. Just in 2015 alone, 350,000 Florida seniors saved $351 million on their prescription drugs. That is an average of about $1,000 per beneficiary. So my amendment makes the point that Democrats are going to fight for our older neighbors to keep those savings intact, brought to you by the Affordable Care Act.

Second, we also want to put everyone on notice that Democrats intend to fight tooth and nail to keep the vital consumer protection, one of the bedrocks of the Affordable Care Act, that bars health insurance companies from refusing to cover you or charge you more because you have a preexisting condition or charge women more than men.

Whether you know it or not, all Americans have benefited from the bar on discrimination from preexisting conditions since January 1, 2014. So if you have health insurance through your employer, you have benefited from the Affordable Care Act. If you have gone to healthcare.gov because you are a student, part-time worker, or you don't have it through your job, you have benefited. If you have health insurance for your children through the Children's Health Insurance Program or Medicaid, you are no longer subject to discrimination.

Remember a few years ago when insurance companies maintained a long list of conditions where they said, if you have cancer or diabetes or something, you are automatically excluded, that is the way things worked. A congressional investigation into this practice during the healthcare reform debate uncovered more than 400 medical diagnoses or conditions that insurance used to justify coverage denial. At the top of the list were cancer, heart disease, pregnancy, diabetes, HIV/AIDS, multiple sclerosis, and muscular dystrophy.

You know what? Generally, States with the highest rates of denial were in the South and the Midwest where the overall health status of residents has consistently been worse than in other parts of the country. The incidence of cancer, heart disease, and diabetes is higher in those States.

Well, now you cannot be discriminated against for those preexisting conditions. That kind of discrimination wasn't right. It had no place in America, so we outlawed it in the Affordable Care Act. Like one of my neighbors, Christine Roper in Tampa—Christine is 26. She recently aged off her father's insurance and was unsure how to find coverage because she has a heart condition and asthma. Before, she would have been prohibited from getting health insurance, but not today. And we are not going backwards. That is because millions of Americans who can now buy coverage would be forced back into the ranks of the uninsured.

We are going to start this Congress off by standing up for our families and rejecting any attempts to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on my motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I remember Chairman Ed Towns who used to say when someone ran on: The gentleman's time has long expired. I think we might have that situation here, but I am going to give the gentlewoman from Florida a moment more in just a moment.

The motion to recommit specifically sends it back to the committee. That is not necessary. The fact is that if she wanted these changes and wanted them enacted immediately there is a procedure to do so.

So I rise in opposition because this is certainly something that would delay, would send this back to committee, and cause it to come back again.

I will yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for a question, if she wouldn't mind: Is there a regulation in those 61 that would be affected by this that would affect any of the provisions that you cited in your amendment?

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Well, according to the Midnight Rules Relief Act, the public really won't know, and that is the point.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, would the gentlewoman answer the question. Is there 61, according to the ranking member, pieces of regulation that

could be in the window? I just wondered if you had one regulation by the Obama administration that concerned any of these issues that you had in the act.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In fact, there are extensive regulations listed as major rules relating to Medicare because part of what we did in the Affordable Care Act was to begin to change Medicare from a volume-based system to a value-based system.

MAJOR RULES ISSUED BY THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION THAT ARE POTENTIALLY ELIGIBLE FOR DISAPPROVAL UNDER THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT IN THE 115TH CONGRESS

MAJOR RULES LISTED ON GAO'S WEBSITE AS OF JANUARY 3, 2017

Title of Rule (As Published in Federal Register) and RIN Number are as follows:

Exemptions To Facilitate Intrastate and Regional Securities Offerings 3235-AL80; Investment Company Liquidity Risk Management Programs, 3235-AL61; Retention of EB–1, EB–2, and EB–3 Immigrant Workers and Program Improvements Affecting High Skilled Nonimmigrant Workers, 1615-ACO5; Walking-Working Surfaces and Personal Protective Equipment (Fall Protection Systems), 1216-AB80; Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation, 1004-AE14; Investment Company Swing Pricing, 3235-AL61; Establishing a More Effective Fair Market Rent System; Using Small Area Fair Market Rents in the Housing Choice Voucher Program Instead of the Current 50th Percentile FMRs, 2501-AD74; Medicare Program; Revisions to Payment Policies Under the Physician Fee Schedule and Other Revisions to Part B for CY 2017; Medicare Advantage Bid Pricing Data Release; Medicare Advantage and Part D Medical Loss Ratio Data Release; Medicare Advantage Provider Network Requirements; Expansion of Medicare Diabetes Prevention Program Model; Medicare Shared Savings Program Requirements, 0938-AS81.

Medicare Program; CY 2017 Inpatient Hospital Deductible and Hospital and Extended Care Services Coinsurance Amounts, 0938-AS70; Medicare Program; Medicare Part B Monthly Actuarial Rates, Premium Rate, and Annual Deductible Beginning January 1, 2017, 0938-AS72; Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment and Ambulatory Surgical Center Payment Systems and Quality Reporting Programs; Organ Procurement Organization Reporting and Communication; Transplant Outcome Measures and Documentation Requirements; Electronic Health Record (EHR) Incentive Programs; Payment to Nonexcepted Off-Campus Provider-Based Department of a Hospital; Hospital Value-Based Purchasing (VBP) Program; Establishment of Payment Rates Under the Medicare Physician Fee Schedule for Nonexcepted Items and Services Furnished by an Off-Campus Provider-Based Department of a Hospital, 0938-AS82; Medicare Program; Merit-Based Incentive Payment System (MIPS) and Alternative Payment Model (APM) Incentive Under the Physician Fee Schedule, and Criteria for Physician-Focused Payment Models, 0938-AS69; Medicare and Medicaid Programs; CY 2017 Home Health Prospective Payment System Rate Update; Home Health Value-Based Purchasing Model; and Home Health Quality Reporting Requirements, 0938-AS80; Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, and Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program, 1840-AD19; Energy Conservation Program, Energy Conservation Standards for Miscellaneous Refrigeration Products, 1904-AC51.

Medicaid Program; Final FY 2014 and Preliminary FY 2016 Disproportionate Share Hospital, Allotments, and Final FY 2014 and Preliminary FY 2016 Institutions for Mental Diseases, Disproportionate Share Hospital Limits, 0938-ZB30; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Update For The 2008 Ozone NAAQS, 2060-AS05; Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium-and Heavy-Duty Engines and vehicles—Phase 2, 2060-AS16; U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Fee Schedule, 1615-AC09; Treatment of Certain Interests in Corporations as Stock or Indebtedness, 1545-BN40; Establishment of the Electronic Visa Update System (EVUS), 1651-AB08; ONC Health IT Certification Program: Enhanced Oversight and Accountability, 0955-AA00; Cleaning Requirement Determination Under Section 2(H) Of The Commodity Exchange Act For Interest Rate Swaps, 3038-AE20; Standards For Covered Clearing Agencies, 3235-AL48.

Medicare And Medicaid Programs; Reform Of Requirements For Long-Term Care Facilities, 0938-AR61; Child Care And Development Fund (CCDF) Program, 0970-AC67; Establishing Paid Sick Leave For Federal Contractors, 1235-AAI3; OCC Guidelines Establishing Standards For Recovery Planning By Certain Large Insured National Banks, Insured Federal Savings Associations, And Insured Federal Branches; Technical Amendments, 1557-AD96; Emergency Preparedness Requirements For Medicare And Medicaid Participating Providers And Suppliers, 0938-A091; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations On Certain Federal Indian Reservations And Ceded Lands For The 2016–17 Season, 1018-BA70; Safety And Effectiveness Of Consumer Antiseptics; Topical Antimicrobial Drug Products For Over-The-Counter-Human Use, 0910-AF69; Head Start Performance Standards, 0970-AC63; Standards Of Performance For Municipal Solid Waste Landfills, 2060-AM08; Emission Guidelines And Compliance Times For Municipal Solid Waste Landfills, 2060-AS23.

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Fair Pay And Safe Workplaces, 9000-AM81; Medicare Program; Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems For Acute Care Hospitals And The Long-Term Care Hospital Prospective Payment System & Policy Changes & Fiscal Year 2017 Rates; Quality Reporting Requirements For Specific Providers; Graduate Medical Education; Hospital Notification Procedures Applicable To Beneficiaries Receiving Observation Services; Technical Changes Relating To Costs To Organizations & Medicare Cost Reports; Finalization Of Interim Final Rules With Comment Period On LTCH PPS Payments For Severe Wounds, Modifications Of Limitations On Redesignation By The Medicare Geographic Classification Review Board, & Extensions Of Payments To MDHS And Low-Volume Hospitals, 0938-AS77; 0938-AS88; 0938-AS41; Workforce Innovation And Opportunity Act; Joint Rule For Unified And Combined State Plans, Performance Accountability, And The One-Stop System Joint Provisions; Final Rule, 1205-AB74; Workforce Innovation And Opportunity Act, 1205-AB73; Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System And Consolidated Billing For Skilled Nursing Facilities For FY 2017, SNF Value-Based Purchasing Program, SNF Quality Reporting Program, And SNF Payment Models Research, 0938-AS75.

Medicare Program; Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Prospective Payment System For Federal Fiscal Year 2017, 0938-AS78; Medicare Program; FF 2017 Hospice Wage Index And Payment Rate Update And Hospice Quality Reporting Requirements, 0938-AS79; Margin And Capital Requirements For Covered Swap Entities, 3052-AC69; Medicare Program; FY 2017 Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System—Rate Update, 0938-AS76; National School Lunch Program And School Breakfast Program: Nutrition Standards For All Foods Sold In School As Required By The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act Of 2010, 0584-AE09; Revised Critical Infrastructure Protection Reliability Standards, No RIN provided; Amendments To The Commission's Rules Of Practice, 3235-AL87; Disclosure Of Payments By Resource Extraction Issuers, 3235-AL53; Migratory Bird Hunting; Seasons And Bag And Possession Limits For Certain Migratory Game Birds, 1018-BA70; Oil and Gas And Sulfur Operations On The Outer Continental Shelf—Requirements For Exploratory Drilling On The Arctic Outer Continental Shelf, 1082-AA00.

Medication Assisted Treatment For Opioid Use Disorders, 0930-AA22; Department Of Labor Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Catch-Up Adjustments, 1290-AA31; General Administrative Regulations; Catastrophic Risk Protection Endorsement; Area Risk Protection Insurance Regulations; And The Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Basic Provisions, 0563-AC49; Transition Assistance Program (TAP) For Military Personnel, 0790-AJ17; Operation And Certification Of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems, 2120-AJ60; Transit Asset Management; National Transit Database; FTA–2014–0020, 2132-AB07; Revision Of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery For Fiscal Year 2016, 3150-AJ66; Medicare Program; Medicare Clinical Diagnostic Laboratory Tests Payment System, 0938-AS33; Jams Zadroga 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund Reauthorization Act, 1105–AB49; Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards For Battery Chargers, Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards For Dehumidifiers, 1904-AC81; Removal Of Mandatory Country Of Origin Labeling Requirements For Beef And Pork Muscle Cuts, Ground Beef, And Ground Pork, 0581-AD29.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would ask that the gentlewoman, if there are some, place them in the RECORD. I don't know of any in the 61 that were granted, let's say, after June.

What I will say is that the reason I will be voting and urging my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit is not the regulations that she alludes to but, in fact, the fact that this would kill the bill by sending it back and having it delayed further.

So, in order to pass it today, because she did not set it up to exclude these items and have them immediately considered, I cannot support her motion to recommit.

What I will say is that when we look at regulations to put into a package that may be a package of one or a package, if this passes, of more than one, I certainly will expect that those regulations will have to do with things which could have been done sooner, would have been done sooner, and were done in the waning days of the administration for no reason that was time sensitive.

The Affordable Care Act was passed in the first days of the administration. If there is something in the last days of the administration that has merit, I certainly would urge my colleagues not

to rescind that regulation. But if there is something that should have been done in year one, two, three, four, five, or six, I would ask why it wasn't done then.

Having said that, it is unfortunate that this motion to recommit was written in a way that would send it back to committee and, thus, cause a substantial delay.

I would caution my colleagues that, at least from this Member, if you have a motion to recommit and you want the amendment itself considered, make it one that is immediate and not back to committee. The difference, I think, is important. The Parliamentarian simply can advise on how to write one that would prevent it having to get, if you will, another delay of days or weeks.

I urge opposition to the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1615

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

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 the following order:

The motion to recommit on H.R. 21; and passage of H.R. 21, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

MIDNIGHT RULES RELIEF ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 21) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for midnight rules, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 183, nays 236, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—183

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

NAYS—236

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

NOT VOTING—14

Becerra
Beyer
Collins (NY)
Costa
Gallego
Gonzalez (TX)
Kihuen
Mulvaney
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Richmond
Rush
Waters, Maxine

□ 1638

Messrs. WEBSTER of Florida, RENACCI, JENKINS of West Virginia, Mmes. HARTZLER, McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. STEWART, THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, STIVERS, BRADY of Texas, and BERGMAN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. KILDEE, BLUMENAUER, RUPPERSBERGER, O'ROURKE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SESSIONS was allowed to speak out of order.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 5, H.R. 79, H.R. 238, AND H.R. 78

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee issued announcements outlining the amendment processes for several measures likely on the floor next week.

An amendment deadline has been set for Monday, January 9, at 10 a.m. for H.R. 5, the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2017; H.R. 79, Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act. And a deadline has been set for 3 p.m. on Monday for H.R. 238, the Commodity End-User Relief Act, and H.R. 78, the SEC Regulatory Accountability Act.

The text of these measures are available on the Rules Committee Web site. Please feel free to contact me or my staff with any questions you have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 184, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

AYES—238

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

NOES—184

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

NOT VOTING—11

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Gallego
Mulvaney
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush
Scott, David
Waters, Maxine
Zinke

□ 1648

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 26, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 11, OBJECTING TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2334

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–1) on the resolution (H. Res. 22) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 26) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 11) objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

101ST PENNSYLVANIA FARM SHOW

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the Pennsylvania Farm Show that opens this weekend in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. This weeklong event is the largest indoor agricultural expo in the country. It showcases 6,000 animals and thousands of agricultural exhibits.

There will be a Member listening session on Saturday, January 7, at 1:30 p.m. Proudly, Agriculture Committee Chairman MIKE CONAWAY and I have organized a public forum for Members to hear directly from farmers and farm families.

We invite all Members of the House to join us at this tremendous expo that celebrates Pennsylvania's rich history and the agriculture industry. We will tour the show and visit various exhibits. Pennsylvania Agriculture Secretary Russell Redding will also join us.

Agriculture is the number one industry in Pennsylvania and generates nearly $6.9 billion in agricultural cash receipts. Almost half a million jobs are tied to this industry in the Commonwealth. This show has been widely attended for generations. In fact, this year marks the 101st show.

Come join us Saturday in Harrisburg as we celebrate the prominence of the agriculture industry in Pennsylvania and its importance to this Nation. We hope to see you there.

SNOWDROP FOUNDATION FIGHTS CHILDHOOD CANCER

(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, as you know, everything is bigger in Texas. But as any Texan knows, the biggest, most grand thing is the heart of a Texan. The best example of these hearts are my two dear friends, Kevin and Trish Kline. Their huge Texas hearts want to end childhood cancer, so they started the Snowdrop Foundation. They have raised over $1 million in less than 10 years to stop cancer.

They do this for kids like Ana. When Ana was 14, she was told she had acute leukemia. She wondered: Will my soul be taken away? Who will take care of my younger brother? Am I going to die?

After nearly a decade of fear, with Snowdrop's help, Ana now says: Cancer, been there, beat that.

God bless Ana, Snowdrop, Kevin, and Trish.

CONGRATULATING PLEASANT VALLEY VIKINGS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out the pride of Chico, California, and the First District. The Pleasant Valley High School Vikings became State champions of football just a few weeks ago.

It was a very exciting game. They traveled south to Long Beach for it, to beat St. Anthony. The resiliency of the Vikings was amazing. I didn't get to go to the game myself, but I was texting back and forth with a good friend down there. After a 17–13 halftime score, it ended up 50–49.

The Vikings were back and forth, up and down. With just 1½ minutes left in the game, after a late interception by the other team, they were down by 8 points. But with about 1½ minutes to go, they drove the field, scored a touchdown, got the 2-pointer and tied. They went into overtime. After giving up a touchdown to the other team in overtime, they came back, drove the field once again, scored a touchdown, and went for two and became division champions for the State of California by a score of 50–49.

Congratulations, Pleasant Valley Vikings. Well done. You showed a lot of heart.

□ 1700

DOUBLE STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARRINGTON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to get to come into this hallowed Hall and to have a chance to address our peers.

It was a rather enjoyable day yesterday, even with all the vitriol, but I was reminded and couldn't help but reminisce a bit and walk a bit down memory lane yesterday as we heard from Members of the House on the other side of the aisle expressing repeatedly a desire to have open debate and not shut off debate.

The reminiscing took me back to a time last year when, as far as we could find, the only time in American history one party in the United States Congress physically prevented another party from coming to the floor and going into session and trying to begin debate and trying to discuss the business of the day. We can't find that any party ever staged such a sit-in.

We know there are House rules about not eating on the House floor and about not having things to drink on the House floor other than water, and yet our friends across the aisle were eating and drinking. It is actually a violation of the House rules to sing on the House floor. Every now and then, people look the other way from the violation, but certainly not to take pictures and broadcast.

I approached the Sergeant at Arms and asked him why this wasn't stopped.

I was told: Well, they won't stop; we have told them repeatedly.

I said: Well, you won't let Republicans get away with this kind of conduct. They are preventing debate. They are preventing a session from starting timely. This has been going on for hours.

I was told: Well, Congressman, when we tell you Republicans that you are violating a rule, you stop and you follow the rules. We have told them repeatedly, and they will not stop violating the rules. They will not stop preventing you from going into session, so we don't know what else to do.

Mr. Speaker, I had issues like that when I was a felony judge, and they didn't last long because we had bailiffs who would drag people out to stop such inappropriate conduct. It just seemed that, in this potentially last bastion of civility where we can use words and debate issues, it is rather ironic, to say the least, to be preached to repeatedly about the desire for open debate and the desire to not be shut down from speaking when that is exactly what happened last year by the very people who were standing up, and some of them were reading a script pointing out how offended they were by being prevented by the rules under which we have been proceeding from going forward and debating. So it is rather ironic and rather incredible actually.

I also recall back when we were debating ObamaCare and some of us wanted to get amendments into ObamaCare. Of course, some of us remember the fact that John Dingell was chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce that had jurisdiction over the healthcare debate and the healthcare bill. He has been working for a healthcare bill, something like what passed, for all of his time, as I am aware of, in the House.

I was told by someone that his father may have worked for the same bill for years. So that was something that was going to be a crowning glory for an incredibly honorable man. We see differently on many issues, but I know him to be an honest and honorable man. His word has always been good. When he has given it, it was always the way it is. I have great respect for him.

Anyway, he understood that the cap-and-trade bill that was being pushed here in the House by then-Speaker PELOSI was going to unduly harm the Nation's poor more than anybody else in the country. If you are very rich, if you are on Wall Street, you are friends of the Obama administration, and you have gotten $656 million in grants to open a non-carbon-based energy facility, you are not worried about the price of anything because your friends in the Obama administration were giving you millions and billions of dollars that you could fritter away as you wished.

But for our Nation's middle class, lower middle class, and poor that don't have the ability to absorb increasing energy costs, the cap-and-trade bill would have been devastating. That is why, when John Dingell was asked about the cap-and-trade bill, he responded something to the effect that it is not only a tax, it is a great big tax, it will unfairly hit the poor, and he was not going to bring that bill out of committee. So Speaker PELOSI, at that time, took whatever actions were required to remove him as chair and replace him with Henry Waxman.

Chairman Waxman made clear: We don't need your votes; we don't want your input; so we don't care what you want in the healthcare bill.

JOE BARTON, the longest serving Texan in the House right now, had indicated, as a former chair of that same committee, that it is interesting if

John Dingell—the consummate professional and honorable man that he is—had been allowed to remain as chairman of that committee, he would have instinctively gotten Republican input into that bill and included things in the bill that Republicans would have had a hard time voting against. If he had been allowed to remain as chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, John Dingell would have probably been able to get a bill through that would not even be taken up by this body to be repealed and ripped out by its roots.

Hopefully that is what we are going to be able to do with the extremely partisan bill. There were groups that were telling Republicans: Look, of course we are negotiating with the Obama administration. We have got to have a seat at the table.

I would tell them: Not when you are on the menu.

But there were groups like the Big Pharma, like the American Hospital Association, the AMA, and some of the health insurance businesses that ended up getting behind it. Of course, AARP totally sold out retired folks because they were going to make hundreds of millions—billions perhaps—more than they would have without ObamaCare being passed. They had no interest in supporting a bill like I proposed that would have ended any need for a senior citizen to ever have to pay for supplemental insurance on top of Medicare; they would have been totally covered.

But I didn't realize, at the time I asked them to support it in 2009, that the year before they had made, I think, over $400 million or so in profit as a nonprofit organization on getting their members to buy their insurance that they had sponsored and put their mark of approval on.

So anyway, there were people that were going to make a lot of money. But I could see that in the end it would probably spell the doom of the pharmaceutical industry. Yes, it would be years down the road; yes, there would be executives at pharmaceutical companies who would see massive billions of dollars come in more than would have otherwise; and, yes, they would likely take their golden parachutes and their millions in severance in retirement and be gone before they were relegated to perhaps producing medications without getting reimbursement for research and development. This is the way this whole ObamaCare thing would have eventually played out, and still they got on board with ObamaCare because they were going to make short-term extra billions of dollars.

So having all of that in mind, as it has all appeared to me, it had just been astounding to be here yesterday and hear all the comments about the inability to have open debate.

I have talked to numerous friends across the aisle who were greatly troubled over the last 6 years. Actually, the Office of Congressional Ethics was started by Speaker PELOSI. You are allowed to file complaints without anybody knowing who filed the complaint. The OCE is then able to go after a Member of Congress and start demanding things that they could not possibly be entitled to under the Constitution if a Member of Congress were getting due process.

I haven't been run through the ringer like so many have. But when you set up a process like that, and you have the Office of Congressional Ethics set up, they have no one at all to whom they are accountable—no one—and they are encouraged, even if they filed the complaints themselves, to enable them to continue to grow from the little office they had over here in the Longworth Building. I am told they have a massive amount of space in one of the big Federal buildings now, and they continue to grow. So apparently, they were offended that their budget was cut and they were put under the Ethics Committee so that they would have some accountability. There were an awful lot of great people—good friends—across the country that did not know about how unconstitutionally they had been acting—I mean more abusive even than the IRS at times from the reports of some of my colleagues to me of what they have been through.

I stand here, Mr. Speaker, as a judge who has had to look people in the eye and sentence them to death—something that is never taken lightly. I may be the only person here in Congress who has ever looked someone in the eye and sentenced them to death and been appointed as counsel against my wishes to represent an indigent defendant on appeal from a capital murder conviction under sentence of death and was able, appropriately, to have his case reversed and to save his life as the law should have been. So I feel rather strongly that, yes, people should be accountable, but they must have due process, and that is not what is provided for by the OCE.

□ 1715

Wonderful people, including our incoming President, were not aware of just how crazy the abuses have been. One of the Members was telling me yesterday that he was out about half a million dollars in attorney's fees responding to ridiculous demands and still never got to know who the accuser was. You don't get to necessarily even see what the specific complaint is.

So we didn't do a good job of educating people of how grossly unfair the OCE process was, could be, but everybody in Congress, the judiciary, and executive branch needs someone to whom they are accountable, and that would include the OCE.

We have got to do something about this, but we do need to go about it in an appropriate way to make sure that, once again, justice is done. But when you hear ''ethics watchdog group,'' then immediately you think, Gee, they are going to stop an ethics watchdog group? That is outrageous. That is what I would think if I didn't know all the background.

So it made for an interesting day yesterday, but I have been amazed, though, that some who have told me that they wanted to eliminate the OCE who stand up on the other side of the aisle and preach about ethics, apparently referring to the effort to place OCE and make them accountable under somebody for a change—in this case, under the Ethics Committee—and would demagogue the issue, in essence, when they have been mistreated by the OCE, according to what I have been told by them in the past.

So I think if we can just set the politics aside and work together for appropriate due process, we can have a bipartisan group that could work out something that would create due process and would make people accountable so that when you have somebody with $90,000 of cold, hard cash in their freezer, there is accountability. In that case, it was a crime and it needed to be addressed. So there does need to be accountability.

I know we have friends here. I saw my friend, STEVE KING, at the back just a moment ago. We feel strongly that when a Federal judge intentionally refuses to go along with what they know the Constitution says, that ought to be an impeachable offense. They are not keeping their oath, and that is as offensive as anything is when it comes from a judge. They ought to be able to impeach a judge like that.

I don't think we have done enough removal, impeachment of judges who have violated their oath. Yes, we were removing a judge who had committed sexual assault. Well, that should have been a no-brainer, but that took literally an act of Congress to eventually get that done.

For another judge, it was not until we actually impeached him for his terribly inappropriate actions of suppressing information when he was being investigated for being a Federal judge, but from his days as a State judge. Apparently, as a State judge, he didn't have a problem, if tuition was due for his son, to just send the secretary or somebody to one of the law offices which he often appoints and then have them fill up the envelope with a bunch of cash and use that to pay his son's tuition. That didn't seem to be a problem for that judge. Those are all things that should have been appropriately taken into account before he was ever made a Federal judge.

I see my friend here on the floor. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. I was listening to the gentleman's remarks on a couple of these topics here that are very important.

He led off with the situation that occurred with the sit-in that occurred here on this House floor last year, some months ago, and I found that to be very appalling for the decorum, for

the honor, for the history, for all the things that are important about conducting ourselves in a society where order is needed in order to conduct business.

This House floor was not treated with that respect that is necessary to have order, to have an honest debate, and a debate that is constructive when you have a sit-in like that where basically the folks on the other side of the aisle—some of them—decided to take over the entire building outside of session, outside of the rules. As Mr. GOHMERT mentioned, many rules were violated.

I had the appalling experience of walking on the floor just a few minutes after they concluded their sit-in and, honestly, the garbage that was laying on the floor. I saw food crumbs, old newspapers, magazines, a couple of blankets. They didn't even pick up after themselves. They expected the staff of the building to pick it up and haul it off for them because their Occupy Wall Street moment was over with. This is not the sixties. This is not the hippy era. This is the United States House of Representatives.

This week, rules were proposed that say, when you violate rules in such a fashion where videotaping or Periscoping, as they call it, is occurring—sending these speeches during a nonofficial, non-session time, basically bootlegging them to the American public via C–SPAN; and I am a little annoyed with C–SPAN actually playing along with the violation of House rules of piping this out the way they did.

If you want to have a protest out on the front lawn, fine. That is within the rights of free speech, the First Amendment, and all that. You don't do it in violation of the rules of a fairly, some might say, sacred place—this House floor—the way that happened then. For them to be piping it out live that way, I found it to be completely wrong.

There are those folks that might say: Well, this is all First Amendment rights, not in violation of the decorum of the House rules. So I am glad Mr. GOHMERT brought that up. Rules are put in place this week to address people that are going to violate the very House rules that help us keep order and do business of the American public. We lost part of, I think, three session days that we could have been grinding out the important business that the people expect of this country.

We lost that session time and, indeed, had to come in here and the Speaker or whoever was introducing legislation that day had to yell over the process here to do things in order for the House. I find that appalling. It isn't very mature. I think with some of the penalties that are put in place by the rules this week, there will be a little more accountability for that.

Mr. GOHMERT. I recall being told when that was going on and after it happened that Republicans should not respond, and that we were assured that people who violated the rules back then would be punished. Well, adopting rules now, specific penalties, don't really punish people that violated those very rules last year.

So I am surprised that there is any complaint at all since basically it means people who violated the rule with such abandon would complain about inserting a specific penalty now, meaning they got a free one. They didn't even get probation. They got nothing. They got pardoned, basically.

Perhaps it is not too late for those that feel like putting a penalty in place now is unfair. I don't think it is too late. It is not unusual to have punishment assessed in a felony case 6 months or more after an event. Perhaps if they think it is unfair, then we ought to have ethics hearings on what happened back then.

I haven't heard of the OCE, by the way, taking any action on such widespread abuse that didn't require investigation. All you needed was footage that was being streamed out from the very violators of the rules. So it should have been an easy thing to pursue, if OCE were really that interested in making sure our rules were not violated.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. LAMALFA. It wouldn't be inappropriate since OCE is a hot topic this week.

The accountability goes both directions. So we have heard our colleagues talk about unjust charges that can be brought from anywhere, out of the blue, against a Member of the House without justification, without even a due process for that Member to have a chance to address directly what that charge is, and then have their name run through the newspaper, giant headlines, and maybe a year's worth of investigation.

When you see it, Congressman being investigated, well, that is an ugly headline. It can be used to manipulate it for political purpose when it might be a trumped-up charge, something that has no merit, and many times talking to my colleagues that have faced this, hundreds of thousands of dollars of cost to them for attorney's fees, their reputation besmirched by this, when, really, there is an investigative process that is open, with oversight.

Now we didn't have the perfect piece of legislation in the rule this week. No. We probably need a little more time for it to be aired out and a little more widely. It was withdrawn after at least getting the idea out on the table.

So I am proud of my colleagues who are going to take this up and work in a bipartisan fashion and get the input to make some needed reforms to the OCE so that we have an ethics process that is fair to the Members, but obviously enforces ethics for this House that are needed and clearly demanded by the public and us.

We are talking here tonight about a decorum, a code, a process that our House is to be conducted by. So that sit-in is one extreme. The other one is charges that are, in many cases, absolved months later without giant headlines but are not even sometimes an oops or I am sorry for trumped-up charges being brought up against somebody that would affect them negatively in their ability to serve their districts or to fend off the huge costs of legal matters that they have to go through.

So many of my colleagues here strongly care and want to have a strong ethical process in this place, but there needs to be accountability and balance to it. That is what we are all looking forward to, is accountability with OCE and our Ethics Committee who, in a bipartisan fashion, can weed through all these processes.

I think we will get to that. For those that are concerned around this country that some here want to get rid of that ethics process, that absolutely couldn't be further from the truth. We all demand that with the code of conduct of this House, on the floor and off, of our Members.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend, Mr. LAMALFA for great insights. Such truth.

I also was just advised this afternoon that the EPA, apparently in accordance with some frenzied effort to have this administration put as problematic regulations in place to stifle the economy, stifle and skyrocket further costs of energy, has apparently given notice to all gas operators that they have 60 days to comply.

One such operator in Texas was saying the date on the notice says it was received December 15, but he was out of the country. Somebody in the building accepted it. The date for the 60-day compliance kicks in January 18, 2 days before President-elect Donald Trump would be able to strike such an arbitrary and capricious regulation down.

□ 1730

Apparently, they must have backdated the 60-day compliance before they ever got notice saying you have got until January 18 to comply. So what we have heard from so many small-business owners, they get notices like this: You have all of a sudden got to comply. You have got to give us all these records, those records.

It has cost them a fortune. It has stifled their ability to expand their business and hire more people and give more people opportunity and give more people opportunity to make more money than they had been making. Those have been so completely stifled by this administration. I understand there was a political article glorifying the great efforts of the Obama administration in helping the economy, and to justify that, took one quarter out of, I guess—four times eight—32 quarters and said, ''Look what they did in this one quarter,'' when actually, as I understood, if you take the whole term that we have numbers on and adjust the growth for inflation, President Obama's administration, his policies,

his crony capitalism, helping people with no-bid contracts like IBM, giving $1.6 billion to this company to create mirrors to heat water and however much it was, hundreds of millions for Solyndra—there are just so many companies. They have squandered so much money. And yet, with all the money squandered, the economy grew, when adjusted for inflation, at about half the growth rate during the Jimmy Carter administration.

Now, I understand this administration is extremely proud of what they accomplished, but I would humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, if your policies cause the economy to grow at half the rate of the Jimmy Carter administration, you have done more damage to the American people and the American economy than you have done good, and that is for sure. And that is at a time when, scientifically, we were having such breakthroughs that we found out we could actually be totally energy independent if this administration had not been spending so much money on too expensive of sources of energy and all the other things this administration supported.

We had a hearing in Chairman ROB BISHOP's Committee on Natural Resources in our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, a hearing on some of the abuses. I know there are legitimate groups and businesses that have invested in this idea of having this fantastic carbon-free energy production out in California, and, yes, it took a massive amount of acreage. I believe it was Federal land that they were allowed to use. I believe. I am not certain.

I was intrigued, they were going to create all these mirrors that would reflect the Sun's light in concentrated amounts towards three different towers, and the towers would then be superheated, superheat the water, turn the water to steam. The steam would turn turbines that would produce electricity. If I recall correctly, they got $1.6 billion in government loan; and to help them make their loan payment, they got over $600 million in grants.

When I asked over this period of time that they have been operating how much of their $1.6 billion in government loan was paid back, I believe he said $6 million had been paid back from, it may have been, $656 million that they had given to them by this administration.

But we also came to find out that apparently there have been problems. One of the towers got super-superheated and was totaled, was destroyed because of the massive sunlight reflected and damaged to where it wouldn't function. Because, apparently, they had squandered so much of their money, they had to find a cheap source, an extremely cheap source of energy because they had contracts to supply a certain amount of electricity. With the third tower not in operation, they were not able to supply over 30 percent of the energy they had contracted to provide. They very quickly, cheaply, efficiently built a natural gas electricity production plant, and, wow, apparently it is working great. Of course, anybody that studies natural gas understands, if they know what they are doing, that natural gas is an amazingly clean form of energy.

Anyway, now about a third of the energy is being produced using natural gas, when the whole purpose of the massive $1.6 billion in the government-backed loan and the $656 million or so that was given to them was because it was not going to be carbon based at all.

But it is not just the one problem, apparently, of the tower. This is out in an arid area where there is not much water. Well, they didn't need much water other than what they had in the towers, really; but what they didn't anticipate was something that I am told operators, others in the area refer to as flamers.

Flamers, as I was given to understand, those are birds, perhaps some of them endangered species, that make the mistake of flying through the superheated beam of sunlight and immediately explode or burst into flame. Apparently, if you are a bird that gets superheated and explodes, bursts into flame, then masses of fluid keep covering the mirrors, which need to be kept clean.

Normally, you would figure out in a desert or an arid area, you are not going to need to clean those mirrors very often, so you are not going to need much water. But then when it turns out you have got all these flamers that supercoat the mirrors so they are constantly having to be recleaned, those poor birds that our nature-loving friends are exploding, it is running up the water bill as well because, gee, it is just not healthy to be exploding birds that fly through this superheated beam of sunlight.

So 8 years of misguided policies have made, probably, a lot of Democratic millionaires, but the American public has suffered; and when adjusted for inflation, the American people are, on average, worse off.

I was surprised to see a video where the President actually admitted, he had actually acknowledged, that in his administration, for the first time we are aware of in the history of the United States, 95 percent of the income in America went to the top 1 percent of the income earners. I have read articles since then about, actually, even that 1 percent that was making 95 percent of the Nation's income, they still weren't making, many of them, quite as much as they had before, because that is what happens when you hurt and throttle down an economy, as has happened. We haven't really adjusted.

Of course, we have had the Fed that has had interest rates down to basically nothing, and it was clear they were doing everything they could to try to help the Obama administration's economy look better than it was. Now that people have started having hope because we have President-elect Trump and the policies are going to change dramatically, we are going to hopefully be completely rid of, or as completely as possible, the crony capitalism. I know my colleagues here in the House, actually on both sides of the aisle, have made clear we want to stop crony capitalism, and I am looking forward to that stopping once we get out from under this administration.

So the economy is showing great signs. I have got people back home telling me they are starting to hire again just based on the hope and the promise. President Obama was supposed to bring hope and change, but all my constituents tell me so many of them are left with, after he has been President, a little change left from what they had when he took office.

But there is real hope, and people are gearing up to grow, and the economy should take off, and we should get energy independent. I expect President-elect Trump to keep his promises. He assured me personally he was going to. So I am expecting great things. But just on that, the economy has started going up, on the assurance that President Obama would not be around any longer than January 20, and as a result now, the Fed finally has started increasing interest rates because they don't have to artificially try to protect President Obama's reputation and his poor economy.

So just the fact that the EPA would send out regulations in such a capricious manner as they have, demanding that well operators start monitoring all their emissions, something to that effect, I am looking forward to getting into it and just seeing how abusive the EPA has been as these oligarchs. Not to give a chance for true input into an arbitrary and capricious rule, not to give businesses a chance to get ready and to adjust, I mean, this is the kind of thing that has stifled so much growth and has sent so many high school and college graduates to their parents' home.

I think there are a lot of people who voted for President Obama and were excited. I think it is unfortunate that so many people expressed that they voted for a President because of his skin color—and I am not talking about Donald Trump—that they made a racist vote to vote for a man who was not White so they could feel good about voting for someone who was not White, where some of us—and it is one of the things for which I love Alveda King, Martin Luther King's niece. I mean, she believes in his dream, and the Americans that voted for Donald Trump, they believe that skin color should not matter. It is racist to vote for a candidate because of what his race is.

Let's look at the character. Let's look at the qualifications. What have you built that you actually built that someone else didn't build for you? Let's look at those things and then make a determination rather than voting for

someone just because of his race. Let's do as Martin Luther King, Jr., was so profound in saying in looking forward to the day when people were judged by the content of their character rather than the color of their skin. I am looking forward to that day. That day has been set back tremendously.

It was a highlight for me back at the end of the fall to go back to my hometown of Mount Pleasant, Texas. I had mentioned to a reporter sometime back, though I didn't vote for President Obama, I had hopes that he would do for America what Coach Willie Williams did for our football team. Actually, I didn't say ''football team.'' I said ''our team.''

□ 1745

Liberals immediately put up an article saying that I said my basketball coach, my favorite coach, was African American. Apparently, liberals think, if you are African American, you must be a coach of basketball because of your race. When actually, it was the year before I went to the varsity, I was on the junior varsity, and I enjoyed playing for Coach Williams more than any coach I had ever played for.

And unfortunately, Coach Williams' memory is still intact. I haven't seen him in decades. But I was asked to come give a motivational talk for the team I played for—the Mount Pleasant Tigers. It was such a treat being with those players that morning. It had a rough year to that point. I got to be with them on the field during the game. It was such a treat. Those young people were just inspirational. They fought hard, and some say it was the best game of the year. They won singlehandedly against a team from a bigger town than Mount Pleasant. They even gave me the game ball.

And as much as that meant to me, the real highlight was, as we went into halftime, somebody told me that my old coach, back from over 40 years ago, was up in the press box, and I got to go up. I was so thrilled to see him. We hugged and smiled big as ever. I was so elated in seeing him and talking to him. Somebody said when I got back here—when I said: I finally got to see Coach Williams after all these years. It was wonderful.

Well, did you get a picture?

I didn't even think about a picture. That is not a very good politician. But I didn't think about a picture. But it is a shame.

His memory is so good because he remembered. We didn't have a lot of talent on that team. We didn't. He made us so cohesive. We played well together. We didn't have any outstanding talent, but we had a winning season. And it was a fun season because Coach Williams made it that way. He inspired us together. Everybody got treated just the same. Nobody got special treatment. Nobody got treated more harshly than anybody else. And we came together as a team.

He remembered. He said: Yeah, you guys didn't have much talent on your team, but you played so well together. Well, that was because of him. He brought us together.

And I so hoped that President Obama would do that for America. I didn't vote for him, but I thought it will be awesome if he can bring us even closer together. And now at the end of his administration, it is so grievous that America seems more divided than ever.

I see an article here about more police officers again being shot in our U.S. cities. I heard the former police chief, I believe, in Chicago this week saying that Black Lives Matter was supposedly organized to try to stop killings of Black, especially young, men. And yet, what Black Lives Matter has done is actually increase the number of people being shot.

I was absolutely astounded to hear a quote from the President. A speech, apparently, he was making. I heard it on the radio. Maybe he was giving an interview. But he was saying that we know that cities that have more gun control laws just have less violence. That is called gaslighting. That is called creating a fiction and trying to push it across and make somebody who knows the truth think that they are crazy and that this alternate truth is really what is going on.

The fact is that cities with the most gun control laws, like Chicago, for heaven's sakes—I mean, the hundreds of precious Black lives that have been taken, been killed, the massive gun control laws have not helped Chicago. They have got a massive number of gun control laws there than we do in any city in east Texas, and yet nowhere in east Texas has that kind of violence at that percentage rate. It is insane.

It is time to quit trying to gaslight the American people, convince them they are going crazy, and that what they know to be true is fiction. It is time to just have a truthful assessment of where we are. We need to follow the law. We need to have enforcement of our borders.

We will continue to be the most generous Nation in the world, not just in giving funds to help others, not just in giving lives of our citizens to help freedom for other countries like nowhere else in history, but also most generous in the number of visas and the number of people that we allow to come into the United States and visit. Yet, that generosity has been abused. As the border patrol has said, every time we hear somebody in the government in Washington say anything about legalizing anything, or anybody that is here illegally, it is like a shiny object that draws even greater numbers illegally through our borders.

And what is our border patrol ordered to do? Don't turn them back and prevent them from entering the United States. Oh, no. Let them step foot on American soil, then in-process them, and we will ship them around different places. Although, I saw an article last week where there were some aliens illegally here who were just dropped off at a bus stop.

I have an article from Julia Edwards Ainsley, January 3, from Reuters: ''Trump Team Seeks Agency Records on Border Barriers Surveillance.'' It is fantastic. I mean, here they are trying to gear up, yet they want to know information. They don't want to be gaslighted. They want to know what is the truth so that they can start making hard preparations for taking office on January 20.

An article, December 30, from Paul Bedard from the Washington Examiner says that the Department of Homeland Security says 94 percent of deportations are people illegally here, terror threats, or gang bangers. The CBP—border patrol—reports assaults on border agents have skyrocketed 231 percent in 2017.

So not only has this President's rules of engagement gotten about four times more Americans killed, our military members killed in Afghanistan, in the same amount of time as Commander in Chief George W. Bush had, in addition to the rules of engagement getting our people killed four times faster than under Commander in Chief Bush, but also the assaults on our own agents have gone up 231 percent just in this year—in 1 year. We are getting our border patrol harmed.

Another article by Chris Tomlinson in Breitbart: ''600 'Underage' Migrants Turn Out to Be Adults.'' I mean, I have seen that in the middle of the night down on the border. People coming in, switching off Xeroxed indications they were going to use for their identification: This is who I am. For whatever reason, they would look at their thing and switch out as to who was going to be who. They weren't able to vet those people, but they were still ordered to in-process them anyway.

This article from Michael Patrick Leahy, December 7, reported that Somalia refugees were arriving in the United States at the highest rate ever in the first two months of fiscal year 2017, which would be October and November. So just astounding when America was making very clear we need to protect American citizens. It is not just the people in this room, as we did yesterday, who take that oath, but the President takes that oath. You have got cabinet members that take the oath, yet they are not doing their jobs. People are getting killed. 85,000 refugees under Obama, but less than 10 to the District of Columbia. So, apparently, let's put those refugees in your backyard. We certainly don't want them in Washington, D.C.'s backyard, apparently, according to this administration.

Then it is pretty amazing, but just 10 States resettled more than half of recent refugees to the United States. Naturally, way more than anywhere else was California and Texas. The Daily Caller reported that the ''State Department claims no one used sham visas from fake embassy.'' Yet, we have seen hundreds and hundreds of people that—the report showed—had been

given citizenship by mistake when they were supposed to have been deported. It doesn't seem like a very innocent mistake when it is that egregious.

Back in December, The Washington Times reported that the ''Obama administration fails to check immigrants against FBI databases, approves citizenship'' anyway.

The Afghan refugee program has not been totally successful. A report here, Afghan refugee in December was arrested for rape and murder of a top EU official's daughter. So, apparently, that was not working out so well. But that was in the country of Germany where you have a like-minded leader in Angela Merkel, who wants to defeat terrorism, as our President does, with love and compassion. Well, love is a stronger emotion than hate. Love can overcome evil.

But when people are religiously dedicated to wiping another group of people off the planet for what they deem to be their holy god, those are people that have to be defeated. They are at war with you. You defeat them militarily. That puts radical Islam back in a box until some other well-meaning fool like former President Carter—a fine man, just a foolish President—not demeaning his character, but he was just very foolish—in citing the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of peace, as he was so welcoming in the Ayatollah Khomeini taking over Iran. That released radical Islam out of the box, gave them control of a major country, major country military, and thousands and thousands and thousands of people continue to die because of that mistake.

We know going back to the early days of the United States when so much of the Federal Treasury was used to pay ransom to get our sailors back who were being captured by radical Islamists in North Africa, and Jefferson couldn't understand why they kept attacking American boats.

□ 1800

He asked the Islamist whom he was negotiating with why they kept attacking American ships. We are not a threat to you. We don't even have a Navy.

Reportedly, the response was, in essence: Look, if we die, in attacking someone like you, we go straight to paradise.

Jefferson was amazed. He couldn't believe there was a world religion—or even people's interpretation of a world religion—that advocated that you could go to paradise for killing innocent people. Of course, they maintained they are not innocent because they don't believe exactly like the radical Islamists believe.

President Obama basically did the same thing with Libya. Qadhafi was not a good man; but, since 2003, the reports were clear, as others in North Africa and the Middle East reported, that he was about the best friend that the United States had in helping to fight terrorism in that area; yet this administration took him out. There were times on this floor that I and others were begging the administration not to take out Qadhafi, not to keep helping the rebels, not to keep bombing Qadhafi's troops until we knew how extensive al Qaeda was. We knew that at least a part of the people fighting were radical Islamists, but the administration went on and turned the country into chaos.

Thank God America is going to have a new administration before we completely go to chaos ourselves.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 5, 2017, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3. A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Promotion [FNS-2016-0028] (RIN: 0584-AE44) received January 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Small Entity Compliance Guide — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-93; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR 2016-0051, Sequence No.: 8] received January 3, 2017, 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.

5. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Privacy Training [FAC 2005-94; FAR Case 2010-013; Item I; Docket No.: 2010-0013; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM06) received January 3, 2017, 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.

6. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulations; Payment of Subcontractors [FAC 2005-94; FAR Case 2014-004; Item II; Docket No.: 2014-0004; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM98) received January 3, 2017, 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.

7. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of final rules — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-94; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2016-0051, Sequence No.: 8] received January 3, 2017, 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.

8. A letter from the President and CEO, National Safety Council, transmitting the Council's Audit Report, in accordance with their Federal Charter, 36 U.S.C. 152502; Public Law 105-225; (112 Stat. 1415); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 22. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R 26) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 11) objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–1). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 238. A bill to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. RATCLIFFE (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 239. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 240. A bill to encourage engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. FRANKS

of Arizona, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 241. A bill to provide for sanctions on countries that have refused or unreasonably delayed repatriation of an alien who is a national of that country, or that have an excessive repatriation failure rate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. WELCH (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 242. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. AMODEI:

H.R. 243. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in the State of Nevada except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COOK (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 244. A bill to encourage effective, voluntary private sector investments to recruit, employ, and retain men and women who have served in the United States military with annual presidential awards to private sector employers recognizing such efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COOK (for himself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 245. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the calculation of the amount of the monthly housing stipend payable under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on the location of the campus where classes are attended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BARR, Mr. KATKO, Mr. TURNER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REED, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HURD, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LONG, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BRAT, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. YODER):

H.R. 246. A bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. BRAT (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 247. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the permissible use of health savings accounts to include health insurance payments and to increase the dollar limitation for contributions to health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 248. A bill to limit the authority of personnel of the Department of Homeland Security to prohibit a citizen or permanent resident of the United States from boarding as a passenger on an aircraft or cruise ship based on inclusion of the individual in a watchlist, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 249. A bill to prohibit United States voluntary contributions to the regular budget of the United Nations or any United Nations agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIGGS (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOSAR, and Ms. MCSALLY):

H.R. 250. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to divide the ninth judicial circuit of the United States into 2 circuits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 251. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a competitive grant program to award grants to States and local governments for purposes of assisting entrepreneurs planning to start a small business concern; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 252. A bill to provide housing assistance for very low-income veterans; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 253. A bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to invest in funding prevention and family services to help keep children safe and supported at home, to ensure that children in foster care are placed in the least restrictive, most family-like, and appropriate settings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 254. A bill to reinstate Federal Pell Grant eligibility for individuals incarcerated in Federal and State penal institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 255. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to support entrepreneurial programs for women; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 256. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that a member of the armed forces and the spouse of that member shall have the same rights regarding the receipt of firearms at the location of any duty station of the member; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 257. A bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and to transfer to Jerusalem the United States Embassy located in Tel Aviv; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. JONES, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. LEE, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 258. A bill to prohibit the use of United States Government funds to provide assistance to Al Qaeda, Jabhat Fateh al-Sham, and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and to countries supporting those organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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 Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO:

H.R. 259. A bill to prevent the territories of the United States from losing current Medicaid funding; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO:

H.R. 260. A bill to enable the admission of the Territory of Puerto Rico into the Union as a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN OF PUERTO RICO:

H.R. 261. A bill to amend part B of the title XVIII of the Social Security Act to apply deemed enrollment to residents of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 262. A bill to establish the Buffalo Bayou National Heritage Area in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 263. A bill to render United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 null and void as a matter of United States law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 264. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for assessed or voluntary contributions to the United Nations until the submission of certain reports on such funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 265. A bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 266. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that COPS grant fundsmay be used to hire and train new, additional career law enforcement officers who are residents of the communities they serve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 267. A bill to redesignate the Martin Luther King, Junior, National Historic Site in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 268. A bill to amend the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 to permit the construction of certain noise barriers with funds from the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 269. A bill to eliminate the requirement that, to be eligible for foster care maintenance payments, a child would have been eligible for aid under the former program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children at the time of removal from the home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 270. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide support to environmental justice communities and environmental justice projects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 271. A bill to reauthorize the Assets for Independence Act, to provide for the approval of applications to operate new demonstration programs and to renew existing programs, to enhance program flexibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 272. A bill to amend title XX of the Social Security Act to provide grants to support job creation initiatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 273. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an income tax credit for the costs of certain infertility treatments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself, Mr. HURD, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 274. A bill to provide for reimbursement for the use of modern travel services by Federal employees traveling on official Government business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 275. A bill to prevent diversion of funds from the Crime Victims Fund; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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 Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 276. A bill a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure reliable air service in American Samoa; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. WALKER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BARR, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HILL, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 277. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and related reconciliation provisions, to promote patient-centered health care, to provide for the creation of a safe harbor for defendants in medical malpractice actions who demonstrate adherence to clinical practice guidelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Natural Resources, House Administration, Rules, Appropriations, and Veterans' Affairs, 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. ROSS:

H.R. 278. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to complete the required 700-mile southwest border fencing by December 31, 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 279. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide a period for the relocation of spouses and dependents of certain members of the Armed Forces undergoing a permanent change of station in order to ease and facilitate the relocation of military families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 280. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to ensure dislocated workers are provided consultation and advice for starting a small business as part the rapid response activities for dislocated workers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 281. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to simplify the petitioning procedure for H-2A workers, to expand the scope of the H-2A program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 282. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to authorize spouses of servicemembers to elect to use the same residences as the servicemembers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 283. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow without penalty any 529 plan distributions used for student loans payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 284. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish rules for payment for graduate medical education (GME) costs for hospitals that establish a new medical residency training program after hosting resident rotators for short durations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. TURNER (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama):

H.R. 285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the individual and employer health insurance mandates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 286. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt certain emergency medical devices from the excise tax on medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt student workers for purposes of determining a higher education institution's employer health care shared responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 288. A bill to ensure that small business providers of broadband Internet access service can devote resources to broadband deployment rather than compliance with cumbersome regulatory requirements; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 289. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permits for recreation services on lands managed by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. WALDEN (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 290. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 291. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend the basis for the denial of retirement credit, for service as a Member of Congress, to include conviction of any felony under Federal or State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 292. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to exempt Alaska Native and American Indian programs from sequestration; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 293. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.J. Res. 14. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 15. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.J. Res. 16. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the ''Stream Protection Rule''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself and Mr. SANFORD):

H.J. Res. 17. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of consecutive terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.J. Res. 18. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution requiring that each agency and department's funding is justified; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution expressing support for temporary protected status for Haitian nationals currently residing in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. WELCH (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KIND, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COOPER, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution clarifying any potential misunderstanding as to whether actions taken by President-elect Donald Trump constitute a violation of the Emoluments Clause, and calling on President-elect Trump to divest his interest in, and sever his relationship to, the Trump Organization; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Purspant 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. CONAWAY:

H.R. 238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, Congress has the authority to regulate foreign and interstate commerce.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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. POE of Texas:

H.R. 241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 242.

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. AMODEI:

H.R. 243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution grants Congress ''power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.'' Left undefined in the amendment, the ''incomes'' appropriate for taxation must be determined through legislation passed by Congress. Congress therefore has the power to exclude from income taxation such sources as it deems appropriate.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Due Process Clause (''[N]or shall any person . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . . .'')

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 . . . all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.'')

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: 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 published from time to time.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 1)

Commerce Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 3)

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to ''provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The 2nd Amendment of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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;), and 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 of Officer thereof).

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8 ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations''

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8 ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations''

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1: 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.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to ''lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises,'' and to provide for the ''general Welfare of the United States.'' Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 1

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 and 4, of Section 8, of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution grants Congress the authority to regulate interstate commerce.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section, 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, as the Supreme Court of the United States has held that the imposition of the burdensome mandate on hard-working American taxpayers is an action Congress may take under its power to tax, and that this bill seeks to repeal sections of title 26 U.S.C., the Internal Revenue Code.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—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. TURNER:

H.R. 286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution—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 18 of the United States Constitution—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. TURNER:

H.R. 287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution—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 of the United States Constitution—The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution—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. WALDEN:

H.R. 288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6 of the Constitution, which states that ''The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

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.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.J. Res. 14.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution is based is found in Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both chambers deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.J. Res. 15.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution empowers ''[t]he Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary'' to ''propose Amendments to this Constitution . . . which . . . shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof.''

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.J. Res. 16.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.J. Res. 17.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V: The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to year one thoustand eighthundred and eight shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no state, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.J. Res. 18.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to propose Constitutional amendments

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills—and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 26: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HILL, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. COOK, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BACON, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. BOST, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. BEUTLER, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. TROTT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BRAT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. BUCK, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. BARR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LONG, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BARTON, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. YODER, and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 29: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. TROTT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 33: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 38: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BARR, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 40: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 41: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 71: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 77: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 78: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 79: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 140: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 169: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN.

H.R. 174: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 175: Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BUDD, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 184: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.J. Res. 6: Mr. BIGGS and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H. Res. 11: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FASO, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TROTT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. VELA, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. COOK, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. OLSON, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. CALVERT.

H. Res. 14: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. GAETZ.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 21 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rules in H.R. 21 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MRS. BLACK

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 26, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2017, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 26 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rules in H.R. 26 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative CONAWAY, or a designee, to H.R. 238, the Commodity End-User Relief Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4, 2017 No. 2

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, our guide and strength, we need Your guidance. Show us the path to meaningful life. Reveal to us the steps of faith.

Today, use the Members of this body to do Your will. Quicken their hearts and purify their minds. Broaden their concerns and strengthen their commitments.

Lord, show them duties left undone. Remind them of promises unkept and reveal to them tasks unattended. Lead them, Father, through this season of challenge to a deeper experience with You. Then, send them from Your presence to be Your instruments of good in transforming our Nation and world.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority leader is recognized.

A CHANGE IN DIRECTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 2 years ago the American people sent a new majority to the Senate. They called for a change in direction. They called for the Senate to get to work. So we got committees functioning again, we gave Members of both parties a say again, and we put the Senate back to work again and back on the side of the American people.

Because we did, we were able to get important things done with a President of a different party. We put an end to the number of Washington artificial cliffs and punts. We helped make our infrastructure stronger. We helped make our communities healthier and our country safer. We gave our children more opportunities to succeed in school, and we helped ensure that those who suffer exploitation and abuse—whether veterans or the victims of human trafficking—can know more of the justice, hope, and care they deserve.

I am proud of what we were able to achieve in a time of divided government, just as I am excited about the possibilities that lie ahead.

We now stand on the horizon of a new era. We seated a new Congress yesterday. We will inaugurate a new President later this month. The challenges ahead are great, and the work to come will be hard, but just as we heard the voices of the American people in 2014, we heard their message this last election as well. Americans called for change from the last 8 years and for hope, at long last. Each of us, regardless of party, has a mandate to help and to play a role.

The first way to begin realizing that hope, in my view, is to remove the things that are hurting families right now. The President-elect will have an important role to play there, especially in addressing overbearing, ideologically driven regulations.

Congress will have its role too. In terms of what we can do here most immediately, ObamaCare is at the top of the list. It is the very first item we will consider this session. We will continue to devote significant time to it as well.

I know some of our Democratic friends would prefer we didn't act—that we just sit on our hands as premiums jump higher, as more Americans lose plans, and as others continue to struggle with insurance too costly to actually use. That is essentially the message the outgoing President came this morning to deliver. The incoming Vice President came this morning, too, and delivered an entirely different message.

But repeal is just the first step. We know it will take time to undo the damage of this partisan law. We want—and we will need—the contributions of all colleagues as we turn to the development of a lasting, durable reform.

The same is true of our economy. We know the economy over the last 8 years hasn't lived up to its potential—not for working people, not for small businesses, and certainly not for the next generation. We will have disagreements about the best way forward. That is entirely natural. But, if we look, we will continue to find areas of agreement too. There are important contributions for each of us to make. That is the lesson of the 114th Congress.

A more open Senate is a more empowering Senate, but it is also a more demanding Senate. It gives each of us more of a say in the development of legislation, just as it requires more of a responsibility in cooperating. In short, it gives the minority party a stake in governing and thus the obligations that come along with that.

I welcome our colleague from New York in his new role as Democratic leader. The role of leading a party is never easy. He has a tough job ahead of him. I respect him for that. While I know we will often disagree, I am also reminded of his words just before the election. ''We have a moral obligation,'' the Democratic leader said just before the election, ''even beyond the economy and politics, to avoid gridlock and get the country to work again.''

''We have to get things done,'' he said.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

If that is our guiding principle, then I know we can make this session a success. It is what will allow us to get the appropriations process moving, for example. We can set the pace now by working toward a smooth nomination process.

I ask our Democratic friends to remember the consideration we showed President-Elect Obama's nominees in 2009. We approved seven—seven—members of his Cabinet unanimously within hours of his inauguration. Seven nominees for President Obama's Cabinet were approved unanimously within hours of his inauguration.

Now, some nominations will be more contentious. I am sure that will be true, of course, of the Supreme Court. It has been clear throughout that the next President would name the next Supreme Court Justice. I maintained that position even when many thought a President of a different party would be taking the oath this month. Now the President who won the election will make the nomination, and the Senate that the American people just reelected will consider that nomination.

But not everything need become so contentious. We will have many opportunities to cooperate. I have mentioned several already. We will see many more in committee. Shortly, we hope to see an example of that in the Intelligence Committee, where Chairman BURR will lead Members of both parties in a serious, comprehensive, and responsible review of any Russian involvement in our elections. Leader SCHUMER will join the committee as an ex-officio member and will be able to review the reports of the intelligence community. The Armed Services Committee will review how best to tie our cyber capabilities to our warfighting doctrine.

It is just this type of issue—something both parties say is too important to become a partisan football—where we often see the hard work of legislating and oversight transcend party. We saw it last Congress when, for instance, Members of both parties came together—and held together—on highways, on efforts to cure incurable diseases, and on providing TPA authority to both the current President and the next one. I hope we will see similar cooperation on many issues to come.

The American people are watching us. They are hurting. They are calling for a change in direction. It is now our united responsibility to move forward with their needs and their priorities as our guide.

Let me again welcome every new Member of the Senate. I want again to congratulate the Democratic leader, and let me again acknowledge President-Elect Trump for an impressive victory. He heard the voices of Americans in every part of the country in ways others have not. He now carries a heavy burden.

We will work with him to help the American people feel confident again—confident in themselves and confident in their futures.

We look forward to the inauguration in just over 2 weeks. There is now much serious work to be done. I look forward to working with each of you to achieve it.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the motion to proceed to S. Con. Res. 3 occur following the remarks of Senator SCHUMER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2017—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. Con. Res. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 1, S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I apologize to my good friend the Republican leader. I couldn't be here for his remarks. I intended to be, but our President stayed longer and then I was meeting with the Vice President-elect. I apologize for that.

I also wish to recognize the distinguished majority leader and reiterate what I said yesterday: I sincerely hope, just as I heard he hopes, that we can find common ground in the Senate. While we at all times inevitably disagree on the right way forward for our country, I know he is a patriot who cares deeply about this institution. That matters a lot to me. I learned that through a meeting set up by my friend from Tennessee. We had a dinner, and I walked away convinced that Leader MCCONNELL cares a lot about making the institution function. That matters, and that can maybe help us through some of the rougher times. We know it has grand principles, grand practices, and a grand tradition in our national life, something we both want to preserve.

Yesterday, in my opening remarks as a Senate leader, I did remind our Republican majority and the President-elect that there would indeed be places where we can work together, and I named a few of them, but let me be perfectly clear, kicking millions of Americans off their health care and throwing the entire health care system into chaos is not one of them.

I am deeply troubled that the Republican majority and seemingly the President-elect are plotting, as one of their first campaigns in the new Congress, a full-scale assault on the American health care system, not just the Affordable Care Act but Medicare and Medicaid as well because they are inextricably bound. Those are the pillars that support the American health care system, but as its first order of legislative business, the Republican majority has decided to put forward a budget resolution to repeal health care reform. Although he promised not to cut Medicare in the campaign, the President-elect has nominated a man who spent his career strategizing health care's demise, and he chose him to be Secretary of HHS. I don't think that is something a vast majority of Americans or even Republicans believe in.

It is too clear that President-Elect Trump and the Republican Congress are intent on making America sick again. Republicans seem determined to create chaos, not affordable care, for the American people.

Today, I would like to focus on the budget resolution on the Affordable Care Act. I understand why the majority thinks they have to do it. Over the past 8 years, they promised every group—conservative group and audience in the country, they would repeal the law, ''root and branch.''

For a long time, it has been only a conservative fever dream. Republicans knew they could make extreme promises about replacing it with something better without ever having to consider the consequences or even come up with a reasonable plan to replace it because they knew the Democrats or President Obama would ultimately block their attempts to roll back the law.

Now things are different. The consequences of repealing the Affordable Care Act are real. I sincerely urge my colleagues to deeply consider the consequences. It is no longer just a game or a political line to say ''repeal'' because now you have to replace. So far, it has been 5 years of repeal, repeal, repeal; not one replace plan has garnered

a lot of support even on the Republican side of the aisle, let alone in America.

What will it mean for average Americans if you repeal the law without any viable replacement? Not just the 30 million who might lose coverage right away—that is a staggering number, many of them in very red and poor States and rural areas. What will happen to the overall marketplace if you rip away all the safeguards of the ACA and have put nothing in its place?

It doesn't matter if you repeal and delay, as some of my friends on the other side of the aisle call it, for 1 year or 2 years—however long. Folks will lose a lot of benefits, and the insurance marketplace could fall apart long before repeal goes into place. As insurers raise their prices because they have to with repeal, costs to the average American who has employer insurance will go up as well. My colleagues will own that, just as we owned everything that happened previous to this election.

Let me tell you, if Republicans pull the plug on health reform, on Medicaid, and privatize Medicare, it could mean absolute chaos, not affordable care. It would likely increase prescription drug costs, premiums, and out-of-pocket costs to American families—not, as I said, just for the families that got coverage on the exchanges but for all American families, even if you get insurance through your employer. I repeat that to America. Everyone who has employer-based insurance and is not part of the ACA should worry about this repeal with no replace because their costs will go up, sure as we are here together. It would put insurance companies back in charge. It would allow them to discriminate against individuals with preexisting conditions.

We all know of people. Parents—their kid has cancer. They would look for an insurance company. Oh, no, your son has cancer, your daughter has cancer, you can't get it. What are our colleagues going to do about that one? No answers yet. I doubt they have good ones. It would cause premiums to skyrocket. It would unravel the insurance market.

I would ask my colleagues before they jump into this repeal to talk to their local rural hospitals. In my State, rural hospitals are a mainstay of our rural economy. They are the largest employer in many of our towns and villages. Remember, New York has New York City, but we are the third largest rural State in the Nation, only behind Pennsylvania and North Carolina. In those areas, merely repealing the ACA and not doing anything else is going to hurt those hospitals dramatically. In fact, today, in 11 State capitals, rural hospitals—many of them in red States—protested a repeal of the ACA.

It could also exacerbate—I don't want to forget—the opioid epidemic by ripping away coverage from 1.6 million newly insured individuals struggling with substance abuse disorders. We worked so hard in the Cures Act to cover people. Far more would be undone by this act of repeal in terms of fighting opioid abuse.

For all my deficit-hawk friends, your proposal causes a trillion-dollar hole in the budget—at least a trillion. My colleague from Washington thinks it might be even higher, and I rarely doubt her. What are you going to do, deficit hawks, once you repeal and that hole in the budget becomes enormous?

This is not conjecture. My Republican colleagues would be wise to remember how the American health care system operated before health care reform. Health care costs were growing at a much faster rate than they are today, eating into workers' paychecks and dissuading them from taking risks and changing jobs lest they lose a good coverage plan. A debilitating illness could wipe out a lifetime of hard-earned savings because there was no cap on health care costs. Women were charged more than men for the same health coverage. It was outrageous. We will go back to those days with repeal.

Many couldn't get insurance if they had a preexisting condition. Some insurance companies would simply delete you from their rolls if you got sick. You want to go back to those ''good old days''?

Today, because of health care reform, those things are no longer true. Health care costs are rising much more slowly than before, and the uninsured rate is the lowest it has ever been. I don't think any American would want to go back to the health care world of yesteryear where insurance companies wrote the rules and costs spiraled up unchecked, but Republicans seem all too eager to dial back the clock and make America sick again.

Democrats are united in our opposition to cutting Medicare, to cutting Medicaid, and to repealing health care reform, and we will hold the Republican majority and the President-elect accountable for the consequences of repealing health care reform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 1 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Corker	Flake
Barrasso	Cornyn	Gardner
Blunt	Cotton	Graham
Boozman	Crapo	Grassley
Burr	Cruz	Hatch
Capito	Daines	Heller
Cassidy	Enzi	Hoeven
Cochran	Ernst	Inhofe
Collins	Fischer	Isakson
Johnson	Perdue	Sessions
Kennedy	Portman	Shelby
Lankford	Risch	Sullivan
Lee	Roberts	Thune
McCain	Rounds	Tillis
McConnell	Rubio	Toomey
Moran	Sasse	Wicker
Murkowski	Scott	Young

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Harris	Nelson
Bennet	Hassan	Paul
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Heitkamp	Reed
Brown	Hirono	Sanders
Cantwell	Kaine	Schatz
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Feinstein

The motion was agreed to.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

RECESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy lunches.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:21 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ROUNDS).

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the two sides during quorum calls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the duration of the Senate's consideration of S. Con.

Res. 3, the majority and Democratic managers of the concurrent resolution, while seated or standing at the managers' desks, be permitted to deliver floor remarks, retrieve, review, and edit documents, and send email and other data communications from text displayed on wireless personal digital assistant devices and tablet devices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. I further ask unanimous consent that the use of calculators be permitted on the floor during consideration of the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, today we have a new Congress. Soon we will have a new President. For the first time in years, hardworking Americans will have their voices heard as we take the first steps to repair the Nation's broken health care system—steps to remove Washington from the equation and to put control back where it belongs—with the patients, their families, and their doctors.

The President's health law has pushed insurance markets to the brink of collapse. Premiums for hardworking families are soaring, while patients' choices are dwindling. I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to face the facts that ObamaCare has failed to deliver on its core promises and is hurting far more than it is helping.

I know our colleagues on the other side of the aisle share our goal of a robust health care system for hardworking families, and I truly hope they will work with us to find common ground that delivers more choices and lowers costs. I welcome the input from all the Nation's lawmakers as we endeavor to listen to the American people in this pursuit. But first, it is important to remember how we got here so that the actions that we will be taking this year are considered in proper context.

After the 2008 election, Democrats controlled the Presidency and had a majority in the House and a supermajority in the Senate. This allowed Senate Democrats in 2009 to pass a health care plan without any Republican support, which is exactly what they did. House Democrats had initially approved a health care reform bill with several important differences. So congressional Democrats needed to address these concerns in a conference committee. But plans to iron out the differences between the House and Senate versions were derailed in early 2010, when Democrats lost their filibuster-proof majority with the Massachusetts special election that resulted in placing Senator Scott Brown in the seat formerly held by the late Senator Ted Kennedy. He had held that seat since 1962.

With the filibuster-proof majority lost, Democrats in the House approved the Senate-passed health care bill without any Republican votes and sent it to the President, while vowing to use the budget reconciliation process to address their colleagues' concerns with the Senate legislation.

Subsequent budget reconciliation legislation was passed by Democrats and signed into law by President Obama. Combined with the initial health care bill, ObamaCare was created.

Now, I share this brief history of ObamaCare only as a reminder that, while my colleagues will surely complain about using the reconciliation process to untangle the country from this unworkable, unpopular, and unaffordable law, they should remember they actually employed the exact same procedure to secure the passage of ObamaCare.

Recent headlines show the ObamaCare problem is only getting worse and discourages people from seeking so-called coverage. Last October, at Bloomberg's The Year Ahead Summit in New York, the CEO of Aetna discussed the issues surrounding their decision not to participate in ObamaCare exchanges, saying:

> As the rates rise, the healthier people pull out because the out-of-pocket costs aren't worth it. . . . Young people can do the math. Gas for the car, beer on Fridays and Saturdays, health insurance.

Now, if you are young and healthy, ObamaCare has made it an easy choice to opt out of health coverage. But if you are not so fortunate—for those who must have coverage—it quickly becomes a frightening reality. I have constituents in Wyoming who have written to me, with worry and concern about their surging health insurance premiums. I recently heard from a young woman who is experiencing the worst of this law. She said:

> Dear Senator Enzi,
>
> I am writing with concerns specifically in the way that our country is heading in respect to healthcare services.
>
> I am a 25 year old with no medical conditions, I rarely need a doctor visit, however as I looked into the health insurance for me and my 8 month old son, also without health problems, I have found insurance to be incredibly expensive. Based on the cost of our health care last year, which included a C-section and the birth of our son, our family would spend less on health care if we paid for medical expenses out of pocket and did not have health insurance. However, in order to obey the law this is not an option.
>
> I have researched and calculated the most cost effective health care option for our family. We are looking at paying almost $800 a month for our insurance, even with my husband receiving insurance through work. This is almost 1/3 of our family's monthly income. . . . Insurance is becoming a huge burden for our family.

Now, that is the reality for many of our constituents across the country. She is trying to do the right thing for her family's health, but the law is crippling them financially. Our answer must be to not ignore these problems. For many Americans caught up in ObamaCare's tangled and expensive web of regulations, the situation is grim and only getting worse by the day. It is time to act.

One of the most disturbing parts of this law is that Americans are now paying more in taxes to pay for the very health law that is driving up their insurance premiums. The law will saddle American households with $1 trillion—$1 trillion—in new taxes and penalties over the next 10 years, unless Congress acts. ObamaCare's crushing regulations mean smaller paychecks for families, while holding back small businesses from expanding and hiring new workers. For every American, ObamaCare has meant more government, more bureaucracy, and more rules and regulations, along with soaring health care costs—along with soaring health care costs.

It is time to lift the burdens and higher costs this law has placed on all Americans. The Senate is poised to pass a repeal resolution that will set the stage for true legislative relief from ObamaCare that Americans have long demanded, while ensuring a stable transition in which those with insurance will not lose access to health care coverage.

Let me repeat that. The Senate is poised to pass a repeal resolution that will set the stage for true legislative relief from ObamaCare that Americans have long demanded, while ensuring a stable transition in which those with insurance will not lose access to health care coverage. This will allow us to move step-by-step on a new set of reforms, listening carefully to the advice of the millions of Americans affected and to do our best to make sure that we proceed wisely and do no harm.

Fortunately, America now has a President committed to repealing ObamaCare and moving toward a system that offers more choices, lower costs, and more individual control for millions of hardworking Americans.

The American people have endured a lot under ObamaCare and its broken promises. As a Presidential candidate not so long ago, then-Senator Barack Obama, a Democrat from Illinois serving here, promised Americans they could keep their health plan if they liked it. Millions soon learned they couldn't, and others soon wouldn't. This is because ObamaCare has drastically reduced Americans' choice of health care plans through a Federal takeover of the insurance marketplace. In fact, the President's promise that ''if you like your plan, you can keep it'' has proven to be one of many unfulfilled and unattainable promises of ObamaCare.

In Wyoming, we have seen the real impact of ObamaCare on our health insurance market. Wyoming now only has one health insurer in the individual market, both on and off the ObamaCare exchange. Many States are experiencing a similar issue of having insurers leaving the exchanges entirely. So for Wyomingites, the Obama administration's talking points about ''choice'' were in the end just more empty promises.

Americans were also promised lower health care costs, but even the administration admits that ObamaCare is failing to address costs, with average premiums rising by 25 percent for silver-level plans on the Federal exchange. That is in 1 year. This means that families have to decide whether to purchase unaffordable insurance or to pay a fine. In most cases, they are literally paying more money for less control over their health care.

Health care costs in Wyoming continue to be among the highest in the Nation, with other States not far behind. ObamaCare's mandates and taxes on employer-sponsored health plans are not only leading to higher out-of-pocket expenses but also to fewer choices and fewer services for the 150 million Americans with employer-sponsored health benefits. Let me repeat that: The mandates and taxes on employer-sponsored health plans are not only leading to higher out-of-pocket expenses but to fewer choices and services for the 150 million Americans with employer-sponsored health benefits.

According to the nonpartisan Kaiser Family Foundation, individual employees who have job-based insurance have seen their out-of-pocket expenses climb by hundreds of dollars year after year. Employees working for small businesses now have deductibles of over $1,800 on average. Since ObamaCare became law, several large employers have stopped offering benefits to part-time employees altogether.

Over the past 50 years, our Nation has made great strides in improving the quality of life for all Americans, but these transformative changes are always forged in the spirit of bipartisan compromise and cooperation. These qualities are essential to the success and longevity of crucial programs such as Medicare and Medicaid.

This is a crucial time for health care in America. We do not have the luxury of ignoring the growing problems in the health insurance markets and the crushing premiums faced by families across our country. That is why we are doing this first. The failures of ObamaCare have metastasized since its passage.

We must act now to repeal ObamaCare and provide relief to the millions of Americans who have been harmed by this law. Relief will require a stable transition period, which ensures those with coverage today continue to have access to health care tomorrow. Unwinding this tangle of partisan gridlock to make meaningful changes will not be easy. Our goal is to create a health care system where Washington makes fewer decisions and families are empowered to control their own health care with more choices and lower costs.

This is where we find ourselves today. Congress and soon the new President will be in a position to begin the process of repealing ObamaCare. Passing this resolution is just the first step on a path to repair health care for millions of hard-working Americans whose experiences with ObamaCare have meant broken promises, higher costs, and fewer choices.

This is the budget resolution we are debating now. As far as the budget part of it, all this is, is a statement of where we are at the moment. This budget went into effect last October. It has been changed a few times in the meantime, and this is a reflection of the changes that have been made up to this point.

The difference is in title II, which is where the reconciliation can take place. You will notice that it is a very simple title. There is not much to it. It requires that the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1 billion for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026. The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1 billion for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026. There is no specificity in this as to how the reconciliation will take place. That is up to the Finance Committee and the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee on the Senate side and the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Committee on Ways and Means on the House side to come up with the reconciliation bill, which has to pass a lot of Senate rules in order to be done, but you will notice that there isn't any specificity in here on how to do that.

That comes later. That will be another budget debate we will have, but it sets the stage so that can be done. Hopefully, it will be done quickly and we will be able to find solutions for the hard-working Americans whose experiences with ObamaCare are broken promises, higher costs, fewer choices. I hope our Democratic colleagues will join us in this effort so that we can come up with solutions so that Americans can afford the insurance they want and need.

I remember when we started this debate, I think there were 30 million people uninsured. Today, I think there are 30 million people uninsured. It is a different 30 million, though: The 30 million who couldn't get insurance now have insurance, and 30 million people who had insurance now can't afford their insurance. It is time for us to take care of both 30 millions and not just one. We will have that opportunity if we pass this concurrent resolution to fix ObamaCare.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. MIKE ENZI, the Senator from Wyoming, is a friend of mine. He comes from a beautiful rural State—Wyoming. I come from a beautiful rural State—Vermont. That is probably the end of our commonality. We look at the world very differently, and I hope that in the course of this debate, the American people will see the very profound differences we have not only on health care, not only on tax policy, not only on the deficit, but on many other important issues.

What we are looking at right now is a budget process whose ultimate goal is to remove health insurance from tens of millions of Americans. Let's be clear. Today, the United States of America is the only major country on Earth that—I live 50 miles away from the Canadian border. Many of us have visited Europe. We are the only major country on Earth that does not guarantee health care to all people as a right. It is something I passionately believe in. I believe that health care for all is a human right. I had hoped we would work together to figure out what is a complicated issue as to how we can move forward to guarantee health care to all people in a cost-effective way, but that is not what we are debating today.

Let's be very clear. The Republican plan—their budget plan—lays the groundwork for ending the Affordable Care Act, which will remove tens of millions of Americans from the health insurance they get. There is nothing wrong with change. We can always improve.

I hope that during the course of this debate, my Republican friends who want to repeal the Affordable Care Act will come down and tell us what their plan is, how, in fact, they are going to provide quality, cost-effective health care to all Americans. Well, you know what. They all voted against the Affordable Care Act. Senator ENZI is right—we did not get one Republican to vote for it. They have had 8 years to think about how they are going to come up with a new plan, and I would hope but I do not expect one Republican to come to the floor and say: Oh yeah, we are going to throw 20, 30 million people out of their health insurance. This is our new plan. This is how we are going to provide health care to those people.

They have no ideas. Their theme is to repeal and then delay. Someday they are going to come up with a new plan. You don't destroy a house without having another house in which people can live. You don't throw 30 million people off of health care without having a plan to provide health care to those people.

Under the Republican proposal—something many Republicans have been talking about for years—they want to end Medicare as it presently exists, a program that is life-and-death for millions of seniors. They want to voucherize Medicare, give people a check, and then let them go to the private insurance market and get the best deal they can.

Imagine that you are an 85-year-old senior citizen who has been diagnosed with cancer and you get your check for whatever it may be. We don't know what it will be—$7,000, $8,000, $9,000.

You go to the insurance company and you say: I have $9,000. I am 85. I have been diagnosed with cancer. I want you to take care of me. Give me an insurance program that will take care of my medical needs, my hospital needs.

The insurance agent will laugh in your face because $9,000 or $8,000 will last you, at most, for 1 week.

That is their plan.

I have been all over the country, and right now the American people are outraged at the high cost of prescription drugs in this country—let's be clear—because of the power of the pharmaceutical industry and their lobbying and their campaign contributions—a power that exists, by the way, not only influencing Republicans but too many Democrats as well. We pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs. In fact, one out of six Americans who goes to a doctor to get a prescription for an illness cannot even afford to fill the prescription. Yet, under the Republican proposal, if you eliminate the Affordable Care Act, the doughnut hole fix, which now helps seniors pay for their prescription drugs, will be eliminated and prescription drugs for seniors could rise by as much as 50 percent.

By the way, at a time when we have more income and wealth inequality than any other major country on Earth, when the very rich are getting richer while the middle class shrinks, the Republican proposal not only throws 20 to 30 million people off of health insurance, not only raises the price of prescription drugs for seniors, not only moves forward to privatize Medicare, but, shock of all shocks, our Republican colleagues want to give massive tax breaks to the top 2 percent.

Among many other negative impacts that the repeal of the Affordable Care Act will have will be one that will impact heavily rural States, such as Wyoming, Vermont, and other rural States around this country; that is, as a result of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, rural hospitals could be forced to close their doors—not getting the funding they need—leaving millions of Americans with nowhere to turn for critical medical care.

I look forward to this debate. Nobody here thinks the Affordable Care Act is perfect. Nobody believes that at all. The goal is how we repair it, how we improve it, how we expand health care to more Americans, how we end what has been the case for decades in this country—that we pay, by far, the highest prices in the world per capita for health care. Maybe we should understand that we are the only major country in the world that allows private insurance companies to profit off of people's illness.

The proposal being brought forth by the Republicans is not only poorly thought out, it really is not popular. It is not what the American people want. Go to your hometowns and ask people—at a time when the top one-tenth of 1 percent owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent, when the top 1 percent is earning 52 percent of all new income, go out and ask your constituents whether we should give huge tax breaks to the top 2 percent, and they don't think that is a good idea.

According to a poll released this month by POLITICO and Morning Consult, 80 percent of the American people think the Federal Government should be spending more money on Medicare. Only 10 percent think we should be spending less. Seventy-one percent of the American people think we should be spending more on Medicaid.

So 84 percent of the American people think the Federal Government should be spending more on Social Security. In other words, the proposal we are seeing from the Republicans today is way, way out of touch from where the American people are.

There is another issue out there that I find extremely interesting. Senator ENZI mentioned—and, of course, he is right—that within a couple of weeks we are going to have a new President. Donald Trump will be inaugurated as President, and it is interesting that we listened to what Donald Trump said during the campaign. The Democrats heard what he had to say during the campaign, what he campaigned on, and more importantly, Republicans, listened and heard what their leader had to say about these issues. This is what Donald Trump said, and he didn't say it once in the middle of the night. He didn't say it in an interview. This was a central part of his campaign. This is what he asked millions of elderly people and working-class people to vote for him on. These are the principles that Donald Trump ran and won the Presidency on. On May 7, 2015, Donald Trump tweeted: ''I was the first and only potential GOP candidate to state there will be no cuts to social security, Medicare and Medicaid.'' On April 8, 2015, Mr. Trump said: ''Every Republican wants to do a big number on Social Security.'' That is not BERNIE SANDERS talking; that is Donald Trump talking.

> They want to do it on Medicare, they want to do it on Medicaid and we can't do it. It is not fair to the people that have been paying in for years.

That is not BERNIE SANDERS—Donald Trump, our soon-to-be President.

On March 29, 2016, Mr. Trump said:

> You know, Paul [Ryan]—

PAUL RYAN is the Republican Speaker of the House—

> wants to knock out Social Security, knock it down, way down. He wants to knock Medicare way down and frankly . . . you're going to lose the election if you're going to do that. I am not going to cut it, and I am not going to raise ages and I am not going to do all of the things they want to do, but they want to really cut it and they want to cut it very substantially, the Republicans, and I am going to do that.''

What Mr. Trump said was exactly right. Here are the ''they.'' This is the day. They want to cut Social Security. They want to cut Medicare. They want to cut Medicaid. Mr. Trump was right, and millions of people voted for him on the belief that he would keep his word.

Well, it seems to me that Mr. Trump right now has to do one of two things. No. 1, if all that he was talking about was campaign rhetoric, then what he is obliged to do now is to tell the American people: I was lying. Yes, I said that I would not support cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, but I was lying. It was a campaign ruse. I just said what came to my mind to get votes. I have no intention of keeping my word. If that is what he believes, if that is what the case was, let him come forward and say that. But if that is not what the case is, if he was sincere, then I would hope that tomorrow or maybe today he could send out a tweet and tell his Republican colleagues to stop wasting their time and all of our time and for Mr. Trump to tell the American people that he will veto any proposal that cuts Medicare, that cuts Medicaid, and that cuts Social Security. What we are talking about right now—let us be clear: no debate. That is exactly what this goal is. That is what this budget proposal is. It is to move toward the voucherization and privatization of Medicare, to make massive cuts in Medicaid and throw millions of people off health insurance.

So there is a lot of responsibility on Mr. Trump's shoulders, but I would hope that he could save us a whole lot of time by telling the American people that he was sincere in what he said during the campaign, that he was not lying. If that is the case, we can end this discussion, get into the serious business of how we create a quality health care system guaranteeing health care to all people in a cost-effective way.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, there has been a flurry of activity this week with the beginning of the new year and the beginning of a new Congress—the 115th Congress—and we have a lot of work to do.

This election that we just went through on November 8 was surprising in many ways, gratifying in many ways. Personally, I think the best thing about it is that it gives us an opportunity to start anew, to deal with the problems that the American people were, frankly, not all that happy with either of the political parties about in terms of the solutions that we were to offer. I would hope that it would also give us an opportunity to hit the reset button when it comes to working together to try to find political consensus to solve some of these big problems.

I mentioned yesterday our friend, the chairman of the Budget Committee, and his 80–20 rule, which I told him I have used time and again to make the point that just because you disagree on some things doesn't mean you can't get

anything done. To the contrary, people of widely divergent ideological, philosophical, and political beliefs can work together by simply trying to find common ground. That is possible. That, in fact, is the way our Constitution created our government to force us to do that, because what we decide here impacts a lot of people—well over 300 million people in the United States alone. But if there was one consistent complaint that I heard from my constituents back in Texas and that we heard in the national media and beyond, it is about the failure of the promise of ObamaCare. We made a solemn commitment to the American people that if they provided us with the majority we needed to do it and if they provided us a President who would sign it, we would repeal ObamaCare and we would replace it with affordable health care that would be of their choosing, as opposed to a top-down mandate, a one-size-fits-all, which is the failure of ObamaCare.

In a previous life, I was attorney general of my State, the State of Texas. We had a huge division of trial lawyers called the consumer protection division. What we did is we sued people who committed consumer fraud—people who promised one thing but delivered another. I can't think of a bigger case of consumer fraud than ObamaCare, which was sold under false pretenses: If you like what you have, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. If you are a family of four, your premiums will go down by an average of $2,500.

None of that has proven to be true.

The reason why ObamaCare is so unpopular is that people have seen their premiums skyrocket. People have seen their deductibles grow to the point where they are effectively self-insured, which is not having insurance at all. Many people have simply seen insurance companies pull out of the insurance market, leaving them with little or no choices in terms of where to buy their health care.

So many remember the PR campaign of the President and Democrats, with which they sold ObamaCare to the American people, and, as I said, promised better coverage, more choices, and lower prices.

That means now that ObamaCare has failed to deliver that. It is incumbent on us to try to repeal it, which we will do, and to replace it with more affordable coverage that people will choose and that fits their needs better. The bad news of ObamaCare picked up throughout last summer into the fall. As I mentioned, insurance companies were losing money and were unable to operate and deliver health care under the tight grip of ObamaCare. But the real losers weren't the insurance companies. It is the tens of thousands of Texans who were forced to find new insurance at higher prices—not insurance they would have chosen on their own, but which they were forced to accept because there was no alternative.

So instead of helping rural Texans—the Senator from Vermont talked about rural residents in his State—I would submit that for people living in rural areas across the country, the implementation of ObamaCare hurt most of our rural country by dwindling the number of choices to one health care option for the year. That sounds like the opposite of more choices and better coverage to me. But we can't forget that behind these numbers and headlines are real personal consequences for families across the country.

So today I want to provide just a snapshot of some of the thousands of letters that I received in my office about ObamaCare and the burdens that it is placing on the backs of the people I represent in Texas. One Texan wrote telling the story that I have heard time and again. She said her insurance plan was discontinued—so much for ''if you like what you have, you can keep it.'' But she did what she had to do, and she switched to a more expensive plan—one with a higher monthly payment and one with an $11,000 deductible. What good is health insurance if you have to spend $11,000 out of your own pocket before the insurance begins to kick in? It is nearly worthless.

Well, nothing about that says affordable health care. Unfortunately, this individual is like many folks across the country, full of questions and with nowhere to turn to find any relief for their families or their small business.

Another one of my constituents had a similar complaint. He wrote to me that he was searching for yet another health insurance plan for the third time in as many years after his was canceled. He went on to highlight this in this letter, which I received from a constituent on November 23, 2015. He said:

> I seem to remember the President saying something about liking your insurance and being able to keep it. For myself and my family, it has been just the opposite. We loved our insurance prior to the passage of the Act and since have been forced to purchase much more expensive insurance with much higher deductibles.

Well, this Texan is right, but unfortunately, his experience was not isolated. It was shared by millions of people across the country for whom ObamaCare was a false promise. It is not as if he had the freedom to choose. The choice was made for him, and this was the fundamental flaw of ObamaCare. In a country as big and diverse as ours, this notion of ''one-size-fits-all'' and that somehow the people who live and work inside the beltway are smarter than the rest of us and we can figure out what is good for them and a choice they would not themselves make is just simply implausible. It is not true. This constituent ended his letter by asking the Congress:

> Do anything. Do anything within your power to reverse this terrible health care trend. I need relief.

After this historic election, after the promises we made that have given us the opportunity to govern in the majority, with a President in the White House who will work with us, I believe we have a clear mandate to repeal this terrible law and make it a relic of the past. We will do that by adopting the budget resolution submitted by Chairman ENZI of the Budget Committee.

It is not just Republicans who have pointed out the defects of ObamaCare. Many of our Democratic colleagues have pointed out the law's failed promises as well—from an op-ed entitled ''How to fix the Affordable Health Care Act,'' which was written by a Democrat, to statements on the Senate floor, to legislation introduced to ''fix the glitch.'' Even in campaign ads, many of our Democratic colleagues have themselves been outspoken advocates for changing ObamaCare. The senior Senator from Missouri, pointing out the ''huge problem ObamaCare has been in her State'' came up with an entire list of necessary changes. I, for one, would be happy to start with her list and say let's try to use this as a core of issues that we can then try to build consensus around to begin to make that replacement and make it on a bipartisan basis.

We have seen that attempted fixes, unsupported by the Obama administration and vastly insufficient, continually have been met with frustration by Democrats and Republicans. I pointed out yesterday that when the Democrats voted through ObamaCare, they had 60 votes. They had 60 Senators. Today they have 48.

At one point, certainly back in 2009 and 2010 when ObamaCare passed, they had a majority in the House of Representatives. Well, they lost that. Now they have lost the White House itself. I just don't know how much longer, how much more needs to be said or done for them to get the message that this is not working because I believe they are paying a political price for it as people are searching for accountability for what they have to deal with day in and day out.

The senior Senator from Indiana said that he supported the Affordable Care Act to help working and middle-class families have access to health care, but he said that doesn't mean the law is perfect, and it doesn't mean we don't still have work to do.

I was delighted to hear the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS, say he agrees ObamaCare is not perfect. My request of him and others is to work with us to try to replace it with something better.

I recognize that neither side is going to be able to get everything they want. That is just not the way this place works. Indeed, the single failure of the Obama administration is to try to do things on a go-it-alone basis because we are going to see those Executive orders that he issued unilaterally rescinded on the first day President-Elect Trump takes office. All the massive regulations that have been issued, we are going to use the Congressional

Review Act to rein those in or to defund those through the appropriations process. In order for legislation and policy to be sustainable, it is going to have to be bipartisan. I realize our Democratic colleagues are disappointed with the outcome of the election on November 8. That is an understatement. At first they started out in denial: It just can't be true. The next stage was met with anger. Well, they are angry about it, and they are going to obstruct everything the new majority, working with the White House, tries to do, but I would hope they would move past that denial and past that anger and do what the Senate was always designed to do; that is, to work on a bipartisan basis, as our friend and colleague from Wyoming demonstrated to us working on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee with the liberal lion of the Senate, Teddy Kennedy. Let's try the 80–20 rule and see how it works. It will work.

The senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. MANCHIN—this is another Democrat—has said he would vote to repeal ObamaCare. He said that we should be working together to identify which parts of the law are broken and need to be fixed. We may learn that some parts of the law can't be repaired and we should eliminate those parts entirely. This is our Democratic friend and colleague from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN.

I think that is a great place to start because no matter which side of the aisle you sit on, you can see the Affordable Care Act is not working, certainly not as sold to the American people. The choice of the Democrats now is whether to obstruct or whether they will actually work with us, as we should have done in the first place, to come up with something more sustainable that would address costs and preserve individual choice.

It is interesting. It is not just our Democratic colleagues, many of whom voted for ObamaCare. I remember during the Presidential campaign that former President Bill Clinton made some pretty interesting comments. This would have been on October 5, 2016. I am reading from a CNN story here. It said:

> Speaking at a Democratic rally in Flint, Michigan, the former president ripped the Affordable Care Act (ACA) for flooding the health care insurance market and causing premiums to rise for middle-class Americans who do not qualify for subsidies.

Here is what he said:

> So you've got this crazy system where all of a sudden 25 million more people have health care and then the people who are out there busting it, sometimes 60 hours a week, wind up with their premiums doubled and their coverage cut in half. It's the craziest thing in the world.

Former President Bill Clinton said that in Flint, MI, on October 5, 2016.

He is right, but that is what you get when you try to do things in a partisan, unilateral fashion. We should learn from our collective mistakes and try to do better, and shame on us if we can't do better than ObamaCare with all of its failed promises.

By repealing ObamaCare, Congress is doing more than just delivering on a promise we made to the people who put us here. We are providing a way forward for millions of people across the country who have been hurt by ObamaCare and are looking for relief.

I look forward to making ObamaCare and the many burdens it has placed on American families a thing of the past in this new year. That is what we will do when next week we pass this budget resolution, and then reconciliation instructions will be sent to the relevant Senate and House committees. They will then report back with the replacement, and, yes, it may take some time to transition into that replacement because it has taken us 6 years to get into the mess, into the ditch we find ourselves in now. When your truck or car is in the ditch, the first thing you need to do is get out of the ditch. Sometimes that takes a lot of hard work.

We are going to have to work as hard as we can. I would hope our colleagues will work with us, not just to resist for resistance's sake, not just to take a partisan position because they feel they are required to do so because of their allegiance to the policies of the Democratic Party. Let's do what this institution has always been best known for; that is, to try to find some way to work together on a step-by-step basis to produce reform which will make health care more affordable and still preserve those choices for individuals and their families, not a one-size-fits-all government mandate which simply has failed in this tragic experiment known as ObamaCare. We can and we will do better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first let me comment on what my friend, the distinguished Senator from Texas, said. If my car goes into a ditch, the first thing I don't do is dismantle the car. That doesn't help me get anywhere in terms of transportation.

First of all, let me speak on process before talking about the substance of what we are really talking about and how it affects people. We have a bill in front of us that creates a process for the majority to be able to unravel and repeal essentially our whole health care system. You pull a thread and it goes through not only employer-based care, patient protections, people who have insurance, Medicare, Medicaid. All of it begins to unravel. Interestingly, also in this bill, in the text it adds $1 trillion to the deficit—$1 trillion to the deficit in the bill that our colleagues just voted to proceed to pass.

We need to be very clear on this: If colleagues want to work with us to fix problems and improve health care, we can start this afternoon. It is almost 3:30. By 4 o'clock we could put together a group of people. I am sure our distinguished Democratic leader on the Budget Committee would be happy to sit down and work together on ways to make health care reform better and make health care more affordable and make it more available to people. If that is what we want to do, count us in, but that is not what we are talking about here. We are talking about this crazy idea that no one in their real life would do.

It is like deciding you want a new house, so you tear down the old house. That is the easy part. Then your family is homeless. Then you say: Well, gosh, you know, maybe I better have a plan to get a new house for my family and figure out a way to pay for it, to be able to afford it.

Nobody would do that. Nobody would start by saying: We are going to rip apart the entire health care system and create chaos. We are going to undermine Medicare. We are going to undermine Medicaid. We are going to take away patient protections for everybody who has insurance through their employer, and then we will figure out later what we are going to do to replace it, if anything.

I know there is a division on the Republican side. Certainly Members in the House don't think it should even be replaced at all.

It is interesting. We are talking about one-sixth of the economy that would be destabilized. There is no question that if you do a repeal and insurance companies don't know what is coming—I have talked to hospitals, and they don't know what is coming—behavior will begin to change. Rates will begin to go up. Different decisions will be made because, as businesses, they will not know how to plan. Their investors will not know how to plan.

There is no question about it. When you repeal without creating certainty in the marketplace, you begin a process that results in chaos.

We have an interesting example, one that I have been involved with for a lot of years, where we wanted to change just one piece of the health care system, the reimbursement system for doctors.

I was in the House when they passed Medicare changes. We put in place a new policy. We were going to write a new policy to reimburse physicians for quality instead of quantity. It makes sense. It took 18 years to get agreement. We got agreement last year. It doesn't even take effect for 4 years.

Everybody here knows about this thing called the doc fix. It is an inside term—or SGR, which is even more insider. The truth is, we were trying to change just one thing and could not get agreement to do it for 18 years.

Anyone who thinks that there is going to be a repeal without an ACA extender going on has not looked at past processes.

What is most important, though, is what this means to real people. This

really is about a plan of ripping apart the health care system. There is nothing in its place immediately so we don't even know what will be coming. This is going to make America sick again.

We are talking about a process and a plan that for real people is not a political game. It is not smoke and mirrors. It shouldn't be about politics. It is about the moms and dads who go to bed at night and say: Please, God, don't let the kids get sick. Now, many of them—close to 30 million counting everybody with new coverage—don't have to say that. They can say a different kind of prayer because they can go see the doctor.

We know that when you unravel that system with nothing responsible in its place, we are talking about making America sick again. We want affordable care, not chaos. This plan goes from affordable care to chaos. We talk about some parts of what we passed in health reform, but there are a lot of things we don't emphasize that I think are important to recognize in this debate.

First of all, what we pass in terms of changes in quality care affects every single American with health insurance. A lot of people in my State are fortunate to have employer-based insurance. We have a lot of folks at the collective bargaining table fighting every year to make sure they keep their insurance—150 million people across the country. All of them have benefited from the patient protections we put into health reform. When we take those away, then immediately the insurance companies will be back in charge. If you get sick, you can get dropped. Right now they can't do that. If you are sick or if your child is sick, right now you can't be blocked from buying insurance. We call it a preexisting condition. But before health reform, insurance companies were doing that every single day—a child with juvenile diabetes, someone with cancer or Alzheimer's disease.

I think about a very good friend of mine who just found out her grandson has leukemia. He is 2 years old. He is going through treatment. We pray he is going to be able to get through it successfully. He is going to have a preexisting condition for the rest of his life. With this repeal, there is no guarantee he will ever be able to get insurance. On top of that, if he has to have treatments that go on for some period of time, caps will be reinstituted on the amount of care you can get, the amount of treatment per year, dollar amount, or amount of visits you can get, and there is no guarantee that this little boy will be able to get the treatment he needs so that he can live a healthy, successful life going forward.

In talking with pediatric cancer doctors a couple of weeks ago, it was so amazing and gratifying to me to hear them talk about children whose lives have been extended, whose quality of life has been extended because of the fact that they are able to fully treat these children and insurance companies can't put caps on how much they will pay or how many treatments. Now there is a whole other range of protections for everybody.

One of the fights I was proud to lead in the Finance Committee when we passed the ACA was to make sure that the basic insurance package every company has to provide has to include maternity care. That seems like a no-brainer. People were shocked that it didn't. Before we passed health reform, 70 percent of the insurance companies—the policies you buy in the private market didn't include maternity care. In fact, women were viewed as having a preexisting condition because they might get pregnant, might have a baby. That is not true anymore. Women are not rated differently than men, and maternity care is now available regardless of the kind of insurance you have. That is a pretty good deal. Right now I have a son and a daughter with growing families, and I can tell you that is a very big deal in my family.

There is a whole range of things. We all know about young people who are able to stay on their parents' insurance. They get out of college and they are wrestling with a huge debt, and one thing they don't have to worry about is whether they can stay on their parents' insurance until they can find a job. That goes away with repeal.

Something I care deeply about is mental health. We have all worked together on opioids and substance abuse treatment. Because of what we did in health care reform, insurance companies cannot discriminate if it is mental health or substance abuse treatment rather than physical health treatment. Prior to what we passed, they could charge much higher copays, higher premiums, but not anymore. So the whole body—above the neck as well as below the neck—is now being treated equally with our insurance reforms.

So there are a multitude of things—preventive health services with no copays, such as cancer screenings for mammograms and contraception. I was talking to someone who said she thought it was so wonderful that her drugstore wasn't charging her for copays anymore on her contraception. I said: Well, you know, that is actually the law. That was changed when we passed the Affordable Care Act.

So there is a whole range of things that relate to reviewing premium increases, if you get removed from your insurance, you have the right to appeal. There is a whole range of things. So that is under the first step. Everybody will feel it when insurance companies are back in charge and, through this vote and the subsequent actions, patient protections are repealed for everybody.

Secondly, this includes cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. Through what we did in health reform, we closed the gap on the high costs of prescription drugs. We called it the doughnut hole. That was in the process of being closed. If you have a lot of medicines and a lot of costs, you suddenly get to a point where there is a gap in coverage and you have to pay the full cost. That goes away and the doughnut hole comes back.

What we did added 12 years of solvency to the Medicare trust fund to keep it strong longer. That goes away. Wellness visits for seniors—every year they are able to go in and get a physical without a copay—that goes away. So Medicare is undermined. Then, unfortunately, when you add the incoming nominee as Secretary of Health and Human Services and couple that with the proposals that the Speaker has had and others that I am sure we are going to see to turn Medicare into a voucher—you go into the private market. Here is your voucher. Good luck. That is part of what the new regime is promoting, which only adds to this.

Eighty percent of Medicaid spending is seniors in nursing homes. And we know that the majority of those who—many who have gotten care, in addition to the exchanges, have been folks who have been working hard every single day in minimum wage jobs and who couldn't afford or find insurance before. Now they are covered if their State or their Governor is willing to do that. We have a whole bunch of folks who are working hard every day at minimum wage who at least know they have access to health care and a doctor.

Interestingly, this helps our hospitals, whether they are rural hospitals upstate or up north in Michigan or whether they are our great urban hospitals, safety net hospitals in Detroit and other areas, instead of people walking into the emergency room and not having insurance and having the cost put on everybody who does. Because of the Medicaid expansion, when a working person comes in with Medicaid, they are able to pay for their own care rather than having everybody else with insurance carry the brunt of that, which is the way it was prior to that.

So there are Medicare and Medicaid cuts.

Next, we do know that altogether, counting Medicaid and people using the new exchanges, we have about 30 million people who will be kicked off of their insurance, folks who, like anybody else, want to have health insurance for their families. Can we design that in a better way? I would love to work with you on that. I am not going to kick them off first. I don't want to say: We are going to rip your insurance away. We are going to rip the small businesses I have talked to—rip their insurance away. And then, by the way, don't worry, further down the road we will figure out something else. We don't know what it is, we don't know what it will cost, but trust me.

I wouldn't be trusting that would happen if I were counting on that for my insurance.

The fourth item is that there is no question that costs will go up by destabilizing the marketplace. We know the cost of prescription drugs will go up as a result of taking away the extra help for prescription drugs. There is no question that costs are going to go up for everybody else who has insurance.

When we look at this, I don't know how anybody looking at this outside of a political lens or a rigid ideological lens could say this makes any sense. It doesn't make any sense.

We have a President-elect who is coming in who said that he would not do anything to hurt Medicare or Medicaid or Social Security. Yet the first thing on the floor definitely undermines Medicare and Medicaid. We have a President-elect who said he wants to bring down the cost of prescription drugs. Yet, by undermining Medicare prescription drug coverage, those prices are going to go up. People who have the most medical needs and need the most medicine are going to see their costs go up.

What would be better would be if the new incoming HHS Secretary would be given the ability to negotiate through Medicare for prescription drugs—something we have all fought for, for a long time. Let's allow drug reimportation. Our leader on the budget—and I have as well—put seniors on buses in the past to demonstrate the differences in cost across the bridge between Windsor and Detroit, the cost of the same drug, with the very same safety provisions. That would bring down costs. Taking away Medicare coverage and increasing the gap in coverage is exactly the wrong thing to be doing if, in fact, the incoming President really means it when he says he wants to bring down drug prices.

So there are a number of things we care deeply about on health care. As someone who has worked on this for years—in fact, it was health care and health policy that first got me into politics, leading an effort to save a nursing home in my community. I care deeply about this. I am one of the folks way down deep in the weeds on this. But we don't improve a health system by ripping it out by its roots, by undermining the whole system without figuring out what comes next. That only happens if you really don't care what comes next because if you care, that is not a responsible position.

So, Mr. President, and my colleagues, I feel very strongly that with everything we know that has been made available to strengthen quality, to give people back their own decisionmaking instead of the insurance companies on basics like providing care for themselves and their families, the strengthening of Medicare and Medicaid, the coverage that has been made available, we know there is a way to work together to make things better, and this is not it.

Mr. SANDERS. Will my colleague from Michigan yield for a moment?

Ms. STABENOW. I will be happy to.

Mr. SANDERS. I want to thank my colleague for her very thoughtful presentation talking about the implications of simply repealing ObamaCare.

The assumption that many of my colleagues seem to start from is that before ObamaCare, the health care system was great in America, that everybody had health care in a cost-effective way and then ObamaCare came along and all of these problems arose.

What the Senator from Michigan just told us—and I want people to remember it—8 years ago, if you were diagnosed with cancer and you walked into an insurance company, they would say: Why would we give you insurance? We will lose money on you. Your cancer may recur.

You are a woman and you want maternity coverage? What do you think is going on? Why should we do that?

You are a family with a kid who is 21 years of age and you want his insurance on your policy? Well, you couldn't have it.

I think what the Senator from Michigan pointed out is not that anyone thinks the Affordable Care Act is perfect—nobody thinks it doesn't need improvement. But to simply throw out all of the benefits, for 30 million people to be thrown off of health insurance—during the budget hearings a couple of years ago that Senator ENZI chaired, I asked a question of my colleagues when this idea came up, and I would ask it again to my good friend from Wyoming. What are the studies you have seen in terms of the number of people who will die when they lose their health insurance? How many thousands of people will die because they no longer have health insurance and they cannot go to the doctor and the hospital? The studies I have seen suggest that many thousands of people will die. That is common sense. If you throw 30 million people off of health insurance, they are going to die. How do you go forward providing a death penalty to thousands of people without having any solution to it?

Further, I would add to the excellent points made by the Senator from Michigan. Senator ENZI and the Senator from Texas before him talked about the impact of health care problems in rural areas. I come from a rural area. Michigan has large parts of the State that are rural. The Senators from rural areas on the Republican side have said they want to make sure their constituents in rural areas can see a doctor. That is certainly a modest proposal. Of course they should be able to see a doctor.

If that is the case, my Republican friends should understand what the Federation of American Hospitals and the American Hospital Association said about repealing the Affordable Care Act. These are major hospital organizations. According to a very recent report, what they said is that a repeal of the Affordable Care Act will mean a reduction in payments to rural hospitals of over $165 billion over a 10-year period. According to the hospital associations, rural hospitals will suffer an additional loss of $289 billion from their inflation updates.

This is a report from the Federation of American Hospitals and the American Hospital Association, major health care institutions in America. They said in their report: ''This reversal of health coverage would represent an unprecedented public health crisis.'' Furthermore, they said: ''The magnitude of reductions would threaten hospitals' ability to serve patients.''

So when we talk about the needs of rural Americans, I would hope my colleagues listen to what the Federation of American Hospitals and the American Hospital Association have to say.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the more things change, the more they seem to stay the same. Republicans won the White House. Republicans control the Senate. Republicans control the House. What will the first order of business be for the new Republican majority? To pass a budget that never balances, to pass a budget that will add $9.7 trillion of new debt over 10 years.

Is that really what we campaigned on? Is that really what the Republican Party represents?

Our first order of business will be a budget that never balances, a budget that adds $9.7 trillion to the debt, and they tell us: Oh, but it is not a budget. If you listen, they will say: No, no, it is a vehicle to repeal ObamaCare.

Yet I have the title in front of me, which says a concurrent resolution for the budget of 2017. We have special rules when you pass the budget so that we may be able to repeal ObamaCare, and I am all for that. But why should we vote on a budget that doesn't represent our conservative view? Why would we vote on a budget that adds $9.7 trillion to the debt? Because we are in a hurry, we can't be bothered.

It is just numbers. I was told again and again: Swallow it. Take it. They are just numbers. Don't worry. It is not really a budget.

Yet the legislation says it is a budget. The numbers say we will add $9.7 trillion of new debt.

So I say: If they are only numbers, and if the numbers that are in the budget don't matter, why don't we put numbers in that balance? Why don't we put a vision into the budget that represents what Republicans say they are for?

Republicans say they are the conservative party. Are we? When George W. Bush was President for 8 years, the national debt went from $5 trillion to $10 trillion. The debt doubled under a Republican President and a partially Republican Congress. Yet the words were these: Well, he had Democrats to deal with, and if we could ever take all three branches of government, things would be different.

The Republicans took over the House in 2010. They still didn't control the

Senate, but they said: If we only controlled the Senate, we could be the conservative party again.

We have had an election. The conservative party—the supposedly conservative party—won. Republicans control the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, and the first item of business for the Republicans will be to pass a budget that never balances—a budget that will add $9.7 trillion to the debt over 10 years.

This sign could have been put up for Obama's first budget. Every Republican railed and said: $10 trillion—President Obama will add $10 trillion. And he did. President Obama doubled the debt again.

It went from $5 trillion to $10 trillion. The national debt went from $5 trillion to $10 trillion under George W. Bush, and then it doubled again under President Obama. It went from $10 trillion to nearly $20 trillion.

What are we looking at here? More debt, under a solidly unified Republican Congress and a Republican President.

So you might scratch your head and say: The more things change, the more they stay the same. Is it all smoke and mirrors? Is there really a difference? Are Republicans different than Democrats? It is a pretty important question. We are in such a hurry to repeal ObamaCare. I am all for it. As a physician, nobody thinks that ObamaCare has been worse for the country. Nobody more than me thinks it is a terrible piece of legislation that has not helped the country and that has inflated our costs and not helped. Yet do we have to add nearly $10 trillion of debt in order to get at it?

So as this moves forward, I will offer a replacement. I will offer my own budget. I will offer to strike and remove $10 trillion worth of debt, and I will offer my own budget that balances within 5 years. How do we do it? We give the authority to make the cuts where they should be, where they are most wasteful in government, and we offer this budget by simply freezing expenditures. You don't have to cut any expenditures.

Every department of government could get what they got the last year. If you think some departments of government need more money, cut other departments of government. Frankly, there are some departments of government you could eliminate and you would never know they were gone. If the Department of Commerce were gone, a few corporate executives would not be able to fly around on government jets. They could fly around on their own jets. You would never know the whole entire Department of Commerce was gone.

You can cut spending. You can actually get to the balance by not cutting anything. So here is what happens. If you freeze the on-budget spending, within a little over 5 years, your budget balances.

I remember a time when there were the moderates who were for freezing spending, and the real conservatives were for cutting spending. Now nobody is for cutting spending. When I bring it up that you can absolutely not balance the budget if you are not willing to look at entitlements, do you know what I am told by many well-meaning Republicans? Don't write it down. Don't put it on paper because people will be upset with you if you explain that to save Social Security, to save Medicare, you will have to reform these entitlement programs. They say: Let's just talk about waste. Let's just talk about fraud and abuse. And I do, and we should eliminate all of those. But guess what. If you eliminate all of the budgetary spending that we vote on—this is called the discretionary spending. This would be the military and all the rest of the nonmilitary. It is about $1 trillion, not including the entitlements—Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. If you did just the military and the nonmilitary and you reduced it 10 percent a year for 10 years, and you virtually wiped out all discretionary spending, you still don't balance the budget.

So, really, you are not a conservative if you are not willing to look at all government spending. The budget cannot be balanced and the budget will never balance unless we look at entitlements.

What does that mean? It means that because of demographics—we had big families 60 years ago, with three, four, five kids to a family. Now we have less than three kids to a family—probably two kids to a family. So you had all the baby boomers born right after World War II, and they are all retiring—60 million of them. So we have this huge population boom, and you don't have as many workers. So the demographics aren't working. Then you add to that the fact that we are living longer.

When Social Security was started, the average life expectancy was 65. It worked pretty well as a pension plan because you died. But now it is great. We are living on average to 80, and if you make 80, you may well make 90. What a great thing—longevity. But it is not working. Social Security is not working. We spend more on recipients than we bring in with the tax.

Medicare is even worse. The average taxpayer pays about $100,000 over their lifetime in Medicare taxes. The average recipient takes out $350,000. How big a problem is this? Medicare is $35 trillion to $40 trillion in the whole.

It is inexcusable that we are not talking about how we fix Medicare. It is inexcusable that we are not talking about how to fix Social Security. If we don't fix them, there is going to be a cliff. Within about a decade, the cliff is so severe that everyone on Social Security will suffer a 20-percent decline in their monthly check. It will happen all at once if we don't fix it. Can we fix it? Yes, we have to talk about it.

What we are doing today is kicking the can down the road. We have our focus on ObamaCare, but we are taking our focus off the debt. As bad a problem as ObamaCare is, as much as it has disturbed, destroyed, and distorted the health care market, it may be that the debt is a bigger problem.

So it is not a popular stand that I take today. I will be the only Republican to vote against the Republican budget. That won't be popular. But I ran for office. I left my medical practice. I am away from my family. I spend long hours traveling here because I am concerned about the debt.

We borrow $1 million a minute. The debt threatens the very foundation of our country. Yet here we are. The Republican Party controls the House, the Senate, and the White House, and in their haste, they put forward a budget that is going to add this much debt.

This is what the debt has been doing. Here is 1980. We see the growth. It has become exponential—the growth of the debt. This should worry every American. But here is the Republican 10-year budget that we are getting ready to pass. It is virtually a vertical line of accumulation of debt.

People will say: But how could we ever cut any spending? I will give you a couple of examples of where your government spends money and you tell me whether or not we ought to look long and hard at cutting spending.

There was a grant given for autism. I have a great deal of sympathy. I know children with autism. The grant was for $700,000. But do you know what they spent it on? They spent it on studying Neil Armstrong's statement. Remember Neil Armstrong? He landed on the moon and said: ''That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.''

Well, your government, in its infinite wisdom, wanted to know: Did he say ''one small step for man'' or ''one small step for a man''? Your government spent $700,000 studying the preposition ''a.'' Did he say ''a man'' or just ''man''—$700,000. Money that should have been spent on autism was spent on something frivolous.

Is anybody going to fix it? No. Every year, all of the spending bills are globbed together in a 2,000-page bill—and not one iota of reform.

My colleagues may remember that Senator Proxmire from the 1970s used to have something called the ''Golden Fleece Award.'' Every one of those things he complained about in the 1970s happens now but tenfold greater. Nobody fixes it. We don't pass individual spending bills. We do continuing resolutions, which means we continue doing the same thing we have done over and over.

Again, $700,000 was spent studying Neil Armstrong's statement. Do you know what their conclusion was? We are not sure. They spent $700,000, and they are still not sure whether he said ''a man'' or ''one small step for man.''

We spent $500,000 studying whether or not, when you take a selfie, if you are smiling in the selfie, does it ultimately make you feel better? We spent $500,000.

So what do we do? Do we give these people less money? Teach them a lesson. Give them less money, and maybe they will conserve the money. Maybe they will eliminate waste if they have less money next year than they had this year—or what I am proposing: Freeze the spending. Is anybody proposing that? No. We say: They spend a half a million dollars on selfies; give them more next year.

So the Republican budget will increase spending every year. It increases spending at about 5 percent a year. So spending goes up. They say it is the baseline, and they say we are cutting off the baseline. No, no. The baseline goes up 5 percent a year. Spending will increase over the 10-year period. The red line is spending.

Part of that is what the Republicans are proposing. They are going to stay on the spending curve. If we stay on the spending curve, they will continue to spend $700,000 studying Neil Armstrong's statement; they will continue to spend half a million dollars on selfies. They spent another half a million dollars on a climate change game. They spent $45 million to build a natural gas station in Afghanistan—$45 million. The first problem: Nobody in Afghanistan has a car that runs on natural gas. They discovered this after they built the gas station. The gas station was 86 times cost overrun. The original estimate was about half a million for the gas station, but lo and behold, somehow it cost $45 million. If your government had 86 times cost overrun, would you give them more money or give them less money? I, frankly, think we should give them less money. If you give them more money, they will not waste it less; they will waste it the same or worse. They should be given less money.

Mazar-e Sharif is a city in northern Afghanistan. We built an $85 million embassy there and we signed a 10-year lease, and then somebody looked at the place and decided that since there were tall buildings surrounding the entire entity, people would shoot down into the courtyard and kill our diplomats, and they said the building could never been occupied—after they spent 85 billion, after they signed a 10-year lease. How will they get better? Were the people who made this decision fired? No. They are Federal employees, and you never fire Federal employees. Will they make wiser decisions because we give them less money? No. We give them more money.

You would be excused for being upset if you went and voted and said ''I am going to vote for the conservative party'' and if you went and voted and said ''I am going to vote for the party that is going to balance a budget.'' Wouldn't you be upset? Wouldn't you wonder which party that is?

This is the spending curve. We are going to add $9.7 trillion in 10 years, and yet they say: Oh, no, this isn't really a budget.

I have it in front of me, though. It is a budget.

There is no reason why Republicans couldn't have put forward a budget that doesn't add all the red ink. We are at $20 trillion. We are going to nearly $30 trillion under the Republican plan. My goodness, what happened? Where is the conservative party? Where are the conservatives in Congress who would say enough is enough? Now they say: We just have to be done with this. Don't distract the little people. Don't let the people of the country know we are voting on a budget. We are going to call this the vehicle to repeal ObamaCare.

Well, that is not what it is. It is a budget. And we have special rules for dealing with the budget that allow us to repeal ObamaCare, which I am all for, but this is a budget.

They say: Well, how can we get the votes? No Democrats will vote for this budget. This is a Republican blueprint. Not one Democrat will vote for this.

So this is what Republicans are for. This is the blueprint the Republican Party says they are for—$10 trillion worth of new debt. I am not for it. That is not why I ran for office. That is not why I am here. That is not why I spend time away from my family and my medical practice. It is because debt is consuming our country. There is a time and a place to debate ObamaCare, and I am more than willing to debate that. But this is a budget. This is the vote on a budget.

They say: Oh, it is just a gimmick. It is just a game. The numbers don't mean anything.

Well, if the numbers don't mean anything, put honest numbers in there or put conservative numbers in there.

I, for one, will put forward a conservative opposition to the Republican majority's budget. I will put forward a budget that freezes spending and balances the budget over a 5-year period. Would there be some agencies that would get less money? Yes. But it would force us to go through the government and pick and choose what is good spending and what is not good spending.

We have a waste report that we put out. If you look on our Facebook, you can find our waste report. I listed four or five of the most egregious. There are hundreds and hundreds, if not thousands, of things we shouldn't be spending money on. I will give another example.

We have sold $100 billion worth of weapons to Saudi Arabia. They were wanting to spend money giving F–16s to Pakistan. You pay for them and give them to them.

There is riddled throughout the Pentagon—look, the Pentagon has never been audited. You are surprised? The government has never been audited. The Federal Reserve is not audited. The Pentagon is not audited. So what is the Pentagon's response to being audited? The Pentagon says to us: We are too big to be audited. I don't know about you, but that makes me kind of angry, that a part of our government, even a necessary part such as national defense, says they are too big to be audited. Meanwhile, we have $85 million embassies built that will never be occupied and $45 million gas stations that will never be used.

I think it is time that we say enough is enough. Don't give government more money; give them less. The government hasn't been a good steward of your money.

The question is often asked: Are the people who spend your money, are the people involved in government inherently stupid? It is kind of a debatable question. I think they are mostly well-intentioned. I don't think they are inherently stupid, but I do think they don't get the right incentives. Because there is no profit motive in government, because there is no rationale or motive to conserve, money is spent, and because of sheer laziness and ineptitude, we continue to pass the spending bills—glommed together, thousands of pages—without reform. But I won't be party to that. I won't vote for spending bills that are not individualized and don't have reforms in them. I won't vote for budgets that never balance.

So while I may be a lonely voice on this issue, I will continue to bring up to the American people that it is important not to add more debt, that it is important to slow down the accumulation of debt. It is important that we have a $20 trillion debt, and I am not willing to add $10 trillion more in debt. So at the appropriate time, I will introduce an amendment that will strike and replace this budget, and in its place I will put forward a conservative vision for the country—a vision of a balanced budget that balances within 5 years.

Every Republican in the Congress who has been here for a while has voted for a balanced budget amendment. Interestingly, the balanced budget amendment—which would be an amendment to the Constitution—has within it a provision that the budget would balance within 5 years. And even when Republicans get around to saying ''Oh, we will have some gimmicks to balance in 10,'' 10 is not what the amendment says. Why bother voting on an amendment if you are not serious about it?

Republicans are completely in charge. It is a Republican document; it is a document I disagree with; and at the appropriate time, I will be introducing a replacement that will balance within 5 years and provide a conservative view for the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are discussing the budget resolution. It is an interesting time to do it in the month of January. The fiscal year, the spending year for the Federal Government, starts October 1. We have tried, with no success, to pass appropriations bills—12 of them—that would meet our obligation to fund the government for the entire fiscal year. We have had two continuing resolutions, which are temporary spending bills. And here we are again discussing a budget resolution.

But it isn't really about the budget; it is about the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare, a law passed 6 years ago with the goal of providing affordable health insurance for all Americans. I voted for that bill. It is one of the most important bills I have ever voted for, and I believe that, despite shortcomings, it has achieved its goal and it has done it in a way that most American families would agree they want to see.

As an example, there are very few families in America who have every member of the family in perfect health. In the old days before the Affordable Care Act, if you happened to have a child who had survived a cancer situation, a spouse with diabetes, and you went to buy a health insurance plan, you ran into a problem: They might not want to insure your family because of that sick child, or they might want to charge you a premium way beyond your reach. So in the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, we said: As a health insurance company, you cannot sell insurance in America and discriminate against a family or person because of a preexisting medical condition.

From where I am sitting, my own personal life experience and my family's experience, thank goodness. We had members of our family with serious health issues. I worried about that all the time as a husband, as a father. The Affordable Care Act gave me and every other American the peace of mind that health insurance companies could not discriminate against us or our families because of a preexisting condition.

There was also a practice where they would put a limit on how much coverage you could buy in a health insurance policy. So many people thought: I have a great health insurance policy. It has a $100,000 limit. I will never hit that number; I am a healthy person.

The next accident, the next diagnosis, and that healthy person realized that $100,000 in today's world of health care costs—you could eat that up in a minute and find yourself without any health insurance protection. What happens to you next?

You have been diagnosed with cancer. You start treatment. It is expensive, and now your health insurance policy has reached a point where it doesn't cover you anymore. What then are your options? Stop treatment? Exhaust your savings? Throw yourself on the mercy of a hospital and hope for the best?

We ended that. ObamaCare ended that. They can no longer put limits on health insurance policies because none of us—not one of us—knows what kind of health crisis we might face or a member of our family might face tomorrow. That is important.

A third provision in ObamaCare, which most families would understand in a hurry, involved what to do with that recent college graduate. What are you going to do with that daughter whose graduation you are so proud to go to, and then it dawns on you that she doesn't have a full-time job yet and that the part-time job she has doesn't have any health insurance benefits.

I remember calling my daughter and saying to her: Jennifer, I know you had health insurance as a student. What is your situation now?

Oh, Dad, I am fine. I am healthy. I am not worried.

I am worried, as a father, something is going to happen to her and she will have no health insurance protection.

Do you know what ObamaCare did? ObamaCare said I could keep my daughter under my family health insurance plan until she reached the age of 26. Peace of mind for 2, 3, 4 years while that son or daughter is starting their professional life, their life of employment. For thousands in Illinois and across the United States, more peace of mind that health insurance would be there when your family really needed it.

We also said we don't think you ought to discriminate against people when you sell them health insurance just because, for example, you happen to be a woman. Yes, the health insurance premiums charged women were higher than those for men. Obviously, women can have challenges in their lives but so can men. We said you cannot discriminate in health insurance premiums under ObamaCare between men and women.

These are issues that affect the real world—what people pay for insurance, whether they qualify for insurance, and whether insurance will be there when you need it. That is what ObamaCare did. By providing helping hands to those in lower and middle-income categories, we extended the reach of health insurance under ObamaCare to cover 20 to 30 million more Americans. We currently have the highest percentage of Americans with health insurance in modern history.

We had another provision too. We said: If you happen to be a senior citizen under Medicare and you are paying for your prescription drugs, that can be expensive. Under the old law, before ObamaCare, there was a gap in coverage, and you might spend $1,000 or $2,000 out of your savings account each year just to keep taking your meds. We closed the gap so you had continuous coverage under Medicare as a senior.

Important? You bet it is. A lot of seniors ended up retired with limited savings wanting their meds, their prescriptions, so they can remain strong and independent as long as possible. Don't we want them to? So that, in a brief summary, will contain four or five of the main features of ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act—more Americans with the guarantee of health insurance than any time in our modern history in the United States of America.

How important is it to have health insurance? If you have ever been the father of a very sick child and you didn't have health insurance, it is a life experience you will never forget. I know. I lived through it. At that time, I thought, if I don't do anything else the rest of my life, I am always going to have health insurance, and I did. At some sacrifice to my wife and me, but we made sure we had it because for a period of time when we had no health insurance, I felt like I had let my family down and I let my daughter down. I didn't want it to happen again.

I don't want anybody else to go through that. We want to make sure health insurance is there for all of us. Some people say: If you are rich, you ought to get it, but if you are not, tough luck.

I don't think so. I think health care and health insurance protection should be a basic right in this great Nation of America. That was the driving force behind passing ObamaCare, passing the Affordable Care Act.

The Republicans hate the Affordable Care Act like the devil hates holy water. They despise it. Over 60 times they voted to repeal it in the House of Representatives. It drives them into a rage. The first thing they say is, we can't wait to get a new President and abolish ObamaCare.

The obvious responsible question to them is, And what happens the day after you abolish it? What happens when it comes to preexisting conditions? Can health insurance companies now discriminate against people again? What happens when it comes to the limits on how much a health insurance policy would pay? Are we going to be back in the day when there isn't enough coverage when you and your family desperately need it?

What happens to those kids fresh out of college if they can't get on your family health insurance plan? Do you want to go out and buy an individual policy for that son or daughter who is still looking for a job? How about the seniors? Are they going to go back to the time where they have to pay out of pocket for their prescription drugs? I think those are all legitimate questions.

Do you know what the answer is on the Republican side? Trust us. We are just going to abolish this program, and someday, not today and not soon, but someday we will come up with another

idea. That is irresponsible. They are replacing affordable care with chaos. They are saying to the American people: Just trust us. Someday we will dream up a plan.

You know what, they have had 6 years to come up with a plan, 6 years to come up with an alternative to the Affordable Care Act. They have been unable to do it. It is difficult. It is painful.

You know what is ironic, the Affordable Care Act is based on a Republican model of health insurance. This was what the Republicans suggested years ago: Use private insurance companies and make it available to all Americans. That is what we did. A lot of Democrats felt there was a better way: Why don't we make a Medicare Program for every American a nonprofit program that is there. We couldn't get it done. We didn't have the votes, and the Republicans wouldn't help us.

In the first step of the new year and the new Congress, the new Republican majority in the Senate wants to abolish the Affordable Care Act, wants to put millions of American families at the mercy of health insurance companies. They must think we are suffering from amnesia and that we had forgotten what that was all about—sitting on the phone for hour after weary hour with some adjuster who may or may not be in the United States, trying to argue about whether your son or daughter can go into a hospital, whether your wife can receive the medical treatment the doctor asked about.

That is what it used to be, and that is what it is going to go back to when we abolish the Affordable Care Act and don't replace it with something that is as good or better. That is the first step in the Republican program, make 20 to 30 million Americans more vulnerable when it comes to their health care. That is not the end of it.

I live in a State that has the great city of Chicago, Cook County regional area, but downstate we are very rural, smalltown America. I know from my congressional experience and from my life as a Senator representing that State, there are downstate hospitals that cannot survive without the Affordable Care Act. In my State, some of those hospitals are the major employers in their communities and the only go-to place for someone seriously ill or injured.

The Republicans have yet to suggest any suggestion at all about how we are going to keep those hospitals open. They are starting to contact me now—the hospitals as well as the clinics and the health care providers, and they are asking: The Republicans really aren't going to do this, are they? They are not just going to abolish it and leave us with this chaos to follow.

Sad to say, that is exactly what they are going to do. Senator RAND PAUL of Kentucky wrote an article today and said he thought it was wrong on the Republican side to do that. He said: The responsible thing to do is to have an alternative before you abolish the Affordable Care Act. Good for him. That is common sense. You would expect it from a party that says it is conservative in its approach to government. What they are suggesting with the Affordable Care Act is not conservative. It is destructive. It is catastrophic. It is irresponsible.

I hope my colleagues will join me. We need two or three Republicans to join us to stop this effort. Let us sit down together, Democrats and Republicans, take the Affordable Care Act and make it more effective, fix the problems that are part of it—and there are some—make sure we keep our promise to the American people that they will have access to affordable, quality health care. Keep these providers covered by the Affordable Care Act in business in rural areas and inner cities and all across our Nation. That is our responsibility.

DACA

Mr. President, 16 days from now, and just a few steps from where the Senate Chamber is located, we will have an inauguration for the 45th President of the United States, Donald Trump. On that day, the fate of more than 750,000 young people in America will be hanging in the balance. They will be waiting to learn whether they have a place in our Nation's future or whether they will be asked to leave.

It was 7 years ago that I sent a letter to President Obama, joined by Senator Richard Lugar, Republican of Indiana. On a bipartisan basis, we asked the President to stop the deportation of young immigrants who grew up in this country. We called them DREAMers, after a bill I introduced 15 years ago. Who are they? Babies, infants, toddlers, children, young adults under the age of 16 brought to America by their parents from another country, and the proper papers were not filed. You can't hold the kids responsible. They didn't decide to come here. You certainly can't hold them responsible for not filing the papers. They were just children at the time.

If anybody should be held responsible, it is the parents. What do we do about the kids who have lived their entire lives in the United States believing this was their country, this was their future, and now come to realize in their teenage years they are undocumented and their future is uncertain?

We asked President Obama: Will you give these young people a temporary opportunity to stay, study, and work in America, and he agreed to do it. It was called DACA. It was the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program. What it said was, if you are in that category of a child brought to America and you are undocumented, step forward, pay a filing fee of almost $500 so the government can process your application, submit yourself to a criminal background check, including fingerprints, and let us look into your background and see if there is anything you have done that would disqualify you from staying in the United States. If you are approved, for 2 years—renewable—you will not be deported and you can work in America.

Many young people in that circumstance were reluctant to step forward. Their parents had warned them their entire lives that if they turned themselves into the government, they might be deported—in fact, their family might be deported with them. They said: The President has offered us this opportunity for a chance. We are going to follow this, do the right thing, make an application. Almost 800,000 of them qualified. They are DACA recipients. Others will be eligible in the months ahead. DACA has been a success.

What will President Donald Trump do with these DACA students? He made some pretty harsh statements during the course of the campaign about immigration. I think he is reflecting on these kids as a special category. This is what President-Elect Donald Trump said to TIME magazine just a few weeks ago about the DREAMers, the DACA recipients.

> We're going to work something out that's going to make people happy and proud. They got brought here at a very young age, they've worked here, they've gone to school here. Some were good students. Some have wonderful jobs. And they're in never-never land because they don't know what's going to happen.

I appreciate Mr. Trump's comments, soon-to-be President Trump. I hope he will keep the DACA Program in place, but I am working with my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to give him an option. Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, Republican of South Carolina, and I have joined the lead sponsors on what we call the BRIDGE Act. The BRIDGE Act is an opportunity to protect these young people legally, on a temporary basis, while Congress rolls up its sleeves and takes up immigration.

I am happy to have Senator LISA MURKOWSKI and JEFF FLAKE, Republicans from Alaska and Arizona as cosponsors, as well as DIANNE FEINSTEIN of California and CHUCK SCHUMER of New York, and I hope others will follow. I believe DACA was a lawful exercise of the President's authority. Some disagree with that completely. Regardless of whether you agree or disagree, I hope you will agree that these young people should be allowed to have a bridge so they aren't deported, they don't lose their right to work or go to school.

Incidentally, when these young DACA DREAMers go to school, they have to pay for it right out of their pockets. They don't qualify for any Federal assistance. It is a special effort and a special sacrifice. I have come to the floor over 100 times over the last 10 or so years to tell the stories of these young people. I think the stories tell a lot more than any speech I could give.

This young man is Luis Gonzalez. Forgive me for being especially drawn to this photo because Luis is standing in front of my college, Georgetown

University, wearing one of the Georgetown Hoyas shirts.

Let me tell you about Luis. He was 8 years old when his family came to the United States from Mexico. He had a difficult childhood in Santa Ana, California. His parents separated. He lived with his mom in a car garage for several years. After his mom remarried, he lived with his stepfather, who turned out to be abusive.

Luis overcame these circumstances and still was a good student. He graduated high school in the top 1 percent of his class with a 4.69 GPA, and he passed all nine advanced placement exams that he took. He was involved in extracurricular and volunteer activities. He was the secretary of the school's National Honor Society, and he helped organize an anti-bullying campaign in his local elementary school. He was a mentor to incoming freshmen in high school. Saturdays, instead of taking it easy, he volunteered to tutor other kids in math, and he volunteered to help a teacher at a local school. He was active in his church every Sunday, translated the pastor's sermon into English for those who didn't speak Spanish, and cleaned up the church before and after the Sunday services.

Because of his outstanding record in high school, Luis was admitted to Georgetown University. He is currently a sophomore majoring in American studies and minoring in government. He continues to use his spare time to help others. He is a member of the provost committee for diversity and co-chair of Hoya Saxa Weekend, a program that brings students from underrepresented communities to Georgetown. Luis is a leader of Strive for College, a program that mentors students in the inner city high schools. His dream is to be a high school teacher, which isn't surprising given the strong commitment he has already shown.

He wrote me a letter and here's what he said:

> DACA gave me the confidence and security I've not had before. I lived in fear and the shadows. Thanks to DACA, however, I've been able to do things I otherwise wouldn't be able to do like travel through an airport or working on campus. I've always felt that I am an American, but having DACA allowed me to stop living in constant fear and uncertainty. Now these fears have come back again.

If DACA is eliminated, Luis could be forced back into the shadows. The day after DACA, Luis will not be able to travel or work on a campus. He will lose his legal status, and he could be deported back to Mexico, a country that he hasn't lived in since he was 8 years old.

Luis and other DREAMers have a lot to give America. Would we be stronger if we deport him, take this man's talent, drive, and energy and banish him from this country? I don't think so.

I hope President-Elect Trump will understand this and will continue the DACA program. If he decides to end DACA, then I hope this administration will work with Congress to pass the BRIDGE Act into law for Luis and for thousands of others who will be counting on it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 28 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. FLAKE. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in the quorum call be equally divided between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I want to comment and say a few words about the use of the budget reconciliation process to facilitate an effort to repeal but not replace ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. I serve on the Budget Committee. During the course of multiple hearings during the previous year before the election, we heard the most adamant stories from the Republican side about how dire our Nation's debt situation was, how dire our Nation's deficit was.

Member after Member on the Republican side spoke as if the end of the Republic was at hand. Yet the policies from the Bush administration that kept driving that debt and that deficit they protect. They blamed President Obama for the effect of Bush policies that took place during President Obama's years, while defending those Bush policies the President had actually tried to correct. In many respects, their concern about the budget was a little ironic since they were defending the Bush policies that created this debt and deficit explosion in the first place.

Nevertheless, be that as it may, you had this phalanx of Republican Senators in a state of very high animation about our debt and deficit. You would think that in this Congress, with control both over the House and the Senate and a Republican President-elect looming, they might use the budget reconciliation process to do something about the debt and the deficit.

After all, there was a lot of big talk last year, and here is the budget reconciliation process. As we see, it is not being used to do anything about the debt or the deficit, it is being used to open an effort to repeal but not replace ObamaCare. The problem is, when you do that, you do some pretty bad things to the debt and to the deficit.

Before the Affordable Care Act was passed, Medicare officials projected out-year costs for Medicare in 10-year increments. After the experience of the Affordable Care Act, they went back and they redid those projections, and they dropped the cost of Medicare dramatically. Those outyear costs, dramatically reduced, are an important, valuable step toward lower debt, balanced budgets, and less of a national annual deficit. Repealing ObamaCare will undo that.

It was pretty clear from Budget Committee hearings that that reduction in anticipated Medicare costs in the outyears was related to the work that had been done in the Affordable Care Act as well as the changes in experience that we are seeing. That is one budget buster which shows that this reconciliation effort is going in the wrong direction.

In Rhode Island, I watched this issue pretty closely because I want Rhode Island to be a leader in delivery system reform. I want ours to be one of the most efficient health care systems in the country, and I worked very hard over many years to put the pieces in place in Rhode Island to help make that come to pass. So I talked to people like Dr. Kurose, who runs one of our largest primary care practices, and Dr. Puerini, who runs another very big Rhode Island primary care practice, and I saw that both of them had taken advantage of the Affordable Care Act to make themselves accountable care organizations, ACOs, and they have used the powers and they have used the shared savings under those programs to change the way they deliver medicine.

What they show is that their price, their annual cost of service per patient, is actually going down. They are delivering care more efficiently and they are getting to illnesses earlier. They are not just churning the wheel of bill and pay, bill and pay, bill and pay; they are actually managing their patients' health. We hit this wonderful sweet spot where the patients are healthier and the patients are way happier because they are getting better service, and the cost per patient in these practices is coming down. So if that is taken away, we reverse that effect. It is plausible to think that those costs will start going back up again. Why would we want to undo a method that has helped local practices improve the quality of care, reduce the cost of care, and serve their patients better? The ACO program is part of the Affordable Care Act.

The last thing is that around here, we try to defend Medicare. One of the achievements of the Affordable Care Act was that it extended the solvency of Medicare out to 2028. Undo this bill and there will be a direct hit on Medicare's solvency. It will come roaring back.

So when you put what the Republican Senators on the Budget Committee said with such vehemence and alarm about the debt and the deficit beside the use to which they have put the reconciliation process, which was designed to be used to reduce the debt and the deficit, and you look at how

that actually plays out through the health care system—increasing the costs of what would have been accountable care organizations, if that gets undone; lifting back up, presumably, Medicare costs that in the outyears were reduced because of this; and shrinking the time that Medicare stands as solvent—if that is not a hit on Medicare, I don't know what is.

The other piece in this process that bears on this is that during the period that these very dramatic concerns were being expressed about the debt and the deficit, the same party that was enunciating those concerns and those threats to our American society and solvency was defending all of the loopholes in the Tax Code. We tried and tried to find a loophole that our Republican friends would be willing to let go of, and we couldn't find a single one that I recall. Even President Trump is interested in trying to get rid of the carried interest loophole that lets hedge fund billionaires pay lower tax rates than brick masons, but could we get an agreement on that from our colleagues on the other side? No. They wouldn't touch it.

I hope that as we go forward, we can find a way to bring tax expenditures lined up with appropriated expenditures under the purview of the committee, but so far we have been unable to do that despite repeated bipartisan testimony that a tax expenditure is just the same as an appropriated expenditure in so far as it affects the debt and deficit—no difference—bipartisan testimony, clear on the record. The difference is that behind a great many of these lucrative tax loopholes that are baked into the Tax Code and that survive year after year after year is a special interest, whether it is somebody trying to depreciate their private jet more rapidly than an airline can depreciate passenger aircraft, whether it is the carried interest loophole that puts, very likely, the billionaire getting out of his limousine in front of his New York apartment in a lower tax rate than the guy holding the umbrella over his head, the doorman. How fair is that? But that is the status of the tax law. We couldn't get anybody to budge on that because there are obviously big, powerful interests who don't want to see that messed with. Why should they pay taxes like ordinary people when they are superwealthy immortals who can buy themselves politicians?

So the ironies of the party that declaimed about debt and deficit with such vehemence through so many hearings, with so much blame on President Obama even though it was carried-forward Bush policies they were defending that were driving so much of that debt—to have that group of people now come and use the reconciliation process designed and intended to address the debt and the deficit instead to try to repeal but not replace ObamaCare in ways that I think can be very fairly projected to raise Medicare costs, reduce Medicare solvency, and undo a good deal of the savings that doctors and taxpayers have shared from hard-working practices like Rhode Island Primary Care Physicians and Coastal Medical in Rhode Island, which have relied on the ACO provisions in the Affordable Care Act to get those savings—who wants to undo that? It makes no sense, and least of all, it makes no budget sense because those outyear health care costs will come home into the budget in those outyears. Of course, you compound that with the fact that no tax loophole is to be touched. No tax loophole can be addressed. No revenue can be generated by closing the carried interest loophole, closing the private jet deduction, closing the tax benefits for the fossil fuel industry, which is making more money than any industry has in history and hardly needs the support of the poor American taxpayer. But, no, big special interests have big tax breaks, and they are going to be protected at all costs. That is really where we are on this.

I understand we used reconciliation to move ObamaCare. It did, in fact, do the job of reducing the deficit, I believe. Undoing it goes in the opposite direction, but there is a certain ''what is good for the goose is good for the gander'' equivalence about using that to undo what we did. I get that. But if we are really serious about addressing the debt and deficit, then we shouldn't be using the reconciliation process, which is designed to reduce them both, to attack a health care program whose effect has been to reduce them both. That is where we stand right now.

In the months ahead, I hope we will be able to look at tax expenditures. More money goes out the back door through tax expenditures than gets spent on some of our biggest programs. It is a huge loophole, and within it are a lot of very unattractive special interest special provisions—loopholes in the worst sense of the word. We don't want to touch them because nobody dares to touch the special interests behind them.

So that is where we are. I hope we can make real progress on the debt and the deficit and stop defending private jet reductions, stop defending fossil fuel subsidies, stop defending billionaire special tax breaks, and actually put the debt and the deficit that America faces first rather than having conversations about that being window dressing until you get a Republican President, and then you go completely haywire, using the reconciliation process to undo health care laws, raise Medicare costs, and undo the ACO program that has been so effective in my State.

I see the junior Senator from Utah is presiding, and I know that Utah and Intermountain have some of the best health care work being done on delivery system reform, and it would surprise me very much if the leaders at Intermountain in Utah were excited about undoing the delivery system reform provisions of Obamacare. The Innovation Center at the Centers for Medicare Services, the ACO provisions, the provisions for shared savings between doctors and the taxpayer when savings accrue because of better practices, the changes toward better models of payment—I would be very surprised if they were very enthusiastic about undoing those.

But, as I said, this is where we are, and I will close my remarks, and I hope that soon, once this exercise is over, we can actually get serious about closing loopholes and reducing the debt and reducing the deficit—the nominal cause of the Republicans on the Budget Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be evenly divided between the two sides during the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. With that understanding, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time divided equally between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MINEWORKER PENSIONS AND HEALTH CARE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, 70 years ago United Mine Workers president John L. Lewis, a lifelong Republican, sat down with the Democratic Secretary of the Interior, Julius Krug. They struck a deal to end a national strike. They promised health and pension benefits for miners in exchange for a lifetime of hard work. It is a promise that the Federal Government has kept ever since.

For 70 years, no matter the President, no matter the party in control of the Senate, we have kept that promise. That changed, unfortunately, in December. This body left for vacation. It left tens of thousands of mine workers to face an uncertain future, not knowing if the pensions and health care they had earned for themselves—and in many cases for their widows—over a lifetime of hard work would be there for them in the future. This is shameful.

Senator PORTMAN, my Republican colleague from Ohio, and I and Senator MANCHIN and Senator CAPITO, a Democrat and a Republican from West Virginia, and Senator CASEY—a number of us—said: We should not leave Washington to go home to our families until we take care of mine worker families.

Congress has the power to stop these cuts and to live up to this pledge. We had a bipartisan solution that would have passed if it had been brought to the floor. But instead, Congress broke its promise to these miners and their families. Congress stole the health care they had earned by passing a continuing resolution that failed to address the pension problem, and it stole the funds that were still left in their health care plan to pay for a 4-month fix—4 months, 4 months. Who can make health care decisions when you don't know if you will have health care coverage 4 months from now?

These working people don't deserve to live with this kind of uncertainty. I have heard my colleagues, particularly on the Republican side of the aisle, always talk about predictability. Government should never inject more uncertainty into the lives of individuals, never should inject uncertainty into the lives of business people as they make investment decisions.

But that is what we have done with these mine workers. We have made their lives less certain, less predictable, and their health care so unpredictable. This is the health care these workers fought for, the health care they sacrificed raises for. Keep in mind that at the bargaining table, workers will be willing to accept less wages today in exchange for health care and pensions in the future. That is what collective bargaining is often about. That is what is so important.

This is health care they sacrificed raises for. It was the health care we promised them. My colleagues know their stories of hard work and sacrifice. We know these stories because over the past year, these miners traveled here by the busload. They rode long distances. They gathered in the heat and in the cold for hours outside this building to make their voices heard.

They worked decades in the mines—hard back-breaking work. But that work had dignity. It was dangerous work—work where some of them were killed on the job, work where many of them developed health problems later. Many of them died younger than people who dress like we do and have jobs like this. Their widows have been denied these pensions and health care. They clocked in every day, these workers. They knew the conditions they faced. Many of them now suffer from black lung or other illnesses. They accepted a lifetime of hard labor because they valued their jobs, they valued their work, and they believed that good-paying union jobs were their tickets to the middle class.

These miners believed in the covenant we used to have in this country that promised if you work hard your whole life, if you put in the hours, if you save a little and do your part, you will be able to help your children go to college. They believed that would give their kids a chance at a better life perhaps than they had. They believed that if they upheld their end of the deal, if they put in the work to power our country by mining coal used for a generation of electricity, their government would do the same. In December, Congress told them they were wrong. I don't accept that. These workers sacrificed their lungs and their backs to keep our lights on. It is shameful that Congress, despite all intents and purposes, has stolen what they earned. These miners should have spent Christmas with their grandkids, not worrying about whether they could afford their medicine.

We aren't giving up. We had a bipartisan solution in December. We will keep fighting until mine workers across Ohio and this country have the full health care and retirement security that we promised them. They kept faith with us and powered our country. It is time to keep faith with the workers in our industrial heartland and to right this wrong.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the ensuing quorum call be divided equally between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY CLARK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the first time in three decades, the Kentucky General Assembly began their regular session this month without the fiery voice and passionate character of State Representative Larry Clark. After an impressive career, Representative Clark started a new adventure: retirement. He will be remembered for many accomplishments in Frankfort, among them that he never missed a single floor vote.

Despite our differences, Representative Clark and I both care deeply for Kentucky. As speaker pro tempore of the house, he championed the merger of the Louisville and Jefferson County governments, an issue I fought for when I was the county judge/executive. We also share a passion for the University of Louisville, and Representative Clark has a record of achievements on behalf of the school.

I join the Kentucky General Assembly in congratulating Representative Clark on his career of public service. He dedicated many years to Kentucky, and I wish him well in retirement.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT L. HENDRICKSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate a distinguished Kentuckian and a friend. Robert L. Hendrickson has been the Publisher of the Ledger Independent in Maysville, KY, since 1993. When Bob announced that he would retire at the end of last year, I knew that the paper was not only losing a great journalist, but it also was losing a great man.

Bob graduated from the University of Georgia's Henry Grady School of Journalism. Afterward, he moved back to Kentucky to work on his dad's dairy farm. However, a pair of harsh winters in 1977 and 1978 convinced him, in his own words, ''to put my journalism degree to work.'' He got hired by the Ledger Independent and has served his community ever since.

The Ledger Independent newspaper serves seven counties in northern Kentucky and southern Ohio. Through a series of owners and publishers, the paper continues a 150-year tradition of a local, independent, daily newspaper in Maysville.

Bob became editor of the paper in 1985, calling it ''the best job in the world.'' In 1993, he was promoted to publisher. He oversaw the entire operation and guided the paper into the internet age with the unveiling of Maysville Online. While working full time at the paper, Bob also did postgraduate work at Northwestern University.

Bob and Missy Mann have never stopped working for their neighbors. Bob further dedicates himself to his community, both through his service on the board of directors of the Maysville Chamber of Commerce, and as the moderator of several important political debates in his area.

Bob is a great man and a pillar of his community, and I am honored to call him a friend. I wish him and Missy well in retirement, and I join with countless Kentuckians on thanking him for his service to Maysville.

TRIBUTE TO LAMAR JACKSON

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to offer my congratulations to an outstanding young man and athlete, the University of Louisville Cardinals' quarterback, Lamar Jackson. On December 10 of last year, Cards fans watched with excitement as Jackson was awarded the Heisman Memorial Trophy, the first in the history of my alma mater. The award is given to the most outstanding player in college football, and Jackson surely has earned it.

We have known for quite some time that Lamar Jackson would be breaking many records. Here are just a few. Jackson was the first player in NCAA Division I history to pass for 3,300 yards and run for 1,500 yards in one season. He holds the Atlantic Coastal Conference, ACC, record for most touchdowns in a single season with 51. Only a sophomore, Jackson is the youngest player ever to win the Heisman Trophy at 19 years old, and he is the University of Louisville's first ever Heisman Trophy finalist. The impressive list goes on and on.

It is clear that Lamar Jackson is a truly spectacular athlete. He has earned his spot in the pantheon of college football greats. It is easy to cheer when the quarterback hurdles a defender to score or runs between some of the best defenses in the Nation. His drive and dedication are traits we all admire, and just wait until you hear where it all started.

In an interview, Jackson said ''[e]verything I do, I do for my mother.'' At an early age, Jackson's mother, Felicia Jones, sparked his interest in football, and she pushed him to be his best ever since. When Lamar and his younger brother were just learning the game, their mom would put on pads in the backyard and run plays with them. She became an active part of all of his teams, all the way to the University of Louisville. He said, ''She would tell me the bad things I did. She wouldn't really tell me the good things I did. And I'd say 'All right, Mom. I've got to go fix it.'''

Lamar Jackson's story is just beginning. Under the guidance of some of the best coaches in all of college sports and an athletic director with a strategic vision for the future, the Cardinals are positioned to make a real impact in college football. With the Heisman Trophy already on the shelf, we can only wait and see what Lamar Jackson does next year. As an avid fan of UofL football, I know I can hardly wait.

I would like to join with Cards fans across the Nation to congratulate the entire University of Louisville Cardinals football team and staff on an exciting season and especially congratulate the 2016 Heisman Trophy winner, Lamar Jackson. He has truly made it great to be a Louisville Cardinal.

TRIBUTE TO JOE TOLAN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, at the beginning of this year, one of Louisville's foremost community servants began his much-deserved retirement. I rise today to congratulate Joseph Tolan, a man of distinction who dedicated his life to the people of Louisville and Kentucky.

Many years ago, I had the pleasure of working alongside Joe. When I served as the judge/executive of Jefferson County, Joe led the county department for human services. I particularly remember his passion for helping those around him, and that passion has been the driving force of his career. And believe me, I can tell you, from firsthand experience, that passion is contagious.

For the last 30 years, Joe has committed himself to the Metro United Way, a Louisville organization that raises and distributes funds to worthy causes around the region. Spending the last 15 years as president and CEO, Joe led the effort to raise nearly $30 million every year to support approximately 100 organizations. The community support that Joe inspired has led Metro United Way to be ranked in the top 25 markets nationwide.

However, organizations like Metro United Way are measured by so much more than just the donations they raise. True success is counted by the lives impacted and the good work done. With a focus on education, financial stability, and healthy living, Metro United Way impacts thousands of families across the region every single day.

Since joining Metro United Way, Joe has been a major player in the transformation of the city of Louisville and the entire region. Although the organization is over 100 years old, it is constantly adapting to meet today's challenges in the most effective ways possible. With this commitment to excellence and a growing network of strategic partnerships, Metro United Way proved to be a lasting force for good in the community. During his tenure as president and CEO, Joe hasn't just been a part of this innovation, he has been its leader.

Joe has surely earned his retirement, but I know many of us are very sorry to see him go. He leaves behind an impressive list of accomplishments and an organization well positioned to continue his work. I want to extend my congratulations to Joe on such a successful career of dedicated leadership always with a vision to help everyone reach their fullest potential.

CHANGING SENATE RULES

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, today I wish to continue what has become a tradition. At the beginning of the 112th Congress, I took to the Senate floor and called for this body to adopt its rules with a simple majority vote and to amend them so they actually allowed the body to function as our Founders intended.

I did the same at the beginning of the 112th, 113th, and 114th Congresses. Today, at the start of the 115th Congress, I again call for reform. This is something I have done as a member of the majority and the minority. Senator MERKLEY has worked closely with me on this issue and spoke briefly yesterday about our efforts.

But we did not start this tradition. It dates back decades. My predecessor, Clinton Anderson, was a leading proponent of what has become known as the ''constitutional option'' in the 1950s and 1960s. Vice President Walter Mondale—then a Senator from Minnesota—carried on the tradition in the 1970s. When Senator MERKLEY and I first joined the Senate, Senator Tom Harkin worked closely with us to help us carry on the tradition.

The proposals we have offered to change the rules at the start of a new Congress have never been radical. They were changes we were willing to live with whether we were in the majority or minority. We have offered the same proposals as Members of the majority and minority. We believe the Senate is broken, and even the minority party should want to fix it.

Congress had made some progress in recent years, but unfortunately, it took unprecedented Republican obstruction to bring it about. Republicans blocked nominees to all sorts of positions submitted by President Obama, so we took action to change the rules to break through the gridlock. It was unfortunate that Republicans precipitated that situation, but the result was for the best.

New rules allow for a lower cloture threshold for all nominees except those to the Supreme Court now, and the new Republican President can take advantage of them, just as President Obama was able to do for the final years of his term.

But no one would argue that Congress or the nomination process has been fixed. Further debate and reform is needed on many aspects of Senate function.

We believe the Senate should openly debate and consider its rules at the start of each Congress, to consider changes that can provide commonsense reforms. This ongoing process is the ideal way to restore the best traditions of the Senate and allow it to conduct the business that the American people expect.

We have one goal whether we are in the majority or in the minority: to give the American people the government they expect and deserve—a government that works.

This is not just about rules. It is about the norms and traditions of the Senate.

Neither side is 100 percent pure. Both sides have used the rules for obstruction. No doubt they had their reasons.

But I don't think the American people care about that. They don't want a

history lesson or a lesson in parliamentary procedure. They want a government that is fair, that is reasonable, and that works.

I hope that all my colleagues—and especially the new Senators—give serious consideration to reform.

We do not need to win every legislative or nomination vote. But we need to have a real debate and an open process to ensure we are actually the greatest deliberative body in the world.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING JOHN ''DEPENDS ON HIM'' SMITH

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor and remember my good friend John Smith.

On Saturday, December 31, 2016, we lost one of Wyoming's best leaders and diplomats on the Wind River Reservation. John Smith was a member of the Northern Arapaho tribe. For 27 years, he served as the director of the department of transportation for the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation. Mr. Smith played a major role passing transportation legislation that will save and improve lives on the Wind River Reservation and across tribal communities.

John was a wonderful friend and a wonderful man. I admired him greatly for his big heart, his warmth, and his larger than life personality. John cared deeply about the lives of people who lived and traveled through the Wind River Reservation. John's commitment to improving his community's roads can be seen today all over the Wind River Reservation. He was a hard worker, innovative and creative. He was always doing more with less. His jokes and sense of humor always made that hard work a little easier. Indian country did not have a better advocate or finer person to represent them in Washington, DC.

Since John's work ethic and personality were so big, he naturally lived up to his nickname ''Big John'' in every respect. As a former football and basketball player, you could see Big John coming from blocks away.

In 2014, John was in Washington, DC, to receive the White House Champions of Change award from the Secretary of Transportation, Anthony Foxx. Big John was being recognized for bringing tribal, State, and local leaders together to complete construction of the notorious 17 Mile Road. When he received the award, Big John took off his cowboy hat and placed it on the head of Secretary Foxx. The unforgettable smile on Big John lit up the room with laughter. This special man left a lasting impression on all those who had the privilege of working with him.

Last April, John testified before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. He talked about dangerous roads that were costing lives in tribal communities. His testimony led to important legislation being passed to improve those roads. His efforts not only changed lives, it saved them, and we are all grateful. It has been an honor and privilege to work with Big John on highway bills. It has been a higher honor to be his friend.

John leaves big boots to fill, and I am confident the Wind River community will fill those boots and continue his hard work.

As we lift up our hearts and celebrate Big John's life, we also thank him for his selfless service on behalf of the people of Wyoming. Big John, thank you, and we will miss you.•

TRIBUTE TO SHELBY GARDNER

• Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I would like to recognize Shelby Gardner, of Warren, AK, as this week's Arkansan of the Week, for her work with the Arkansas Veterans Hospital posttraumatic stress disorder program in Little Rock.

Shelby is a senior at Warren High School in Bradley County and is proof that you are never too young to give back to your community. Shelby wanted to find a way to honor the men and women who put their lives on the line for our safety: our veterans. Specifically, she wanted to help those veterans who suffer from posttraumatic stress.

After learning about the Arkansas Veterans Hospital posttraumatic stress disorder program, Shelby began to talk with anyone who would listen about the program—friends and family, her church congregation, civic clubs, and other organizations across Warren and Bradley County. She told them about her passion for helping veterans, the good work this program does, and how much it would benefit from additional support.

Her hard work paid off. With the help of a local auctioneer, Shelby organized a community bake sale auction and managed to raise $8,000 for the Arkansas Veterans Hospital. But Shelby wasn't finished. She and a group of other volunteers spent hours preparing and selling sandwiches at the Bradley County fair and raised an additional $2,000, for a grand total of $10,000 for veterans suffering from posttraumatic stress.

A veteran in Shelby's community was struck by her commitment to such a noble cause and in his nomination of Shelby wrote: ''Her actions are proof that patriotism runs deep in small town America. She is an exceptional representative of many young people in our nation deeply committed to the men and women who serve protecting and defending our nation and our way of life. Shelby is a shining example of the caliber of young person this country requires to ensure the survival of our nation and our values. She is a focused, goal oriented young woman who is a credit to her family, her church, her community, her state and nation.''

I am equally as inspired by Shelby's hard work and her commitment to our veterans. Patriotism does indeed run deep in a State like Arkansas. Now, because of her efforts, the Veterans Hospital in Little Rock can better serve Arkansans who suffer from PTSD.

It is an honor to recognize Shelby Gardner as Arkansan of the Week, and I am thankful for people like Shelby who, using the resources around them, work to make others' lives better.•

TRIBUTE TO ARLENE MATHEWS

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Arlene Mathews of Helena, MT, for her 63 years of volunteer service at St. Peter's Hospital.

In a basement in 1953, Arlene began the ''Sock Sew,'' which makes socks for newborn babies who are born in December at St. Peter's Hospital to take home.

This year, Arlene and volunteers sitting at 20 sewing machines cut, sewed, and glued 100 large stockings for the newborns and another 100 smaller stockings for patients at St. Peter's whose Christmas Eve is spent in the hospital. This is a wonderful gesture that made their Christmas in the hospital just a little bit better. Thank you, Arlene, for thinking of those in the hospital, especially during the Christmas season.

I am thrilled to honor our unsung hero, Arlene Mathews, for her 63-year service to her community.•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 27. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain a copy of any reprimand or admonishment received by an employee of the Department in the permanent record of the employee.

H.R. 28. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adopt and implement a standard identification protocol for use in the tracking and procurement of biological

implants by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution extending the life of the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution to provide for the counting on January 6, 2017, of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution regarding consent to assemble outside the seat of government.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to H. Res. 1, resolving that Karen L. Haas of the State of Maryland, be, and is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives; that Paul D. Irving of the State of Florida be, and is hereby, chosen Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives; that Philip George Kiko of the State of Ohio be, and is hereby, chosen Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives; and that Father Patrick J. Conroy of the State of Oregon be, and is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to H. Res. 2, resolving that the Senate be informed that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that PAUL D. RYAN, a Representative of the State of Wisconsin, has been elected Speaker; and that Karen L. Haas, a citizen of the State of Maryland, has been elected Clerk of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to House Resolution 3, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make: Mr. MCCARTHY of California and Ms. PELOSI of California.

The message further announced that pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of today, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Joint Economic Committee: Mr. TIBERI of Ohio.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 27. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain a copy of any reprimand or admonishment received by an employee of the Department in the permanent record of the employee; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 28. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adopt and implement a standard identification protocol for use in the tracking and procurement of biological implants by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–1. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions'' (FRL No. 9954–47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pesticides; Certification of Pesticide Applicators'' (FRL No. 9956–70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes to Reporting and Notification Requirements and Other Clarifying Changes for Imported Fruits, Vegetables, and Specialty Crops'' (Docket No. AMS–SC–16–0083) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Aggregation of Positions'' (RIN3038–AD82) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Photo Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Card Implementation Requirements'' (RIN0584–AE45) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–6. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Enhancing Retailer Standards in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)'' (RIN0584–AE27) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–7. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Flumioxazin; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9955–45) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–8. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Forest System Land Management Planning'' (RIN0596–AD28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–9. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: New Qualifying Country—Estonia'' ((RIN0750–AJ18) (DFARS Case 2017–D001)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–10. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contract Financing'' ((RIN0750–AI90) (DFARS Case 2015–D026)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–11. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children'' (RIN0790–AJ33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–12. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–13. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Iran-Related Multilateral Sanctions Regime Efforts'' covering the period February 7, 2016 to August 6, 2016; to the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Finance; and Foreign Relations.

EC–14. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Domestic Dates Produced or Packed in Riverside County, California; Decreased Assessment Rate'' (Docket No. AMS–SC–16–0084) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–15. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Almonds Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate'' (Docket No. AMS–SC–16–0045) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–16. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of

Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Cherries Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Increased Assessment Rate'' (Docket No. AMS–SC–16–0077) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–17. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Walnuts Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate'' (Docket No. AMS–SC–16–0062) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–18. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Promotion'' (RIN0584–AE44) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–19. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal years 2004 and 2005 Operations and Maintenance, Army, and was assigned case number 15–03; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–20. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual report entitled, ''Acceptance of Contributions for Defense Programs, Projects, and Activities; Defense Cooperation Account'' and a semiannual listing of personal property contributed by coalition partners; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–21. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict), transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2014 annual report on the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–22. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Depository Institutions and U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks'' (RIN3064–AE42) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–23. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility; (Chambers and Harris Counties, TX, et al.)'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2016–0002)) during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–24. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP): Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement'' ((RIN1660–AA86) (Docket No. FEMA–2016–0012)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–25. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Russian Sanctions: Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List, and Clarification of License Review Policy'' (RIN0694–AH25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–26. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Narrowing the Digital Divide Through Installation of Broadband Infrastructure in HUD–Funded New Construction and Substantial Rehabilitation of Multifamily Rental Housing'' (RIN2501–AD75) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–27. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safe Harbors From Liability Under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act for Certain Actions Taken in Compliance with Mortgage Servicing Rules Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z)'' (RIN3170–AA49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–28. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to the 22013 Mortgage Rules Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures'' (RIN3170–AA49) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–29. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–30. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans Exemption Threshold'' (RIN7100–AD90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–31. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Consumer Leasing (Regulation M)'' (RIN3170–AA66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–32. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Liquidity Coverage Ratio: Public Disclosure Requirements; Extension of Compliance Period for Certain Companies to Meet the Liquidity Coverage Ratio Requirements'' (RIN7100–AE39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–33. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Truth in Lending (Regulation Z)'' (RIN7100–AA67) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–34. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–35. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development , Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modernizing HUD's Consolidated Planning Process to Narrow the Digital Divide and Increase Resilience to Natural Hazards'' (RIN2506–AC41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–36. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, with respect to Belarus; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–37. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–38. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility (Walton County, GA, et al.)'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2016–0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–39. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Suspension of Community Eligibility (McKean County, PA, et al.)'' ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA–2016–0002)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–40. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Home Mortgage Disclosure (Regulation C) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold'' (12 CFR Part 1003) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–41. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the

issuance of an Executive Order that takes additional steps to address the increasing use of significant malicious cyber-enabled activities to undermine democratic processes or institutions with respect to the national emergency originally declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–42. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Acquired Member Assets'' (RIN2590–AA80) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–43. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Instituting Smoke-Free Public Housing'' (RIN2577–AC97) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–44. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Home Loan Bank New Business Activities Final Rule'' (RIN2590–AA84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–45. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Industry and Security Annual Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–46. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Enterprise Duty to Serve Underserved Markets'' (RIN2590–AA27) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–47. A communication from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau on College Credit Cards; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–48. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Depository Institutions and U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks'' (RIN1557–AE01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–49. A communication from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Bureau for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–50. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Housing Counseling: New Certification Requirements'' (RIN2502–AI94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–51. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Recordkeeping for Timely Deposit Insurance Determination'' (RIN3064–AE33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–52. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List'' (RIN0694–AH21) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–53. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to discretionary appropriations legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC–54. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties'' (RIN1990–AA46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–55. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Walk-in Coolers and Walk-in Freezers'' (RIN1904–AD72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–56. A communication from the Departmental Freedom of Information Act Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Freedom of Information Act Regulations'' (RIN1093–AA21) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–57. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Resource Management Planning'' (RIN1004–AE39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 12, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–58. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Uninterruptible Power Supplies'' (RIN1904–AD68) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–59. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Commercial Packaged Boilers'' (RIN1904–AD16) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–60. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Dishwashers'' (RIN1904–AD24) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–61. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Regulations; Areas of the National Park System, Cape Hatteras National Seashore—Off-Road Vehicle Management'' (RIN1024–AE33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–62. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Cooking Products'' (RIN1904–AC71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–63. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reliability Standard for Transmission System Planned Performance for Geomagnetic Disturbance Events'' ((RIN1902–AF25 and RIN1902–AF11) (Docket Nos. RM16–15–000 and RM15–25–001)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–64. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Competitive Processes, Terms, and Conditions for Leasing Public Lands for Solar and Wind Energy Development and Technical Changes and Corrections'' (RIN1004–AE24) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–65. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Procedural Rules for DOE Nuclear Activities'' (RIN1992–AA52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–66. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision of the Department of Energy's Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Regulations'' (RIN1901–AB41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–67. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) Adjustment to Asset-Size Exemption Threshold'' (12 CFR Part 1026) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–68. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of General Counsel, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Increase in the Maximum Amount of Primary Nuclear Liability Insurance'' ((RIN3150–AJ71) (NRC–2016–0164)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–69. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of General Counsel, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Withdrawal of Regulatory Guides 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5'' (NRC–2016–0246) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–70. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2016 Project Deauthorization list; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–71. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 2014 Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–72. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of New Reactors, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes to Aging Management Guidance for Various Steam Generator Components'' (LR–ISG–2016–01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 12, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–73. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Assessing the Technical Adequacy of the Advanced Light-Water Reactor Probabilistic Risk Assessment for the Design Certification Application and Combined License Application'' (DC/COL–ISG–028) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 12, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–74. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR 4) for Public Water Systems and Announcement of Public Meeting'' ((RIN2040–AF49) (FRL–9956–71–OW)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–75. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reclassification of the Sheboygan, Wisconsin Area to Moderate Nonattainment for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL–9956–95–Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–76. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Promulgation of Certain Federal Water Quality Standards Applicable to Maine'' ((RIN2040–AF59) (FRL–9952–99–OW)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–77. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Determination of Nonattainment and Reclassification of the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria 2008 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area; Texas'' (FRL–9956–08–Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–78. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Credit Assistance for Water Infrastructure Projects'' ((RIN2040–AF63) (FRL–9953–24–OW)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–79. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Limited Approval and Limited Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Northern Sonoma County Air Pollution Control District; Stationary Source Permits; Correcting Amendment'' (FRL–9956–65–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–80. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; TN; Revisions to the Knox County Portion of the TN SIP'' (FRL–9956–63–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–81. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Tennessee; Regional Haze Progress Report'' (FRL–9956–90–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–82. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Ohio portion of the Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Area to Attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard'' (FRL–9956–60–Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–83. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Columbus, Ohio Area to Attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard'' (FRL–9956–59–Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–84. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Part 9 Miscellaneous Rules'' (FRL–9956–62–Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–85. A communication from the Eagle Program Manager, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Eagle Permits; Revisions to Regulations for Eagle Incidental Take and Take of Eagle Nests'' (RIN1018–AY30) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–86. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fitness for Duty—Operational Program'' (NUREG–0800) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–87. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protection of Visibility: Amendments to Requirements for State Plans'' ((RIN2060–AS55) (FRL No. 9957–05–OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–88. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Louisiana; Redesignation of Baton Rouge 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment'' (FRL No. 9956–92–Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–89. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Determination of Attainment of the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Eastern San Luis Obispo, California'' (FRL No. 9956–98–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–90. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Control of Volatile Organic Compounds Emissions from Fiberglass Boat Manufacturing Materials'' (FRL No. 9957–20–Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–91. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Limited Approval and Limited Disapproval of California State Implementation Plan Revisions; Butte County Air Quality Management District; Stationary Source Permits'' (FRL No. 9955–16–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–92. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Mississippi; Interstate Transport (Prongs 1 and 2) for the 2010 1-hour NO2 Standard'' (FRL No. 9957–09–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–93. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; MA; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements'' (FRL No. 9952–94–Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–94. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Addition of a Subsurface Intrusion Component to the Hazard Ranking System'' ((RIN2050–AG67) (FRL No. 9956–58–OLEM)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–95. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances; Technical Correction'' ((RIN2070–AB27) (FRL No. 9956–13)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–96. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Determination of Attainment of the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Mariposa County, California'' (FRL No. 9956–66–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–97. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2015 Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges, and Transit: Conditions and Performance''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–98. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Toxic Substance Control Act Chemical Substance Import Certification Process Revisions'' (RIN1515–AE13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–99. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Importations of Certain Vehicles and Engines Subject to Federal Anti-pollution Emission Standards'' (RIN1515–AE11) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–100. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Applicable Federal Rates—January 2017'' (Rev. Rul. 2017–2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–101. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revenue Ruling: 2016 Base Period T-Bill Rate'' (Rev. Rul. 2017–01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–102. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare Program; Conditions for Coverage for End-Stage Renal Disease Facilities—Third Party Payment'' ((RIN0938–AT11)(CMS–3337–IFC)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–103. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Eligibility for Exemption from User Fee Requirement for Employee Plans Determination Letter Applications Filed on or After January 1, 2017'' (Notice 2017–1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–104. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Beginning of Construction for Sections 45 and 48'' (Notice 2017–04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–105. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''2016 Required Amendments List for Qualified Retirement Plans'' (Notice 2016–80) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–106. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Mileage Rate'' (Notice 2016–79) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–107. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Eligibility Rule Waivers for Certain Automatic Changes Made to comply with the Final Tangible Property Regulations'' (Notice 2017–6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–108. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Premium Tax Credit Regulation VI'' ((RIN1545–BN50) (TD 9804)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–109. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Guidance Regarding Predecessors and Successors Under Section 355(e); Limitation on Gain Recognition; Guidance Under Section 355(f)'' ((RIN1545–BN18)(TD 9805)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–110. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Treatment of Certain Transfers of Property to Foreign Corporations'' ((RIN1545–BL87)(TD 9803)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–111. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Treatment of Certain Domestic Entities Disregarded as Separate from Their Owners as Corporations for Purposes of Section 6038A'' ((RIN1545–BM94) (TD 9796)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–112. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Disclosures of Return Information Reflected on Returns to Officers and Employees of the Department of Commerce for Certain Statistical Purposes and Related Activities'' ((RIN1545–BN64) (TD 9802)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–113. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Issue Price Definition for Tax-Exempt Bonds'' ((RIN1545–BM46) (TD 9801)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–114. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007'' (RIN0960–AH95) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–115. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Ensuring Program Uniformity at

the Hearing and Appeals Council Levels of the Administrative Review Process'' (RIN0960–AH71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–116. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Flexibility, Efficiency, and Modernization in Child Support Enforcement Programs'' (RIN0970–AC50 and RIN0938–AR92) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–117. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System'' (RIN0970–AC47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–118. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Total Loss-Absorbing Capacity Instruments'' (Rev. Proc. 2017–12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–119. A communication from the Attorney, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Correction to Applicability Date for Modification of Regulations Regarding Price Adjustments in Antidumping Duty Proceedings'' (RIN0625–AB02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2016; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–120. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress: Results and Performance of the Hospital Value-Based Purchasing Program''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–121. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Revision of U.S. Munitions List Category XV'' (RIN1400–AD33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–122. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2016–0178—2016–0182); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–123. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2016–0169—2016–0177); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–124. A communication from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Presidential Determination No. 2013–06 relative to defense services to France in their efforts to secure Mali from terrorists and violent extremists and Presidential Determination No. 2014–13 relative to defense services to France for continued support efforts in Mali, Niger, and Chad; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–125. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report of the Attorney General to the Congress of the United States on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the six months ending December 31, 2015''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–126. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 16–102); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–127. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Australia Group; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–128. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report of the Attorney General to the Congress of the United States on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the six months ending December 31, 2015''; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–129. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; HHS Notice of Benefit Payment Parameters for 2018; Amendments to Special Enrollment Periods and the Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan Program'' ((RIN0938–AS95 and RIN0938–AS87) (CMS–9934–F)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–130. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Refuse to Accept Procedures for Premarket Tobacco Product Submissions'' (Docket No. FDA–2016–N–1555) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–131. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Procedures for Handling Retaliation Complaints Under Section 31307 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21)'' (RIN1218–AC88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–132. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interpretive Bulletin Relating to the Exercise of Shareholder Rights and Written Statements of Investment Policy, Including Proxy Voting Policies or Guidelines'' (RIN1210–AB78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–133. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits'' (29 CFR Part 4022) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–134. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits'' (29 CFR Part 4044) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–135. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Westinghouse Electric Corporation in Bloomfield, New Jersey, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–136. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Bliss and Laughlin Steel site in Buffalo, New York, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–137. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at the Blockson Chemical Company site in Joliet, Illinois, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–138. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Feed Grade Sodium Formate'' (Docket No. FDA–2015–F–4282) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 29, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–139. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Postmarketing Safety Reporting for Combination Products'' ((RIN0910–AF82) (Docket No. FDA–2008–N–0424)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–140. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Claims Procedure for Plans Providing Disability Benefits'' (RIN1210–AB39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–141. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Division of Select Agents

and Toxins, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''World Trade Center Health Program; Amendments to Definitions, Appeals, and Other Requirements'' (RIN0920–AA56, RIN0920–AA44, RIN0920–AA48, and RIN0920–AA50) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–142. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Requirements for Foreign and Domestic Establishment Registration and Listing for Human Drugs, Including Drugs That Are Regulated Under a Biologics License Application, and Animal Drugs; Correction'' ((RIN0910–AA49) (Docket No. FDA–2005–N–0464)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–143. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Title I—Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged—Academic Assessments'' (RIN1810–AB32) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–144. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Program Integrity and Improvement'' (RIN1810–AD20) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–145. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, As Amended By the Every Student Succeeds Act—Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority'' (RIN1810–AB31) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–146. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''2012 and 2014 Regional Partnership Grants to Increase the Well-Being of and to Improve the Permanency Outcomes for Children Affected by Substance Abuse: Third Annual Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–147. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Program Integrity and Improvement'' (RIN1840–AD20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–148. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Health and Human Services Grants Regulation'' (RIN0991–AC06) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–149. A joint communication from the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Thefts, Losses, or Releases of Select Agents and Toxins for Calendar Year 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–150. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on Coordination of Federal HIV Programs for Fiscal Years 2014–2015''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–151. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Division of Select Agents and Toxins, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''World Trade Center Health Program; Amendments to Definitions, Appeals, and Other Requirements'' (RIN0920–AA56, RIN0920–AA44, RIN0920–AA48, and RIN0920–AA50) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–152. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Compliance with Title X Requirements by Project Recipients in Selecting Subrecipients'' (RIN0937–AA04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–153. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Community Living, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''State Long-Term Care Ombudsman Programs'' (RIN0985–AA08) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–154. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendments to Accreditation of Third-Party Certification Bodies to Conduct Food Safety Audits and to Issue Certifications to Provide for the User Fee Program'' ((RIN0910–AH23) (Docket No. FDA–2011–N–0146)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–155. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Runaway and Homeless Youth'' (RIN0970–AC43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20 , 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–156. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Savings Arrangements Established by Qualified State Political Subdivisions for Non-Governmental Employees'' (RIN1210–AB76) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–157. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Apprenticeship Programs: Equal Employment Opportunity'' (RIN1205–AB59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–158. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clarification of Employer's Continuing Obligation To Make and Maintain an Accurate Record of Each Recordable Injury and Illness'' (RIN1218–AC84) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–159. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Labeling: Health Claims; Dietary Saturated Fat and Cholesterol and Risk of Coronary Heart Disease'' ((RIN0910–AH43) (Docket No. FDA–2013–P–0047)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–160. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''General Hospital and Personal Use Devices: Renaming of Pediatric Hospital Bed Classification and Designation of Special Controls for Pediatric Medical Crib; Classification of Medical Bassinet'' (Docket No. FDA–2015–N–0701) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–161. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Banned Devices; Powdered Surgeon's Gloves, Powdered Patient Examination Gloves, and Absorbable Powder for Lubricating a Surgeon's Glove'' ((RIN0910–AH02) (Docket No. FDA–2015–N–5017)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–162. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Assistance to States for the Education of Children with Disabilities; Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities'' ((RIN1820–AB73) (Docket ID ED–2015–OSERS–0132)) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–163. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2016, including the Office of Inspector General's Auditor's Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–164. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Payment of Subcontractors'' ((RIN9000–AM98) (FAC 2005–94)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office

of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–165. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Privacy Training'' ((RIN9000–AM06) (FAC 2005–94)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–166. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005–94; Introduction'' (FAC 2005–94) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–167. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Financial Report for the Office of Government Ethics for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–168. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Personnel Management in Agencies'' (RIN3206–AL98) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–169. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Update Contract Reporting Responsibilities'' (RIN3090–AJ80) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–170. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Housing and Urban Development Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2016, through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–171. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulatory Implementation of the Centers of Excellence and Expertise'' (RIN1650–AB02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–172. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Post-Employment Conflict of Interest Restrictions; Revision of Departmental Component Designations'' (RIN3209–AA14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–173. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Post-Employment Conflict of Interest Restrictions; Revision of Departmental Component Designations'' (RIN3209–AA14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–174. A communication from the Vice President (Acting) for Congressional and Public Affairs, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–175. A communication from the Inspector General of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period from April 1, 2016, through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–176. A communication from the Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–177. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–178. A communication from the Acting Director, Employment Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Recruitment, Selection, and Placement (General) And Suitability'' (RIN3206–AN25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–179. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, the President's Pay Agent, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of locality based comparability payments; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–180. A communication from the Acting Director, Planning and Policy Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of Eligible Family Members from Existing Self and Family Enrollments'' (RIN3206–AN43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–181. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the New York, NY, and Philadelphia, PA, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas'' (RIN3206–AN29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–182. A communication from the Acting Director, Planning and Policy Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Employees Health Benefits Program: Removal of Ineligible Individuals from Existing Enrollments'' (RIN3206–AN09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–183. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Employment in the Excepted Service'' (RIN3206–AN30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–184. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of Certain Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas'' (RIN3206–AN38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–185. A communication from the Acting Director, Planning and Policy Analysis, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Employees Health Benefits And Federal Employees Dental And Vision Insurance Programs' Coverage Exception For Children Of Same-Sex Domestic Partners'' (RIN3206–AN34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 9, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–186. A communication from the Director, Office of Administration, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to transactions from the Unanticipated Needs Account for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–187. A communication from the Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''The Merit System Principles: Guiding the Fair and Effective Management of the Federal Workforce''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–188. A communication from the Acting Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Department of Homeland Security Privacy Office 2016 Annual Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–189. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–190. A communication from the Director, Congressional, Legislative, and Intergovernmental Affairs, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Agency Financial Report, Fiscal Year 2016''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–191. A communication from the Chairwoman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016 and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–192. A communication from the Executive Director, Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Privacy Act Regulations'' (RIN3219–AA00) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–193. A communication from the General Manager, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety

Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal years 2014 and 2015 inventories and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the reports; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–194. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports entitled ''2015 Information Collection Budget of the United States Government'' and ''2016 Information Collection Budget of the United States Government''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–195. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005–93; Small Entity Compliance Guide'' (FAC 2005–93) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–196. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces; Injunction'' ((RIN9000–AN30) (FAC 2005–93)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–197. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Paid Sick Leave for Federal Contractors'' ((RIN9000–AN27) (FAC 2005–93)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–198. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005–93; Introduction'' (FAC 2005–93) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–199. A communication from the Special Counsel, Office of the Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2016'' and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–200. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Education Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–201. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces; Injunction'' ((RIN9000–AN30) (FAC 2005–93)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–202. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary (Intelligence and Analysis), Department of the Treasury, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

EC–203. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Recognition of Organizations and Accreditation of Non-Attorney Representatives'' (RIN1125–AA72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 22, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–204. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standards and Procedures for the Enforcement of the Immigration and Nationality Act'' (RIN1190–AA71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–205. A communication from the Supervisory Attorney-Advisor, Office on Violence Against Women, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Conforming STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program Regulations to Statutory Change; Definitions and Confidentiality Requirements Applicable to All OVW Grant Programs'' (RIN1105–AB46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–206. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Recognition of Organizations and Accreditation of Non-Attorney Representatives'' (RIN1125–AA72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–207. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report of the Attorney General to Congress Pursuant to the Death in Custody Reporting Act'' ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–208. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Visas: Classification of Immediate Family Members as A, C–3, G, and NATO Nonimmigrants'' (RIN1400–AD96) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 12, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–209. A communication from the Chief of the Border Security Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Definition of Form I–94 to Include Electronic Format'' ((RIN1651–AA96) (CBP Dec. 16–27)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 15, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–210. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Classification for Victims of Severe Forms of Trafficking in Persons; Eligibility for 'T' Nonimmigrant Status'' (RIN1615–AA59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–211. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Classification for Victims of Severe Forms of Trafficking in Persons; Eligibility for 'T' Nonimmigrant Status'' (RIN1615–AA59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–212. A communication from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Commission's competitive sourcing efforts during fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–213. A communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for fiscal year 2015; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–214. A communication from the Acting Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tiered Pharmacy Copayments for Medications'' (RIN2900–AP35) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–215. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Economic Report of the President together with the 2017 Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers; to the Joint Economic Committee.

EC–216. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Loan Programs Office, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Loan Guarantees for Projects That Employ Innovative Technologies'' (RIN1901–AB38) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 16, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–217. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Business Operations, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Roadless Area Conservation; National Forest System Lands in Colorado'' (RIN0596–AD26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–218. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Stream Protection Rule'' ((RIN1029–AC93) (Docket ID OSM–2010–0018)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–219. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–6669)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–220. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–9306)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–221. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled '' Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–0462)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–222. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5041)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–223. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–6672)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–224. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5034)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–225. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5597)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–226. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–5809)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–227. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–7527)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–228. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–9281)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–229. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France)'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–9396)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–230. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Various Aircraft Equipped with BRP–Powertrain GmbH and Company KG 912 A Series Engine'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–9000)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–231. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–7427)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–232. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–7421)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–233. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5044)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–234. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–5593)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–235. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–5466)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–236. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No . FAA–2015–3985)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–237. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No . FAA–2016–3701)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–238. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No . FAA–2015–5596)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–239. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–4228)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–240. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; BRP–Powertrain GmbH and Co KG Reciprocating Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–9103)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–241. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–9356)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–242. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Diamond Aircraft Industries GmbH Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–9369)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–243. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–4223)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–244. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aeronautics (Formerly Known as Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems) Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–6544)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–245. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2015–3820)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–246. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2016–6895)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–247. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (42); Amdt. No. 3719'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–248. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (31); Amdt. No. 3721'' (RIN2120–AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–249. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Camden, AL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1308)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–250. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Murray, KY'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–6775)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–251. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Silver Springs, NV'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–6413)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–252. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Illinois Towns; Carmi, IL; De Kalb, IL; Harrisburg, IL; Kewanee, IL; Litchfield, IL; Paris, IL; and Taylorville, IL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–6985)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–253. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Arkansas Towns; Blytheville, AR; Brinkley, AR; Clarksville, AR; and DeQueen, AR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–4172)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–254. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Ohio Towns; Marion, OH; Portsmouth, OH; Van Wert, OH; and Versailles, OH'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–8840)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–255. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Albany, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–3992)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–256. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Texas Towns; Levelland, TX; Vernon, TX; and Winters, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–8828)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–257. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace for the following Texas Towns; Georgetown, TX; Corpus Christi, TX; Dallas/Fort Worth, TX; Gainesville, TX; Graford, TX; Hebbronville, TX; and Jasper, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–8827)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–258. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Savannah, GA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2016–9101)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–259. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Eugene, OR, and Corvallis, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–3991)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–260. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment and Establishment of Restricted Areas; Chincoteague Inlet, VA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–2776)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–261. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of and Modification to Restricted Areas; Fort Sill, OK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2015–3680)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–262. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Minimum Training Requirements for Entry-Level Commercial Motor Vehicle Operators'' (RIN2126–AB66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–263. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Commercial Driver's License Drug and Alcohol Clearinghouse'' (RIN2126–AB18) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–264. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled ''Update of Overflight Fees'' ((RIN2120–AK53) (Docket No. FAA–2015–3597)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–265. A communication from the Director, Contract and Grant Policy Division, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contractor Financial Reporting of Property'' (RIN2700–AE33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–266. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Railroad Police Officers'' (RIN2130–AC62) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 14, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–267. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications'' (RIN0648–XE695) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–268. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to Framework Adjustment 55 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan and Sector Annual Catch Entitlements; Updates Annual Catch Limits for Sectors and the Common Pool for Fishing Year 2016'' (RIN0648–XE632) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–269. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2016–2018 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications'' (RIN0648–XE336) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–270. A communication from the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration's decision to enter into a contract with a private security screening company to provide screening services at Bozeman Yellowstone International Airport (BZN), Glacier Park International Airport (FCA), and Yellowstone Airport (WYS); to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–271. A communication from the Acting Deputy Chief Financial Officer, National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedule of Fees for Access to NOAA Environmental Data, Information, and Related Products and Services'' (RIN0648–BG39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 20, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–272. A communication from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer and Director for Financial Management, Office of the Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Monetary Penalty Adjustments for Inflation'' (RIN0605–AA47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. LEE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 21. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 22. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in the State of Nevada except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 23. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adopt and implement a standard identification protocol for use in the tracking and procurement of biological implants by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 24. A bill to expand eligibility for hospital care and medical services under section 101 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to include veterans who are age 75 or older, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 25. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit for employers establishing workplace child care facilities, to increase the child care credit to encourage greater use of quality child care services, to provide incentives for students to earn child care-related degrees and to work in child care facilities, and to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 26. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARPER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 27. A bill to establish an independent commission to examine and report on the facts regarding the extent of Russian official and unofficial cyber operations and other attempts to interfere in the 2016 United States national election, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 28. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the permissible use of health savings accounts to include health insurance payments and to increase the dollar limitation for contributions to health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 29. A bill to permit disabled law enforcement officers, customs and border protection officers, firefighters, air traffic controllers, nuclear materials couriers, members of the Capitol Police, members of the Supreme Court Police, employees of the Central Intelligence Agency performing intelligence activities abroad or having specialized security requirements, and diplomatic security special agents of the Department of State to receive retirement benefits in the same manner as if they had not been disabled; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. FLAKE)):

S. 30. A bill to extend the civil statute of limitations for victims of Federal sex offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. HARRIS)):

S. 31. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S.J. Res. 3. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which requires (except during time of war and subject to suspension by Congress) that the total amount of money expended by the United States during any fiscal year not exceed the amount of certain revenue received by the United States during such fiscal year and not exceed 20 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States during the previous calendar year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. COONS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. STABENOW,

Mr. RISCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. Res. 6. A resolution objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 and to all efforts that undermine direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians for a secure and peaceful settlement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Con. Res. 4. A concurrent resolution clarifying any potential misunderstanding as to whether actions taken by President-elect Donald Trump constitute a violation of the Emoluments Clause, and calling on President-elect Trump to divest his interest in, and sever his relationship to, the Trump Organization; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 11

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, a bill to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, to relocate to Jerusalem the United States Embassy in Israel, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, supra.

S. 17

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 17, a bill to ensure the Government Accountability Office has adequate access to information.

S.J. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 2, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 5, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of Israel.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 28. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the permissible use of health savings accounts to include health insurance payments and to increase the dollar limitation for contributions to health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise to speak today about legislation I am introducing, the Health Savings Account Expansion Act.

Earlier this month, individuals across this country were once again faced with fewer choices and increased costs when purchasing health insurance coverage. Unfortunately, this has been a common occurrence since the Affordable Care Act's inception, but no State, I can tell you, is feeling the pinch more than my State of Arizona. Prior to the flawed rollout of the exchanges in 2013, Arizona had 24 health insurance companies offering plans in the individual market. Just last year, residents in Arizona's most populous county Maricopa, where I live, had only 8 private providers to choose from on the exchange—so from 24 to 8. Then, if that wasn't bad enough, a few months ago, individuals all across Arizona received notification that their insurance plans were no longer being offered, despite the current administration's hollow promise that they could keep their plans. Now nearly stripped of their preferred health insurance, residents in 14 of 15 Arizona counties—14 out of 15 counties—logged into the ObamaCare exchanges to shop for new plans only to discover that instead of the vibrant marketplace they used to have, they were left with only one insurer to choose from—so from 24 to 8, to 1 for 14 of Arizona's 15 counties.

So today, when I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle talking about preserving this wonderful program, I am saying ''What State of denial do you live in?'' because it is certainly not working in Arizona. In fact, Pinal County in Arizona briefly held the unfortunate distinction as the only county in America without a single insurer willing to offer plans on its exchange, not a single one. Fortunately, a few months later, one stepped in—just one. Of the plans that were ultimately made available to Arizonans on the exchange, the average policy came with a premium hike of nearly 50 percent—an average of nearly 50 percent. With only one game in town, there was no shopping around for a better deal.

To help put this in perspective, I would like to compare the average cost of health care coverage in Arizona to one of the most important purchases a family will ever make, and that is a home. Throughout most counties in Arizona, it is now cheaper to put a roof over your family's head than it is to pay your monthly health insurance premium under ObamaCare.

Let me say that again. Throughout most counties in Arizona, it is now cheaper to put a roof over your family's head than it is to pay your monthly health insurance premium under ObamaCare. This is for Maricopa County. It is the county in which I live and includes Phoenix. Homeowners can expect to pay nearly $500 more per month on their health insurance than they do on their house—$500 more on their health insurance than they do on their house. This is for the ObamaCare silver plan premium. This is a family—age 40 with two children. So that's about the median, and this is the median mortgage payment with respect to Maricopa County—$500 more.

Let's see the visual for Pima County. Pima County is home to Tucson. Health care premiums ran an average family $100 more per month than their mortgage. So in Pima County you are still paying more—$100 more for your health insurance premium than you are for your mortgage.

Then there is Pinal County, the third largest in Arizona. According to Arizona's Department of Insurance, the average premium for a silver plan in Pinal County for the average family of four is over $1700. That is double the median monthly mortgage payment for the same county. If you live in Pinal County, AZ, you are paying twice as much for your health insurance premium.

Keep in mind, we are talking about the premium, to say nothing of what happens when you go to the hospital or to your doctor and you have to pay deductibles that are through the roof or co-pays that people have never experienced before. So when they utilize that coverage they paid for with their premium, they realize they can't afford that either.

The situation isn't unique to these counties, the three most populous counties in Arizona. In all 15 of Arizona's counties, premiums for a family of 4 dramatically exceed the median monthly mortgage.

It is unacceptable for the Federal Government to force families to spend upwards of $1,700 per month of their hard-earned income on a substandard product without options or choices, only to then slap them with a draconian penalty that they simply can't afford to pay for an untenable law.

Arizona is, without a doubt, ground zero for the structural failures that are plaguing insurance markets around the country. Insurance exchanges are on the verge of collapsing; premiums, deductibles, out-of-pocket expenses are skyrocketing; and our health care system is in desperate need of reform. That is why I stand here today to introduce the Health Savings Account Expansion Act.

The Health Savings Account Expansion Act goes a long way toward reforming our health care system by putting consumers back in charge of their own health care. The bill provides individuals and families with freedom to choose the health care that best meets their needs and allows them to use their health savings accounts on medical products and services they value most.

HSAs give consumers greater control over their health care dollars by providing them with a tax-advantaged savings option for their medical expenses. This means that the dollars they work so hard to save can grow over time, tax free, and can be withdrawn tax free for qualified medical expenses. The HSA Expansion Act strengthens this important tool by nearly tripling the arbitrarily low contribution limits, thus allowing for greater tax equity and more universal participation in HSAs. The bill would then allow individuals to use these expanded HSAs to help cover the costs of their monthly health insurance premiums. This is a critically important feature, particularly for middle-class families whose incomes fall slightly above the qualified threshold for subsidies but whose health insurance has become unaffordable.

In Arizona, I like to go to the gym in the morning, and I like to get on an exercise bike. By that bike is kind of a hallway where people will walk by. Inevitably, in the morning, I will have a lineup of people who will stand to tell me their ObamaCare horror stories—how much their premiums have gone up or that they no longer have any options or that they have had to pay the penalty or that when they go to utilize their care, they simply can't afford the co-pays and deductibles. I can tell you, it is sobering to hear these stories again and again and again.

In addition to further incentivizing prudent savings for health expenses, this legislation repeals existing restrictions put in place by ObamaCare on over-the-counter medications while also reducing the penalty for withdrawing HSA funds for nonqualified purchases. These reforms will help streamline HSAs while also making them more user-friendly for consumers.

Arizonans are struggling. They are struggling under the weight of bureaucracy that is complicating their health care decisions that are some of the most personal and important decisions individuals make for themselves and their families. If we hope to lift that burden off the backs of our constituents, we have to recognize that the key to reforming our health care system is not more government intervention; rather, it is allowing individuals the freedom to take back control of their health care and incentivizing prudent decisionmaking.

As the Senate looks to repeal this disastrous law and replace it with real reforms that would successfully lower health care costs and improve choice, I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that this legislation is included in those negotiations.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. FLAKE)):

S. 30. A bill to extend the civil statute of limitations for victims of Federal sex offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Extending Justice for Sex Crime Victims Act, a bill to extend the time for minors to seek justice against their perpetrators.

Sex crimes committed against children tragically remain a vile and dangerous reality in communities across this country.

Just this past summer, as the world tuned into the 2016 Olympic Games in Rio de Janeiro, the Indianapolis Star reported that USA Gymnastics had failed to report to law enforcement allegations of child sexual abuse committed by some of its coaches.

Due to these purported failures, athletes as young as 7 years old were reported to have been abused for years, without any action taken to prevent the abuse.

Since the initial Indianapolis Star report, more and more young gymnasts have come forward about their abuse.

All over the world, and all over this country, sex abuse victims are bravely coming forward to tell their stories of abuse when they were children.

In my home state of California, numerous victims have contacted my office. They have shared the amount of courage and strength it took to finally come forward with their experiences.

These stories represent an untold amount of pain and suffering. They also represent how difficult it is to come forward until later, in adulthood.

It has been estimated that 90 percent of child sex crime victims never go to the authorities concerning their abuse.

To put this into context, studies indicate that at least one in four girls and about one in five boys is sexually abused. 90 percent of those victims never go to the authorities.

A great number of victims don't ever disclose their abuse. If they do, they do not come forward until many years later, after reaching adulthood.

This bill extends the civil statute of limitations in two ways for minor victims of Federal sex crimes to seek justice against their perpetrators.

For one, the bill extends the statute of limitations for minor victims until the age of 28, from age 21, for injuries stemming from sex crimes such as sexual abuse and child pornography.

Second, for the two laws that provide civil remedies for sex abuse and sex trafficking victims, the bill clarifies that the statute of limitations does not begin to run until after the victim actually discovers the injury or the violation.

This is significant because victims of sex crimes are sometimes abused even before they can remember the abuse, some as young as 3 years old. Some victims are unable to connect their abuse to the injurious symptoms they exhibit throughout their lives.

The bill therefore clarifies that the limitations period begins when the victim first discovers the injury or the violation.

Through these provisions, the bill ensures that minor victims have an extended period to seek justice against their perpetrators after discovering their injury or violation.

I want to thank Senator CORNYN again for working so closely with me on this issue. I also want to thank the cosponsors to this bill: Senators KLOBUCHAR, INHOFE, FRANKEN, FLAKE, GILLIBRAND, TILLIS, and MARKEY.

I also want to acknowledge the support for this bill from the National Center for Victims of Crime, Rape Abuse & Incest National Network, the National Children's Advocacy Center, SGS for Healing, National Crime Victim Law Institute, National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators, National Network to End Domestic Violence, Stop the Silence, PROTECT, the National Association to Protect Children, Rights4Girls, End Rape on Campus, National Children's Alliance, Lauren's Kids, Minnesota Coalition Against Sexual Assault, and Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests.

By Mr. WYDEN (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. HARRIS)):

S. 31. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill, the West Coast Ocean Protection Act, which would amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit the Department of the Interior from issuing a lease for offshore oil or gas in federal waters off the coast of California, Oregon, or Washington.

I am pleased to be joined today by Senators WYDEN, MERKLEY, CANTWELL, MURRAY, and HARRIS in sponsoring this bill, which has been reintroduced in every Congress since 2010.

The original impetus for this bill was the Deepwater Horizon catastrophe in the Gulf of Mexico in April of 2010, which demonstrated yet again the risks of offshore oil and gas extraction.

When the Deepwater Horizon well blew out, 11 people died and 17 others were injured. Oil and gas rushed into the Gulf of Mexico for 87 days.

Oil slicks spread across the Gulf of Mexico, tar balls spoiled the pristine white sand beaches of Florida, wetlands were coated with toxic sludge, and more than one-third of federal waters in the Gulf were closed to fishing.

While Deepwater Horizon served as an important reminder, the dangers of offshore oil and gas were already too well known to Californians. In 1969, the Santa Barbara oil spill leaked up to 100,000 barrels of oil, and remains the third largest oil spill in the country to this day.

Like the Deepwater Horizon, the Santa Barbara oil spill was caused by a natural gas blowout when pressure in the drill hole fluctuated.

It took 11 days to plug the hole with mud and cement, but oil and gas continued to seep for months.

Using containment technologies still in place today, the cleanup effort relied on skimmers, detergent, and booms.

There has been no new drilling in waters controlled by the State of California since then, and there has been no new drilling in Federal waters off the coast of California since 1981.

Appropriately, the most recent plan from the Department of the Interior for Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing will not allow new leasing off the Pacific Coast of California, Oregon or Washington through 2022.

The fact is that those of us on the Pacific coast do not want any further offshore oil or gas development.

In 2012 California's 19 coastal counties generated $662 billion in wages and $1.7 trillion in GDP. This accounts for 80 percent of the economic activity in the State.

California's Ocean economy, including tourism, recreation, and marine transportation, accounts for over 489,000 jobs.

Unlike other areas of the country, any potential fossil fuel resources off the coast of California are likely to be found within only 50 miles of the coast, because of the narrow shelf off the California coast. This means that any potential drilling, and any potential spills, would be in direct conflict with the ocean environment and economy that my state enjoys.

Enacting a permanent ban on offshore drilling would protect our coast for generations to come.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 6—OBJECTING TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2334 AND TO ALL EFFORTS THAT UNDERMINE DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE PALESTINIANS FOR A SECURE AND PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. COONS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 6

Whereas it is long-standing policy of the United States Government that a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict must come through direct, bilateral negotiations without preconditions for a sustainable two-state solution;

Whereas President Barack Obama expressed before the United Nations General Assembly in 2011 that ''peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations—if it were that easy, it would have been accomplished by now'';

Whereas Yasser Arafat committed by letter dated September 9, 1993, to then Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, ''The PLO commits itself to the Middle East peace process and to the peaceful resolution of the conflict between the two sides and declares that all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved by negotiation.'';

Whereas the United Nations has taken a long-standing biased approach towards Israel, confirmed in outgoing Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon's final address to the United Nations Security Council, when he described the ''disproportionate'' volume of resolutions targeting Israel and stated that ''decades of political maneuvering have created a disproportionate number of resolutions, reports, and committees against Israel'';

Whereas the United Nations is not the appropriate venue and should not be a forum used for seeking unilateral action, recognition, or dictating parameters for a two-state solution, including the status of Jerusalem;

Whereas it is long-standing practice of the United States Government to oppose and veto any United Nations Security Council resolution dictating terms, conditions, and timelines on the peace process;

Whereas it is also the historic position of the United States Government to oppose and veto one-sided or anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas efforts to impose a solution or parameters for a solution will make negotiations more difficult and will set back the cause of peace;

Whereas the Obama Administration's decision not to veto United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 (2016) is inconsistent with long-standing United States policy and makes direct negotiations more, not less, challenging;

Whereas several United States administrations have articulated principles as a vision for achieving a two-state solution, including addressing borders, mutual recognition, refugees, Jerusalem, and ending all outstanding claims;

Whereas Israel is a vibrant democracy whose leaders are elected and accountable to the Israeli people; and

Whereas the Palestinian Authority must engage in broad, meaningful, and systemic reforms in order to ultimately prepare its institutions and people for statehood and peaceful coexistence with Israel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses grave objection to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 (2016);

(2) calls for United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be repealed or fundamentally altered so that it is no longer one-sided and allows all final status issues toward a two-state solution to be resolved through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties;

(3) rejects efforts by outside bodies, including the United Nations Security Council, to impose solutions from the outside that set back the cause of peace;

(4) demands that the United States ensure that no action is taken at the Paris Conference on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict scheduled for January 15, 2017, that imposes an agreement or parameters on the parties;

(5) notes that granting membership and statehood standing to the Palestinians at the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other international institutions outside of the context of a bilateral peace agreement with Israel would cause severe harm to the peace process, and would likely trigger the implementation of penalties under sections 7036 and 7041(j) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016 (division K of Public Law 114–113);

(6) rejects any efforts by the United Nations, United Nations agencies, United Nations member states, and other international organizations to use United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to further isolate Israel through economic or other boycotts or any other measures, and urges the United States Government to take action where needed to counter any attempts to use United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to further isolate Israel;

(7) urges the current presidential administration and all future presidential administrations to uphold the practice of vetoing all United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to insert the Council into the peace process, recognize unilateral Palestinian actions including declaration of a Palestinian state, or dictate terms and a timeline for a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict;

(8) reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States to continue to seek a sustainable, just, and secure two-state solution to resolve the conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians; and

(9) urges the incoming Administration to work with Congress to create conditions that facilitate the resumption of direct, bilateral negotiations without preconditions between Israelis and Palestinians with the goal of achieving a sustainable agreement that is acceptable to both sides.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4—CLARIFYING ANY POTENTIAL MISUNDERSTANDING AS TO WHETHER ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT-ELECT DONALD TRUMP CONSTITUTE A VIOLATION OF THE EMOLUMENTS CLAUSE, AND CALLING ON PRESIDENT-ELECT TRUMP TO DIVEST HIS INTEREST IN, AND SEVER HIS RELATIONSHIP TO, THE TRUMP ORGANIZATION

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 4

Whereas article I, section 9, clause 8 of the United States Constitution (commonly known as the ''Emoluments Clause'') declares, ''No title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or

Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.'';

Whereas, according to the remarks of Governor Edmund Randolph at the 1787 Constitutional Convention, the Emoluments Clause ''was thought proper, in order to exclude corruption and foreign influence, to prohibit any one in office from receiving or holding any emoluments from foreign states'';

Whereas the issue of foreign corruption greatly concerned the Founding Fathers of the United States, such that Alexander Hamilton in Federalist No. 22 wrote, ''In republics, persons elevated from the mass of the community, by the suffrages of their fellow-citizens, to stations of great pre-eminence and power, may find compensations for betraying their trust, which, to any but minds animated and guided by superior virtue, may appear to exceed the proportion of interest they have in the common stock, and to overbalance the obligations of duty. Hence it is that history furnishes us with so many mortifying examples of the prevalency of foreign corruption in republican governments.'';

Whereas the President of the United States is the head of the executive branch of the Federal Government and is expected to have undivided loyalty to the United States, and clearly occupies an ''office of profit or trust'' within the meaning of article I, section 9, clause 8 of the Constitution, according to the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice;

Whereas the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice opined in 2009 that corporations owned or controlled by a foreign government are presumptively foreign states under the Emoluments Clause;

Whereas President-elect Donald J. Trump has a business network, the Trump Organization, that has financial interests around the world and negotiates and concludes transactions with foreign states and entities that are extensions of foreign states;

Whereas Michael Cohen, an attorney for Donald J. Trump and the Trump Organization, initially stated that the Trump Organization would be placed into a ''blind trust'' managed by Donald Trump's children, Donald Trump, Jr., Ivanka Trump, and Eric Trump;

Whereas the very nature of a ''blind trust'' is such that the official will have no control over, will receive no communications about, and will have no knowledge of the identity of the specific assets held in the trust, and that the manager of the trust is independent of the owner, and as such the arrangement proposed by Mr. Cohen is not a blind trust;

Whereas, on November 30, 2016, President-elect Donald J. Trump announced on Twitter that ''I will be holding a major news conference in New York City with my children on December 15 to discuss the fact that I will be leaving my great business in total in order to fully focus on running the country in order to MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN!'';

Whereas, on December 12, 2016, President-elect Donald J. Trump abruptly canceled the planned December 15, 2016 news conference, and has provided no set date for a future announcement;

Whereas, on December 12, 2016, President-elect Donald J. Trump stated on Twitter, ''Even though I am not mandated by law to do so, I will be leaving my busineses [sic] before January 20th so that I can focus full time on the Presidency. Two of my children, Don and Eric, plus executives, will manage them. No new deals will be done during my term(s) in office'';

Whereas numerous legal and constitutional experts, including several former White House ethics counsels, have made clear that, notwithstanding the problems inherent in temporarily ceding control of the Trump Organization to his children, such an arrangement, in which the President-elect fails to exit the ownership of his businesses through use of a blind trust or equivalent, will leave the President-elect with a personal financial interest in businesses that collect foreign government payments and benefits, which raises both constitutional and public interest concerns;

Whereas Presidents Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, William J. Clinton, and George W. Bush have set the precedent of using true blind trusts, in which their holdings were liquidated and placed in new investments unknown to them by an independent trustee who managed them free of familial bias;

Whereas the continued intermingling of the business of the Trump Organization and the work of government has the potential to constitute the foreign corruption so feared by the Founding Fathers and to betray the trust of America's citizens;

Whereas the intent of this resolution is to prevent any potential misunderstanding or crisis with regards to whether the actions of Donald J. Trump as President of the United States will violate the Emoluments Clause of the Constitution, Federal law, or fundamental principles of ethics; and

Whereas Congress has an institutional, constitutional obligation to ensure that the President of the United States does not violate the Emoluments Clause and is discharging the obligations of office based on the national interest, not based on personal interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) calls upon President-elect Donald J. Trump to follow the precedent established by prior Presidents and convert his assets to simple, conflict-free holdings, adopt blind trusts managed by an independent trustee with no relationship to Donald J. Trump or his businesses, or take other equivalent measures, in order to ensure compliance with the Emoluments Clause of the United States Constitution;

(2) calls upon President-elect Donald J. Trump not to use the powers or opportunities of his position as President-elect or President of the United States for any purpose related to the Trump Organization; and

(3) regards, in the absence of such actions outlined in paragraph (1) or specific authorization by Congress, dealings that Donald J. Trump, as President of the United States, may have through his companies with foreign governments or entities owned or controlled by foreign governments as potential violations of the Emoluments Clause.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, it is with a renewed sense of purpose that I reintroduce my resolution on the Emoluments Clause. It is a resolution intended to uphold the values and strictures of one of our most sacred documents. I am referring, of course, to the Constitution, the instrument that, in but a short time, President-elect Donald Trump will take an oath to preserve, protect, and defend.

Our Founding Fathers could not have been clearer that any Federal office holder of the United States must never be put in a position where he or she could be influenced by a foreign governmental actor. It was a concern made explicit by Alexander Hamilton's writings in Federalist No. 22, in which he noted examples of republics that had been ruthlessly dismembered by their hostile neighbors who had paralyzed the victim republic by bribing its officers and officials.

The Founding Fathers addressed this grave concern by placing the Emoluments Clause within the Constitution as an explicit bar on foreign corruption and interference. Article I, section 9, clause 8 of the United States Constitution declares that:

> No title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

Longstanding precedent has made it plain that the President of the United States, as the head of the executive branch of the government, clearly occupies an ''office of profit or trust''. As such, the Emoluments Clause clearly applies to and constrains whomever holds the office of the Presidency.

Past American presidents have recognized the danger of foreign corruption and interference, or merely the perception of corruption and interference, and have accordingly taken great pains to avoid even the appearance of impropriety with regard to their personal wealth and investments, ensuring that such investments never interfere with performing their duties as President of the United States. Presidents Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George Herbert Walker Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush all had their assets placed into blind trust while they were President. To fulfill his promises of greater government transparency, President Obama went even further and invested the vast majority of his funds in U.S. Treasury bonds.

The President-elect has claimed he will ''absolutely sever'' his ties to the Trump Organization, which has financial interests around the world and negotiates and concludes transactions with foreign states, as well as entities that are extensions of foreign states. We have a constitutional duty to ensure that he does. It is easy to imagine circumstances in which a foreign government will want to give President Trump a personal gift through his businesses with the intent to curry favor with him and seek to influence his decisions in ways that benefit them, instead of the American people—precisely the danger our Founding Fathers sought to protect against with the Emoluments Clause.

This is not an esoteric argument about rules that do not affect real people. Put simply, the American public has a right to know that the President of the United States is always acting in their best interest, and not take the risk that his actions are influenced by some benefit or gift from a foreign government like Russia or China. The citizens of this country need to know that when the President of the United States is making decisions about potential trade agreements, sending troops into war, or spending America's great resources, those actions are motivated by the public interest, and not because they might advance or harm

the President's private pecuniary interests.

We should be concerned when the President-elect is connected to an organization that has dealings with countries and entities that are not interested in distinguishing between doing business with President Trump and the profit-making organization that bears his name. The President-elect's failure thus far to dispose of his business interests in a comprehensive fashion has left this door wide open, and we are already seeing indications that foreign companies and businesses are beginning to take advantage. Kuwait's National Day event, which has traditionally been held at the Four Seasons in Washington, D.C., was moved to the Trump International Hotel, allegedly because of pressure—or perhaps merely a suggestion—from the President-elect's associates. Similarly, Bahrain has chosen to schedule an event to take place at the Trump International Hotel.

News reports suggest that one day after a phone call between President-elect Trump and the President of Argentina, permits under review for the Trump building in Buenos Aires were suddenly approved. In China, just days after the presidential election, Donald Trump scored a legal victory in a decade-long trademark dispute over the right to use the Trump name for real estate agent services in commercial and residential properties in China. The timing of these actions is interesting, to put it mildly.

I sincerely regret the necessity of reintroducing this resolution. Just after Thanksgiving, when President-elect Trump held a press conference to state that on December 15, 2016, he would make an announcement about his future with the Trump Organization, I publicly said how encouraged I was to see the President-elect's positive response. When I first introduced this resolution, my intent was to create an opportunity for the President-elect to act and remove this as an issue, so that he could put aside any appearance of impropriety and devote himself to good work on behalf of the American people. That is why I was disappointed when Mr. Trump abruptly canceled his December 15 announcement—and, as of today, he has not yet rescheduled it. This issue is far too critical to kick the can down the road, or to ignore, before an incipient violation of the Constitution becomes an actual violation.

Even before Mr. Trump's cancellation of his December 15 announcement, I was deeply concerned by statements he and his lawyers made with regard to the disposition of his numerous business interests. Mr. Trump's lawyers had initially announced that the Trump Organization would be placed into a ''blind trust'' managed by Donald Trump's older children. That arrangement is, unfortunately, by its terms the complete opposite of an actual blind trust. An actual blind trust is an arrangement which the official has no control over, will receive no communications about, and will have no knowledge of the identity of the specific assets being held, and in which the trust's manager operates independently of the owner.

Around the same time President-elect Trump cancelled his December 15th announcement, he tweeted another idea for disposition of his businesses, stating that ''[t]wo of my children, Don and Eric, plus executives, will manage them. No new deals will be done during my term(s) in office''. Let me be absolutely clear: the arrangement tweeted by Mr. Trump is not sufficient and is hardly independent. Mr. Trump would be well-aware of the specific assets held, and he could receive communications about and take actions to affect the value of those assets. The idea that President-elect Trump's children, who are listed as members of his transition team and have already been present at meetings or phone calls with foreign leaders, can ever be truly ''independent managers'' is simply not a credible resolution of this concern.

This inadequate suggested arrangement is not a blind trust and will not ensure compliance with the Emoluments Clause of the United States Constitution. Indeed, numerous legal and constitutional experts, including Richard Painter, a former adviser to George W. Bush, have made clear that such an arrangement will leave the President-elect with a personal financial interest in businesses that collect foreign government payments and benefits. The notion that the American people should be satisfied by an unbinding promise that no new deals will be pursued—a promise that does not define what constitutes a ''deal'' and which can be reneged on at any time—does not pass the laugh test.

I must admit, I have also been quite disturbed and disappointed by the recent excuses and suggestions by surrogate speakers and supporters of the President-elect as to why no action need be taken and, indeed, by statements the President-elect has made himself. President-elect Trump has tweeted, [p]rior to the election it was well known that I have interests in properties all over the world.'' This is undoubtedly true. But the American people, in voting for a candidate, cannot—and, in fact, would not—want to excuse a potential future violation of the Constitution by that candidate. Indeed, I would say that President-elect Trump has this idea backwards. Prior to the election, he was well aware of the fact that he had interests in unique properties all over the world. Since the President-elect has referred to himself as ''a constitutionalist,'' he must have known of the importance of complying with the Constitution by severing his foreign business connections in advance of his inauguration, which makes his continued failure and delay on this front all the more inexplicable.

On November 22nd, President-elect Trump stated, ''The law's totally on my side, meaning, the president can't have a conflict of interest.'' This regrettable statement selectively picks facts and shows a troubling disregard for the Constitution and for the duties owed to the American people. While the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and Federal judges may be granted specific, limited exemptions from conflicts of interest so that they may act and carry out their duties, that law does not supersede the Constitution nor, frankly, have anything to do with the very specific provisions of the Emoluments Clause, which are intended to prevent foreign governmental financial influence over the President.

Even as some of the President-elect's most trusted surrogates have acknowledged that the potential ethics challenges facing President-elect Trump are ''a very real problem,'' they have persisted in arguing that Mr. Trump is somehow exempt from constitutional strictures, and even from the temptation of corruption itself, by virtue of his great wealth. For example, former Speaker Gingrich has claimed ''that this is a new situation we've never seen before, and the rules [that] were written for people who were dramatically less successful literally do not work,'' while Mr. Trump's leading candidate to head the administration's Council of Economic Advisors has claimed that ''[w]ealthy folks have no need to steal or engage in corruption.'' Really? That is a transparently false idea that one does not have to look very far to disprove. We need only glance at the countries where the Trump Organization has done business—places like Russia, Azerbaijan, Argentina, and Nigeria—to find numerous examples of already-wealthy government officials who have used their positions to lie, cheat, extort, and further enrich themselves and their families at the expense of the people they are supposed to be serving.

It was the enduring wisdom of our Founders to recognize that America is not magically immune from the corruption problems in other countries, and that not all men are angels. This is why we place our trust in the Constitution, not in individuals. A man with more wealth and extensive foreign holdings than prior presidents is, by an order of magnitude, more vulnerable to foreign corruption and interference than any president before him. The Emoluments Clause has greater bearing on Mr. Trump's presidency than his predecessors, not less.

No man can gain such wealth and power that he outgrows the limits of our Constitution. John Adams said it best: ''We are a government of laws, and not of men.'' No matter our political or partisan sympathies, we all recognize that the Constitution is the law of the land, and that when the needs and ambitions of any man conflicts with the Constitution, the Constitution must win out.

It has also been suggested by some of Donald Trump's supporters that the

Emoluments Clause does not actually apply to the office of the Presidency. Not only does this conflict with longstanding understanding of the Emoluments Clause in the Executive Branch, it contravenes both the strict interpretation of the plain words of the Constitution, as well as the traditional values and practices adopted by previous presidents.

To get around the ethics challenges facing Mr. Trump, it has been suggested by the President-elect's supporters that a panel of five ''experts'' regularly monitor the Trump Organization businesses and tell the President ''don't go over these bounds''. It has even been suggested that the President-elect can simply sidestep ethics issues that clearly violate the law by pardoning advisors ''if anyone finds them to have behaved against the rules''. These 'ideas' are non-starters that cut dangerously against the plain intent of the Emoluments Clause. I am afraid they show a disregard for the values of our Constitution.

The solution to this problem is simple, not complex, and is set forth by my resolution: President-elect Trump has only to follow the precedents established by prior presidents and convert his assets to simple, conflict-free holdings; adopt blind trusts managed by truly independent trustees with no relationship to Mr. Trump or his businesses; or to take other, equivalent measures. This solution also has the benefit of having been successfully implemented by every modem president before Mr. Trump.

This resolution and its aims should not be viewed through the distorting prism of politics. I want the Trump administration to have the support from Congress to succeed on behalf of the American people. Nevertheless, I believe that Congress has an institutional, constitutional obligation to ensure that the President of the United States, whoever that person may be, does not violate our Constitution, acts lawfully, and is discharging the obligations of the office based on the broad interests of the American people and not his or her own narrow, personal interests.

Despite the late hour—just days before the inauguration—it is still possible for President-elect Trump to live up to the values of the Constitution, give the American people the transparency they deserve, and completely sever his relationship with the Trump Organization before he takes the oath of office on January 20, 2017. To do so would avoid a constitutional crisis that would not serve the best interests of the President, Congress, or the American people. Therefore, I ask for prompt, bipartisan support to advance this vital resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 7. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.
Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the Senate.
Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health care legislation.
Sec. 3002. Reserve fund for health care legislation.

TITLE IV—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 4001. Enforcement filing.
Sec. 4002. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.
Sec. 4003. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 4004. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2026:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: $2,682,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,787,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,884,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,012,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,131,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,262,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,402,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,556,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,727,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,903,628,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: $0.
Fiscal year 2018: $0.
Fiscal year 2019: $0.
Fiscal year 2020: $0.
Fiscal year 2021: $0.
Fiscal year 2022: $0.
Fiscal year 2023: $0.
Fiscal year 2024: $0.
Fiscal year 2025: $0.
Fiscal year 2026: $0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: $3,308,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,227,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,104,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,177,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,152,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,091,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,216,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,203,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,091,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,127,000,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,265,000,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: $582,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $477,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $409,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $314,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $232,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $140,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $41,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: −$68,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: −$191,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: −$314,150,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: $20,034,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,719,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,326,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,018,470,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: $22,775,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,596,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $24,553,462,050,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $25,523,091,900,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $26,431,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $27,445,091,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2017: $14,593,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $15,151,404,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,734,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,428,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $17,210,990,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $18,087,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $19,083,597,410,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $20,105,084,600,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $21,151,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $22,324,428,000,000.

SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2017 through 2026 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $623,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $603,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $618,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $601,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $632,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $648,198,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $632,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $663,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $646,853,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $679,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $666,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $696,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $678,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $713,664,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $689,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $731,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $711,423,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $750,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $729,616,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $61,996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $60,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $61,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $60,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $61,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $62,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $64,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $65,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $67,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $68,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,305,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $31,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,978,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $34,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $35,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $36,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $37,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $38,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,393,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $39,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,238,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $4,773,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $4,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,495,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $4,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,058,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $4,975,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $5,109,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $4,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $3,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $3,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $5,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,124,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $41,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $43,738,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $44,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,201,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $47,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $48,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $49,403,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $50,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $51,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $53,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,915,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $25,214,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $26,148,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $23,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $22,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $22,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $22,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $23,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $23,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $23,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $23,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,192,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $14,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $16,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $18,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $15,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $14,821,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $15,408,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $15,739,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $16,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $17,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $17,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,238,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $92,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $94,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,214,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $96,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,683,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $91,199,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $92,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $93,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $94,118,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $103,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $95,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $96,209,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $97,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,188,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $19,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,457,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $19,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $20,384,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $20,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $21,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $21,756,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,787,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $22,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $22,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,037,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $104,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $108,980,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $112,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $112,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $110,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $114,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $113,377,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $116,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,591,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $119,027,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $121,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $123,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $122,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $126,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $128,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,748,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $562,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $583,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $593,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $615,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $618,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $655,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $645,814,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $677,902,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $676,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $711,176,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $709,301,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $744,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $742,568,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $780,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $778,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $818,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $815,246,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $857,176,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $853,880,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $600,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $600,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $600,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $667,638,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $667,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $716,676,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $716,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $767,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $767,814,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $862,042,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $861,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $886,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $886,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $903,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $903,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $1,007,624,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,007,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $1,085,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,085,173,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $518,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $511,658,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $524,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $511,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $542,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $534,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $558,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $549,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $571,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $563,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $590,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $599,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $592,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $609,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $597,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $630,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $619,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $646,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $641,957,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $37,199,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,227,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $40,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,627,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,035,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $57,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $61,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $66,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $70,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,376,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $177,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $182,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $178,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $179,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $193,088,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $192,198,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $199,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $198,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $206,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $205,667,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $223,542,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $222,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $221,861,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $219,382,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $218,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $237,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $236,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $245,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $244,228,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $64,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $62,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $62,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $64,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $65,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $66,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $68,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $70,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $72,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $79,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,205,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $25,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,318,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $27,095,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $27,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $28,312,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $29,046,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $29,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $30,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $31,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $31,942,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $32,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,071,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $393,295,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $393,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $453,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $453,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $526,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $590,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $590,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $645,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $645,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $698,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $698,101,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $755,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $755,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $806,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $806,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $854,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $854,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $903,443,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $903,443,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,849,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$56,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$39,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$55,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$47,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$58,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$61,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$57,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$63,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$60,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$65,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$62,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, −$67,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$64,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, −$70,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$66,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, −$69,097,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$68,467,000,000.
(20) New Efficiencies, Consolidations, and Other Savings (930):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$122,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$64,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$486,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$293,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$602,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$476,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$795,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$651,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,097,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$895,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,121,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,031,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,270,830,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,154,668,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,635,520,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,409,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,833,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,647,543,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, −$87,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$87,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, −$88,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$88,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, −$80,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$80,125,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, −$81,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$81,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, −$84,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$84,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, −$87,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$87,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, −$91,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$91,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, −$99,164,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$99,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, −$97,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$97,786,000,000.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2017: $826,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $857,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $886,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $918,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $950,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $984,537,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,020,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $1,058,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $1,097,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $1,138,243,000,000.
(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:
Fiscal year 2017: $805,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $857,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $916,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $980,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $1,049,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $1,123,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $1,200,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $1,281,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $1,369,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $1,463,057,000,000.
(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $5,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $6,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $6,205,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $6,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $6,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $6,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $6,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $7,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $7,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,387,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $7,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,615,000,000.

SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $325,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $337,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $373,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(b) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than January 27, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving all such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(b) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than $1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the House of Representatives, not later than January 27, 2017, the committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 3001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and, in the Senate, make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for—

(1) in the Senate, one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, conference reports, or motions related to health care by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026; and

(2) in the House of Representatives, one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, or conference reports related to health care by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SEC. 3002. RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and, in the Senate, make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for—

(1) in the Senate, one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, conference reports, or motions related to health care by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, provided that the cost of such legislation, when combined with the cost of any other measure with respect to which the Chairman has exercised the authority under this paragraph, does not exceed the difference obtained by subtracting—

(A) $2,000,000,000; from

(B) the sum of deficit reduction over the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026 achieved under any measure or measures with respect to which the Chairman has exercised the authority under section 3001(1); and

(2) in the House of Representatives, one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, or conference reports related to health care by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, provided that the cost of such legislation, when combined with the cost of any other measure with respect to which the Chairman has exercised the authority under this paragraph, does not exceed the difference obtained by subtracting—

(A) $2,000,000,000; from

(B) the sum of deficit reduction over the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026 achieved under any measure or measures with respect to which the Chairman has exercised the authority under section 3001(2).

(b) EXCEPTIONS FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, and section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the applicable House has exercised the authority under subsection (a).

TITLE IV—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 4001. ENFORCEMENT FILING.

(a) IN THE SENATE.—If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2017 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2017, 2017 through 2021, and 2017 through 2026 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633).

(b) IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In the House of Representatives, if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017 is adopted without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses with respect to this concurrent resolution on the budget, for the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act and applicable rules and requirements set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget, the allocations provided for in this subsection shall apply in the House of Representatives in the same manner as if such allocations were in a joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on the budget for fiscal year 2017. The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2017 consistent with title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations consistent with title I for fiscal year 2017 and for the period of fiscal years 2017 through 2026 for the purpose of enforcing 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633).

SEC. 4002. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget, or a statement filed under section 4001 shall include in an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations of the applicable House of Congress amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the Senate and the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)), estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 4003. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the applicable House of Congress.

(d) AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement, the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be

subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress).

SEC. 4004. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either the Senate or the House of Representatives to change those rules (insofar as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate or House of Representatives.

SA 2. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING ANY LIFETIME LIMITS ON HEALTH CARE COVERAGE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports, relating to preventing any lifetime limits on health care coverage, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 3. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING ANY LOSS OF CERTAIN HEALTH CARE SUBSIDIES UNTIL A REPLACEMENT LAW THAT PROVIDES AT LEAST THE SAME HEALTH CARE COVERAGE, HEALTH CARE AFFORDABILITY, AND COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE BENEFITS IS SIGNED INTO LAW.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports, relating to preventing any loss of subsidies that were authorized for individuals under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (including amendments made that Act) until a law that establishes a replacement plan that provides the same or a greater level of access to health care coverage, health care affordability, and comprehensive health care benefits is signed into law by the President, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 4. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONTINUED FEDERAL FUNDING FOR MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO NEWLY ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that Federal funding for medical assistance provided by States under the Medicaid program to low-income, non-elderly individuals under the eligibility option established by the Affordable Care Act in section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII)) remains available to the same extent that such funding was available for fiscal year 2016 until a replacement plan that provides such individuals with the same or greater level of access to similarly affordable and comprehensive health care benefits is signed into law by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 5. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND PREVENTING TAX CUTS IN THE CASE OF THE LOSS OF HEALTH CARE COVERAGE DUE TO A REPEAL OF THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing tax cuts for corporations or for individuals with incomes equal to or greater than $250,000 if there is any loss of health care coverage for Americans as a result of the repeal of all or part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 6. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following;

SEC._____. BUDGET POINT OF ORDER ON CLOSING THE GAP IN COVERAGE IN THE MEDICARE PART D PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) provisions included in health reform legislation to close the gap in coverage (often referred to as the ''donut hole'') in the Medicare prescription drug program under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–101 et seq.) have saved over 5,000,000 seniors across the United States more than $5,000,000,000 and have increased access to lifesaving medications;

[(2) in Florida, 355,360 seniors saved $351,000,000, or an average of $987 per beneficiary, on prescription drugs in 2015; and]

(3) absent the protections provided by such provisions, seniors will have to choose between their health and other basic necessities, including food and housing.

(b) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any legislation that repeals the provisions included in health reform legislation to close the gap in coverage in the Medicare prescription drug program under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–101 et seq.).

SA 7. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC._____. BUDGET POINT OF ORDER ON CLOSING THE GAP IN COVERAGE IN THE MEDICARE PART D PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) provisions included in health reform legislation to close the gap in coverage (often referred to as the ''donut hole'') in the Medicare prescription drug program under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–10 et seq.) have saved over 5,000,000 seniors across the United States more than $5,000,000,000 and have increased access to lifesaving medications;

[(2) in Florida, 355,360 seniors saved $351,000,000, or an average of $987 per beneficiary, on prescription drugs in 2015; and]

(3) absent the protections provided by such provisions, seniors will have to choose between their health and other basic necessities, including food and housing.

(b) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any legislation that repeals the provisions included in health reform legislation to close the gap in coverage in the Medicare prescription drug program

under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–101 et seq.).

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Tara Shaw and Matt Giroux from my staff be given all-access floor passes to the Senate floor during consideration of the budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jenna Sablan and Natalie Rico, detailees to the Budget Committee, be granted floor privileges during the consideration of S. Con. Res. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mike Jones and Josh Smith from my staff be given all-access floor passes for the Senate floor during consideration of the budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, January 5; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:45 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 5, 2017, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

REBECCA EMILY RAPP, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 13 , 2019, VICE SHARON L. BROWNE, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GLENN FINE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VICE JON T. RYMER, RESIGNED.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

DAVID J. ARROYO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2022. (REAPPOINTMENT)

BRENT FRANKLIN NELSEN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2022. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

JESSICA ROSENWORCEL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 2015. (REAPPOINTMENT)

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

MICHAEL P. LEARY, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, VICE PATRICK P. O'CARROLL, JR., RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TULINABO SALAMA MUSHINGI, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA–BISSAU.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL

CAROLYN N. LERNER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE SPECIAL COUNSEL, OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL, FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

ELIZABETH A. FIELD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, VICE PATRICK E. MCFARLAND, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ROBERT P. STORCH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY. (NEW POSITION)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE LATE LAVELL EDWARDS

HON. JASON CHAFFETZ

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor legendary BYU football coach LaVell Edwards, who passed away December 29, 2016 at the age of 86.

During the 29 years he coached at Brigham Young University, Edwards transformed a team that had never been ranked or invited to a bowl game into a perpetual force in college football.

Best remembered for leading his team to a national championship in 1984, Edwards also racked up an impressive 257–103 win/loss record. His team won 20 conference championships and qualified for 22 bowl game appearances.

LaVell Edwards touched countless lives, including mine, in a profound and positive way. I feel so fortunate to be among the many young men Coach Edwards influenced and molded during his storied career at BYU. My life is forever changed by my experience as a place kicker on his team.

Upon retiring from BYU in 2000, Edwards and his wife Patti served a mission for the LDS Church in New York, where, in addition to his missionary role, Edwards was invited to put his talents to work coaching football to Harlem youth.

Coach Edwards leaves behind a legacy of success on the field and off. He was a man of integrity whose example his players all wanted to emulate. He is survived by his wife Patti and three children. He will be greatly missed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DAVID DRINKARD

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the passing of a very special person and dear friend of mine, David Drinkard.

David was a former art teacher at Warren High School in Warren, Texas and a renowned wildlife painter. We have been friends since attending Forest Park High School and Lamar University, in Beaumont, Texas. He was an expert at painting God's beautiful creations in nature. There is nothing prettier than a ''David Drinkard sky.'' His paintings hang in homes, businesses and galleries all over, including my own home and dental office.

David was a devout Christian, a loyal husband, father, grandfather and great grandfather. He was a strong conservative and an active conservationist, donating many paintings for auction to the Coastal Conservation Association and other groups to help raise funds for conservation projects and causes. He was an excellent hunter and probably ranked as one of the best fishermen with whom I ever had the privilege of casting a lure.

I am honored to have one of his paintings prominently displayed in my congressional office in Washington. It depicts David and me catching speckled trout on Sabine Lake in Texas. Some of my children and I even took art lessons from him in his hometown of Warren years ago. David Drinkard has a very special place in our hearts and we will miss him dearly.

David passed away on December 26, 2016. His wife Beverly and family will continue to be in our prayers.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN AVALOS

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor John Avalos for eight years of exemplary service on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. John has demonstrated remarkable leadership and collaboration in his efforts to improve the quality of life for all San Francisco residents and particularly those in District 11. He has been a tireless champion of affordable housing, social services, infrastructure and clean energy.

Representing District 11, one of San Francisco's most vibrant and diverse districts, John began his work on the board in 2008 at the height of the Great Recession. He served as the Chair of the Budget and Finance Committee leading San Francisco through the daunting process of closing a billion dollar budget hole while saving jobs and essential services for seniors and children. His commitment to jobs didn't stop with those early years. One of his recent pieces of legislation provided thousands of living wage jobs to San Francisco residents, earning him the reputation as a protector of working-class families.

John also introduced legislation protecting tenants of foreclosed properties and providing rental assistance for low-income families. His bill creating a real estate transfer tax has brought in $50 million in annual city revenue.

In his current role as the Chair of the Transportation Authority, Supervisor Avalos oversees the analysis, design and funding for long-term transportation planning for the city. In the City challenged by ever-increasing traffic congestion, John understands the impact on the quality of life and the necessity to create solutions. He is a staunch advocate of alternative modes of transportation and introduced the strongest employee bike access law in the country, the Bicycle Access and Safety Ordinance. It allows employees to bring their bikes into the office, creating an opportunity for thousands of people to ride their bicycles to work easing congestion, cutting emissions, improving air quality, and maximizing public transportation.

It was at John's urging that the Employees' Retirement System divested almost $600 million in holdings from the top 200 fossil fuel companies. He authored Citizens United Measure Prop G, a policy opposing corporate personhood which was overwhelmingly approved by voters. He has taken on financial fraud, launching an investigation in 2013 into the London InterBank Offered Rate fraud scandal and its impact on San Francisco.

Supervisor Avalos has been a fighter for justice, equality and fairness. As a third generation Mexican-American, one of seven siblings, and one of the first generation in his family to attend college, you can trace John's drive and ambition back to his early years. He moved to San Francisco in 1989 and immersed himself in education, organizing and protecting the rights of others. He earned a Master's Degree in Social Work from San Francisco State University and began his career as a counselor through the San Francisco Conservation Corps and the Columbia Park Boys and Girls Club. He then worked for Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth and for the Justice for Janitors Campaign of the Service Employees International Union.

During his time on the board of supervisors, John continued his work with many outstanding community groups in District 11 such as the OMI Community Collaborative, Excelsior Collaborative, Communities United for Health and Justice, and Coleman Advocates. He firmly believes that real change starts at a grassroots level.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to recognize Supervisor John Avalos for his outstanding public service to the residents of San Francisco, in his district and beyond. This champion of the people may leave San Francisco City Hall, but he will no doubt continue to shape life in the City for years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for roll call vote 3 on Tuesday, January 3, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

HONORING THE LIFE OF JAMES ''JIM'' HOWARD SHAW

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the life of James ''Jim''

Howard Shaw, a remarkable Texan who passed away on December 27, 2016 after a hard fought battle with cancer.

Jim's family has deep roots in Fort Worth, having moved there to open Shaw Brothers' Dairy in the late 1800s. Jim was born on September 12, 1950 to Bill and Betty Shaw. He attended Paschal High School where he was a stand-out track athlete, earning himself a scholarship to Louisiana Tech University. Jim hung up his cleats for law school at Texas Tech and began practicing law in 1975, briefly as a prosecutor and then in private practice as a defense attorney—a role he continued through the final months of his life.

Over his 41 years as a defense attorney, Jim earned the reputation of being a staunch protector of his clients' rights, representing each within the full bounds of the law. His colleagues recall that he would often get hired on a Sunday, pick a jury on Monday, and earn a favorable outcome by the end of the week. Jim loved the art of trying a case. Anyone who watched him in action would agree he was a master of his craft, making lasting friendships and inspiring his peers along the way.

When not in the courtroom, Jim could be found on the golf course at Colonial Country Club, behind home plate cheering on the Texas Rangers, or on a patio somewhere enjoying Mexican food. However, more than anything, Jim loved his family and spending genuine time with them. He is survived by his wife Carol; children James Shaw Jr., Ben Shaw, Tim Shaw, and his stepchildren Steven Prewitt and Aimee Plummer; 11 grandchildren; and his brothers Bill Shaw, David Shaw and Greg Shaw.

Jim Shaw's death leaves a great hole in the hearts of many, but his passion for the law and his kind heart will be felt for generations to come. Fort Worth was lucky to have him and is a better city because of his devotion to justice. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the life of Mr. Jim Shaw. May he rest in peace.

HONORING KAREN ERVIN

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Karen Ervin who served on the Pacifica City Council for four years, including 2015 as the mayor of this picturesque coastal town of about 40,000 residents. As a Pacifica native and lifelong resident, Karen understands and feels the pulse of her town. Even before her time on the council, she always volunteered and gave back to the community. It has been my privilege to work with Karen and to call her a friend.

During her term on the council, Karen served as the liaison to the Economic Development Committee, the Beautification Committee, Pacifica School Volunteers, Emergency Preparedness Task Force, and the Pacifica Resource Center. She also served as a member of the C/CAG Legislative Committee and the Bike and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, an Association of Bay Area Governments delegate, and a member of the San Mateo County Jobs/Housing Gap Task Force.

One of her top priorities was to improve the fiscal health of the city. Her experience on the Financing City Services Task Force helped her tackle the difficult task of balancing the budget and making it possible to fund numerous projects such as the acquisition of a property to finish the Devil's Slide Trail, the Pacifica Resource Center and the Pacifica Beach Coalition. An ERAF reserve fund was also essential in responding to severe damage Pacifica suffered during El Nino storms in the winter of 2015, damage that drew worldwide attention.

Karen loves her hometown and pursues every opportunity to improve the quality of life of all residents. She has been one of the main drivers to create a beautiful downtown along Palmetto Boulevard and to let the world know that Pacifica is a wonderful place to live, work, play, eat and thrive.

As in every small town, city council members serve because they are dedicated to public service. It requires countless hours of meetings, homework and visits in the community for very little compensation. Karen has always managed to make time for her council duties despite her very demanding full-time job as a Senior Research Associate and Project Manager at Genentech in South San Francisco where she has worked for 15 years. Her experience, work ethic and resourcefulness have continually benefited her colleagues and all residents of Pacifica.

On a sunny August Day in 2015 while Karen was mayor, traffic came to a standstill on Highway 1, Pacifica's major thoroughfare, for the entire day. Two car accidents and major roadwork by Caltrans brought out the worst in motorists who were stranded for hours. They crashed the city's Nextdoor page and jammed phone lines. Feeling her constituents' pain, Karen fielded calls on her cell phone and gave advice and updates from her personal Facebook page. She effectively became the communications center and traffic officer.

Before joining the city council, Karen volunteered her time and energy on PTO Boards and in classrooms for 15 years. She was one of the individuals starting the Ingrid B. Lacy and Terra Nova Crab Feeds supporting the schools' PTOs and Booster clubs. From 2006 to 2010, she served on the Pacifica School District Governing Board, and for the last five years she served on the Board of Directors of Pacificans Care, a non-profit that is essential in supporting social services organizations in the community. Karen is a member of the American Association of University Women and the co-chair of Tech Trek in Pacifica which sends three third grade girls to Stanford to experience college life. Somehow she still manages to find enough time to continue her volunteer work with the Pacifica Beach Coalition. You can often find her cleaning up beaches, trails or creeks.

Karen's family moved to Pacifica in 1965. She grew up in the back of Linda Mar Valley and attended Oddstead Elementary School, Ortega Middle School and Terra Nova High School. She earned her BS in Microbiology and Genetic Engineering from the University of California at Santa Barbara.

She married another Pacifica native, Mike Ervin, and they raised two now-grown children, Zach and Aly. After retiring from the council, Karen is looking forward to spending more time with her family and friends, and running and hiking with her two dogs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of the House to join me in recognizing the contributions outgoing City Councilmember and former Mayor Karen Ervin has made to her beloved home town, Pacifica. The residents are very fortunate that she continually dedicated her passion and skills to improving the lives of all Pacificans.

HONORING DONALD J. HELLMANN

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Donald "Don" J. Hellmann. Don is retiring from his position as the Assistant Director for Legislative and Congressional Affairs in the National Park Service after 22 years of communicating the mission and goals of the National Park Service to Congress and working closely with our members and staff to advance the Service's legislative priorities. Don's vast knowledge of environmental law and policy, his expertise in drafting National Park Service legislation, and his exemplary dedication to public service will be greatly missed by those of us who have had the pleasure of working with him.

Don joined the National Park Service in 1994 as the Deputy Assistant Director for Legislative and Congressional Affairs. He led a staff of legislative specialists in developing National Park Service legislation, advised National Park Service leadership on pending legislation, and served as a liaison with members of Congress on legislation affecting the National Park Service. He was promoted to the position of Assistant Director in 2009 by Director Jonathan B. Jarvis.

Over the course of his career, Don drafted hundreds of bills and amendments affecting national parks, national heritage areas, wild and scenic rivers, and national scenic and historic trails that were ultimately enacted by Congress. He was instrumental in crafting all the major park-related legislative packages of the last two decades, including the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–333), the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 (P.L. 105–391), the Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008 (P.L. 110–229), the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (P.L. 111–11), and Title XXX of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (P.L. 113–291).

Don also played a key role in the reorganization and transfer of National Park System-wide laws from title 16 to title 54 of the United States Code, enacted in 2014 (P.L. 113–287) which has made the drafting of park-related legislation significantly more streamlined. Most recently, he was the principal author of the legislative proposal, the National Park Service Centennial Act, that President Obama sent to Congress in 2015. Legislation based on that proposal passed the House on December 6.

Prior to working for the National Park Service, Don was Vice President for Conservation at The Wilderness Society, where he directed the conservation advocacy program and coordinated the litigation agenda of the organization. Before assuming this position, Don served as Legislative Counsel for the society. Don joined The Wilderness Society's staff in 1988.

Don also worked here on Capitol Hill as Legislative Counsel to House Majority Whip Tony Coelho (D–CA) from 1985 to 1988 and as a Legislative Assistant and in other roles to U.S. Senator Walter D. Huddleston (D–KY) from 1977 to 1985. Don taught History and English to junior high school students in Kentucky from 1973 to 1976.

Don is a native of Kentucky who received a B.A. in History/Secondary Education from Thomas More College in Crestview Hills, Kentucky, an M.A. in Politics from Catholic University of America, and a J.D. from the University of Baltimore. He is a member of the District of Columbia Bar and holds a Life Certification as a Secondary Education Teacher from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

A resident of Annandale, Va., his favorite national park is Maui's Haleakala, which is centered around a volcanic crater that he described as "like walking on the moon."

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Don on his retirement and expressing our deep appreciation for his outstanding contributions to the National Park Service and to the Nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 2017, my electronic voting card malfunctioned and I was not registered as recording a vote on H. Res. 5, "Adopting Rules for the 115th Congress." I wish to reflect my intentions on roll call No. 6, as a "NAY" vote.

HONORING GONZALO "SAL" TORRES

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Sal Torres, a departing member of the City Council of Daly City and a friend who has never ceased to serve the people of his community with distinction during his twenty years on the council. Sal Torres has, during these past two decades, become the symbol of this prosperous town filled with talented, industrious residents from around the world.

In 1996, Sal made history by becoming the first Latino to win a seat on the City Council of Daly City and, in 2000, became Daly City's first Mayor of Latino descent. This year he will be finishing his public service as Mayor.

It is difficult to fully describe the impact of Mayor Torres upon Daly City, but it has been enormously beneficial. Over his 20 years in office, the city changed from a typical suburban community south of a major U.S. city, into a thriving commercial center with major new office buildings adjacent to a regional mass transit station. Sal was part of a team that evaluated and approved the rebuilding of Westlake Shopping Center into a modern, thriving retail hub. Today, this center is so essential to the constituents of Mayor Torres and to surrounding communities that it's probably easier to find a parking space in downtown Manhattan than in the garage and lots of Westlake Shopping Center.

Social justice is a core belief of Mayor Torres. Long before his ascension to the council, he earned recognition during his undergraduate years at UCLA for his outstanding contributions as a volunteer in the Los Angeles Unified School District. Throughout all of 1984, Sal worked with the Southwest Voter Registration & Education Project and helped to successfully register over 120,000 new Latino voters for the 1984 general election. He is still the only graduate in the history of the University of San Francisco School of Law to be awarded, in the same year, both the Judge Harold J. Haley Award given by the faculty for outstanding scholastic achievements and the Student Bar Association Award given by his peers for exceptional contributions made to and on behalf of the graduating class.

Sal was a founding member of the non-profit Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART) of San Mateo, a provider of affordable home loans to community residents, and an advocate for new construction of affordable housing. Daly City has always played a vital role in providing affordable housing in San Mateo County. Sal understands the linkage between human dignity and housing and between economic security and owning a home.

Life is more than hard work and housing. If residents in north San Mateo wish to enjoy a summer afternoon, they can see a movie at a major metroplex that Sal shaped as part of a team that revitalized areas east of Highway 280. They can also play on city sports fields that he voted to support because he views recreation as vital to the physical and spiritual health of city residents.

With all of these public accomplishments, one might reasonably wonder if Sal Torres had time to earn a living. He certainly did. As an accomplished attorney, he's worked on behalf of the California School Employees Association, Arysta Life Science Corporation, LSI Logic, Marvell Technology Group, and Equinix, Inc., among many clients. He also hosted and co-produced a popular talk show on the UPN-TV affiliate, KBHK Channel 44, El Amanecer ("Daybreak"), which addressed social, political and cultural issues in the Latino community. In 2000, Sal was selected as one of California's "Top 20 Lawyers under the age of 40" by California Law Business.

At times through the year, the sun sets off the shoreline of Daly City and into the Pacific. It is a scene that is at once stunningly beautiful and yet a brutal reminder that we are transitory figures in history. Sal Torres has never been a public servant who sought immortality through public works with his name in concrete, nor has he been a flamboyant personality in the city's life.

However, as a humble servant of his community, he has shown a relentless dedication to public wellbeing. Whereas the Pacific erodes the city's cliffs and the freeway divides its corpus, Sal built its community spirit through a dedication to collegiality that created lasting bonds, and a love of Daly City by its residents, equal in strength to any steel and certainly more enduring than the boundary of the city with the sea. Sal will be missed at the dais, but ever-present in the hearts and minds of his community. In the end, this is a monument that is far more enduring than a name in concrete. Sal Torres loves Daly City, and Daly City treasures Sal Torres.

HONORING CHIEF MICHAEL RANDOLPH

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Michael Randolph upon his retirement as Fire Chief for the City of Napa Fire Department. Chief Randolph is retiring after an impressive 27 year firefighting career, including serving as Chief for four years.

Chief Randolph completed his B.A. Degree in Information and Communication Studies and then began his career with the City of Napa Fire Department as a firefighter in 1989. He was promoted to a firefighter paramedic five years after that. He was subsequently promoted to Captain, Battalion Chief and Division Chief before becoming Chief in 2012. Chief Randolph has distinguished himself in his department as an excellent mentor, coach, coworker and friend.

Chief Randolph is dedicated to our community and has provided leadership to many of our service and community organizations. He serves as Board Member and President of the California Fire Chiefs Operations Section, on the Paramedic Advisory Board for Napa Valley College, as the Chair of the Napa County Emergency Medical Care Committee and as a member of Life Healthy Napa Valley.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Randolph has had a dedicated firefighting career and is known for his strong, focused and determined leadership. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor him here today and extend our best wishes for an enjoyable retirement with his wife, Wendy, and his children, Andrew and Hanna.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF CAPTAIN JOSEPH BAGGETT, JAG CORPS, U.S. NAVY (RET)

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Captain Joseph Baggett, JAGC, USN (ret), who is retiring after 46 years of combined active duty and civilian service to our nation with the United States Navy.

Captain Baggett was born into a military family. The son of a career enlisted Marine, Captain Baggett grew up in the presence of the United States Navy in such diverse locations as Naval Air Station Pensacola, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, and the United Kingdom. He graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Tulane University in May 1971. He later earned a J.D. from Tulane University School of Law, and an LL. M. in Ocean and Coastal Law from the University of Miami School of Law. A longtime resident of Herndon, Virginia is his home.

In 1971, Captain Baggett began his dedicated service to our nation as a commissioned officer in the U.S. Navy. During the next 30 years, Captain Baggett served on active duty in a wide variety of roles, traveling throughout the United States and overseas. His assignments included two tours as a Supply Corps

officer, including service onboard USS *Rich* (DD 820); Naval Legal Service Office, Jacksonville, Florida; Commander, Middle East Force; Commander, Iceland Defense Force; Commander, Sixth Fleet; Navy Office of Legislative Affairs; and the Joint Staff Strategic Plans and Policy Directorate. Later in his career he served as Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General for International Law; as Counsel for National Security to the Deputy Attorney General of the United States; as Staff Judge Advocate for the Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet; as Commanding Officer, Naval Legal Service Office, Norfolk, Virginia; and as Director of the Legislation Division in the Office of Legislative Affairs.

Following his retirement from active duty in December 2000, Captain Baggett continued his superlative service to the Navy as a civilian, serving for another sixteen years as Deputy Director of the International and Operational Law Division in the Office of the Judge Advocate General in the Pentagon. In that role, he has been a constant champion of our national interests in the areas of law of the sea and freedom of navigation.

His support to our national security cannot be overstated. Captain Baggett's expertise and understanding of the complexities of the law of the sea and the law of armed conflict are without equal in the U.S. government. As the Armed Forces confronted myriad diverse challenges, he delivered sage counsel to the Department of the Navy, facilitating our ability to conduct naval operations. His profound knowledge and experience directly improved the ability to the sea services to fulfil their missions throughout the world.

For his outstanding service to our nation, Captain Baggett earned numerous awards, including the Legion of Merit, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Navy Commendation Medal, Navy Achievement Medal, Navy Distinguished Civilian Service Award, Navy Superior Civilian Service Award, and Navy Meritorious Civilian Service Award.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join in commending Captain Baggett for his commitment to our country and the sacrifices he made on its behalf. On the occasion of his retirement from the federal service, I thank him and his family for his honorable service to our nation and wish him fair winds and following seas as he concludes a distinguished career.

HONORING MARINA FRASER

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Marina Fraser for her 13 years of exemplary public service on the Half Moon Bay City Council, including three years as mayor of this picturesque coastal town that I am very proud to represent in Congress. Marina has been a tireless advocate for coastside residents, in particular children and seniors. I am honored to have worked with Marina for more than a decade and to call her a close friend.

During her tenure on the council, she served on the San Mateo County Council of Cities, the San Mateo County Joint Powers Authority, the San Mateo County Congestion Relief Alliance, the San Mateo County City-County Association of Governments, the San Mateo County Emergency Operations Center, and the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside.

Marina was instrumental in restoring Half Moon Bay's fiscal health. The Great Recession combined with a multi-million dollar land use settlement put the city at the brink of bankruptcy. Through strategic decisions, collaboration and meticulous work, Marina and her fellow councilmembers managed to balance the budget and placed the city on solid financial footing. Today, Half Moon Bay is a thriving community and destination for people from all over the Bay Area and the country. Main Street is filled with a wide variety of small businesses and restaurants. It even features bike racks to make it user-friendly for bicyclists and pedestrians. Marina deserves credit for obtaining the funds for the racks.

Soon, Half Moon Bay will have a state-of-the-art library, thanks in large part to Marina's tenacious work. First considered in 2000, Half Moon Bay finally celebrated the library's ground breaking this summer. It will provide much needed community space and bring Silicon Valley technology to the coast to prepare the next generation for 21st century jobs. It may be called the Half Moon Bay library but in my mind it will also be called the Marina Fraser Half Moon Bay Library.

Marina also worked hard with my office and state and local agencies to replace the crumbling Pilarcitos Creek Bridge with a beautiful aluminum and cedar plank bridge in the winter of 2015 while she was mayor. She was one of many important negotiators in a very creative and complicated program that became locally known as the Three-Way Land Swap. It involved an exchange of properties between the City of Half Moon Bay, San Mateo County and Peninsula Open Space Trust and resulted in restoration of a recreation field, the creation of affordable senior housing, and the preservation of bluff tops as open space.

You can surmise from these accomplishments that Marina, a learning and development consultant by training, is not afraid to take on difficult and large projects and to see them through. Marina is a person who doesn't give up. Even if she is defeated, she will try again. She first ran for the city council in 2001 and lost. I wrote her a letter encouraging her to run again, reminding her that Abraham Lincoln ran and lost many times before he succeeded. Sure enough, she won her seat on the council in 2003 and has served the residents of the coastside very well.

In addition to her council duties, Marina is always looking for ways to give back to the community and improve the lives of others. She has created activities and services for youths and seniors and volunteered with Friends of the Library, the Half Moon Bay Spanish Town Historical Society, and the Cougar Boosters.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of the House of Representatives to join me in honoring the public service of Councilmember and Mayor Marina Fraser on the Half Moon Bay City Council. While she may be leaving the council, her contributions will continue to shape life on the coastside for years to come and I have no doubt that she will remain an important voice in our community.

CONGRATULATING ERIC STARNES ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE EULESS POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lieutenant Eric Starnes on his well-earned retirement from the Euless Police Department in the city of Euless, Texas, after twenty-three years of dedicated service.

Starnes' distinguished career with the Euless Police Department began in 1993 after completing his Bachelor of Science degree in Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University and the Montgomery County Sheriff's Office Academy for his police certification. Additionally, while serving as an officer, Starnes was able to pursue a number of advanced degrees and certifications, including a Master's in Public Administration from the University of North Texas and a Juris Doctor degree from Texas Wesleyan School of Law. Starnes is also a member of the State Bar of Texas.

In his time as an officer, Starnes has served as a Field Training Officer, K–9 Officer, and a member of the Euless Police Tactical Unit. He has received over 2,500 hours of in-service police training which consisted of a variety of courses in patrol, criminal investigation, K–9 criminal interdiction, police instructor training, and police supervision. He received his Basic Police Certification in 1993, Intermediate Police Certification in 1998, Advanced Police Certification in 1999, and his Masters Police Certification in 2001. In addition to these certifications, Starnes has received over forty commendations for professionalism and exemplary service to his community.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize the tireless efforts that Lieutenant Eric Starnes has made in contribution to the safety and security of the City of Euless. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Eric Starnes on his many years of service.

IN TRIBUTE TO THELMA SIAS

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Thelma Sias, Vice President of Local Affairs for WE Energies, who is retiring on January 4, 2017. She has served the organization with distinction for over 31 years, beginning in 1986.

Thelma was born in rural Mayersville, Mississippi, growing up during the civil rights-era. Her father was a farmer. Her mother was a schoolteacher, farmer, and restauranteur. She is one of 11 children, all of whom graduated from college or technical college. Thelma Sias received an academic scholarship to Clark College in Atlanta where she ultimately received her degree. In 1976, Ms. Sias came to Wisconsin to work as the Supervisor of the Ethnic Heritage Recruitment Center for the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, making the Badger State her new home.

Ms. Sias spent most of her career making an extraordinary impact on people in Wisconsin by seeking common ground and finding

solutions. Over the years, she has sat on at least a dozen boards, including the Zoological Society of Milwaukee, Children's Hospital and Health System Foundation, Milwaukee Public Library Foundation, and the Milwaukee Area Workforce Investment Board. Thelma was paid to do what naturally was a part of her core: making connections and fostering relationships. It is also why she has been such an asset to WE Energies in serving their interests in a manner that supports the communities dear to my heart. In her position, she was able to help establish connections between people in need and those who can help through the corporation's separate, nonprofit arm, Wisconsin Energy Foundation, which has invested $130 million into Wisconsin and Michigan communities since 1982.

Ms. Sias has a natural gift for connecting people, which she has to move the powerful to invest both financially and emotionally in economically distressed communities in a way that fosters sustainable solutions to problems. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to know and work with her for so many years. Thelma is political, but, more importantly, she is knowledgeable and she cares. She has remained an integral part of the community, maintaining her residence and remaining deeply committed to the Johnsons Park neighborhood community in central city Milwaukee. In addition to all her work with the Foundation and the community, she has found time to be a fixture in every presidential campaign from Carter to Obama. I join her friends and husband of over 30 years, Stephen Adams, in congratulating her on her well-earned retirement. I wish her much success as she transitions into a different phase of her life.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Thelma Sias and I am proud to call her friend. The citizens of the Fourth Congressional District and the State of Wisconsin are privileged to have someone of her ability and dedicated service working on their behalf for so many years. Thelma, I thank you for all that you have done. I am honored for these reasons to pay tribute to Thelma Sias.

HONORING JOSEPH SILVA

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Joseph Silva for his 20 years of service on the Colma City Council, two of them as vice mayor. At 1,400 residents, Colma is the smallest town in San Mateo County on the San Francisco Peninsula. While Colma is best known as the City of Souls because it is home to 16 cemeteries, locals will point out its architectural charm created by Spanish-Mediterranean motifs, its modem infrastructure, including a BART station, and its central location that makes it easily accessible from anywhere in the Bay Area. Colma is a small town where residents and businesses happily coexist.

Joe Silva has been instrumental in creating or restoring the town's iconic buildings and structures. During his tenure, the town built the 5,500 square foot Colma Community Center that houses the restored historical museum and railroad depot, the Sterling Park Recreation Center and the Colma Police Department. He is also heavily involved in keeping the current renovation of the historic Town Hall on track.

Councilmember Silva and his fellow councilmembers are always striving to maintain a harmonious balance between old and new. Brick paved residential streets with ornamental street lights coexist with Interstate 280. The historic Town Hall and Community Center coexist with the modern Metro Center and Serramonte Shopping Center.

While on the council, Joe served on the Grand Boulevard Task Force, the Peninsula Clean Energy Board of Directors, and the C/CAG Board of Directors. He cares deeply about his community and improving the quality of life for everyone.

Joe has a "roll up your sleeves" and "can do" attitude. This was evident during the recession that started in 2008 when he helped strengthen the town's retail base by finding ways to entice people to shop at Colma's businesses and car dealerships. He collaborated with the Daly City-Colma Chamber of Commerce to think outside the box and come up with creative ideas. Joe's optimism and determination were instrumental in guiding his home town through one of the most challenging times since the Great Depression.

Joe also finds time to volunteer for good causes such as the Lutheran Hope School in Daly City, Habitat for Humanity, the North Peninsula Food Pantry and Dining Center of Daly City, and Club Dust, an organization building homes for extremely poor families in Mexico. He has participated eight times in the AIDS/LifeCycle Ride to End AIDS, a seven-day, 545 mile bike ride from San Francisco to Los Angeles that raises money and awareness for HIV and AIDS. If you do the math, that's 4,360 miles. For his continued dedication to the AIDS ride, he received the distinguished San Mateo County Mayors' Diversity Award in 2012.

Joe grew up in the Bay Area and attended Jefferson High School in Daly City. He moved to Colma 30 years ago and has lived here ever since with his wife, Cynthia. They have raised two daughters, Sandra and Nicole.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Councilmember Joseph Silva for two decades of service to the residents of Colma. While he is leaving the council, I have no doubt he will remain an active member of our community for many years to come.

RETIREMENT OF CALMAN COHEN, PRESIDENT OF THE EMERGENCY COMMITTEE FOR AMERICAN TRADE

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Calman Cohen on his retirement after a distinguished and productive career. Dr. Cohen built on his public service at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative and the Senate by leading the Emergency Committee for American Trade for many years, an organization of leading U.S. companies with a mission to support economic growth through the expansion of international trade and investment. He has effectively represented his member companies by working with Members of Congress and many Administrations on a broad range of trade and investment issues, including all major trade agreements during his tenure as well as Trade Promotion Authority. He has vigorously defended the needs of U.S. companies and their employees as they strive to compete in today's global marketplace, achieve market access for their exports, and create jobs here at home.

I send my best wishes to him, and his wife Susan, who is always by his side, during his retirement.

HONORING SUN VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sun Valley Elementary School which was selected as a 2016 National Blue Ribbon School by the U.S. Department of Education in recognition for its Exemplary High Performance as one of the top schools in the nation as measured by state and national assessments. This highly competitive award reflects outstanding academic achievement and the highest caliber of professional service, and family and community engagement.

With over 500 students from a variety of socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds, Sun Valley Elementary School offers comprehensive educational programs that academically challenge and instill a joy of learning in its students and ensures every child has the skills and knowledge to reach their full potential.

Mr. Speaker, this hard-earned distinction reflects a true community success. From the "Super Star" students and their families, to the staff and administrators and the extended community, Sun Valley Elementary School has developed an education model for the state and nation, empowering students of today to be the problem-solvers, inventors, and pioneers of tomorrow. Please join me in congratulating Sun Valley Elementary School on this impressive achievement.

HONORING DAVID CANEPA

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Councilman David Canepa who is leaving the city council of Daly City to assume a new position as a member of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors from District 5. David's service to Daly City began in the fateful year of 2008 when he was first elected to the council.

As we all know, 2008 and the next few years were financially difficult for many Americans. The budget of Daly City was not spared this stress. Working with his colleagues, David helped craft budgets that were balanced and that included difficult choices, including a reduction in city hall work days, while preserving essential life, health and safety services.

As a C/CAG representative, David Canepa represented Daly City as cities throughout San Mateo County joined together to resolve issues involving transportation funding, congestion management, and storm water management. C/CAG also establishes the public policy position of 21 cities and the County of San Mateo.

While serving as Vice Chair of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, Councilman Canepa helped prioritize hundreds of millions of dollars in transportation projects throughout San Mateo County. This responsibility went hand-in-hand with his service on the Bay Area Regional Air Quality Management District where he again represented county cities in deliberations over air quality regulations and violations of the law by emitters.

David Canepa served as mayor in 2014 and was overwhelmingly re-elected to the city council in 2014. He is a fourth-generation resident of San Mateo and was born in Daly City. He graduated from nearby Skyline College and the University of San Francisco. He and his wife, Ana, live in Daly City.

In his early career, he served as an aide to a state legislator. Through his work with the Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART) and Housing our People Effectively (HOPE), Councilman Canepa has worked to create affordable housing for San Mateo County residents, many of whom are in a crisis because of skyrocketing rents and wages that cannot keep pace. He also served as a director of the North San Mateo County Sanitation District. In Daly City, he is known for his efforts to improve public safety, spur economic development, and to preserve both neighborhoods and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, Daly City is a remarkable place in San Mateo County. Its residents are friendly and the city has always been family oriented. Daly City is now losing a leader in local government, but it will gain an advocate at the county. The interests of the city will be joined to those of South San Francisco, Brisbane, Colma, Broadmoor and San Bruno which together with Daly City form District 5. From criminal justice to healthcare to environmental protection to transportation and dozens of other quality-of-life concerns, District 5 will have an important voice for residents in David Canepa. I wish him well as he seizes the opportunities to serve his constituents in the years ahead.

HONORING INVESTIGATOR MAGGI HOLBROOK WITH THE VANCOUVER POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Ms. BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of Investigator Maggi Holbrook with the Vancouver Police Department, and recognize her contributions to Southwest Washington during 16 years of public service.

Investigator Holbrook's dedication to the community can be seen through her long service to the Vancouver, Washington, Seattle, Washington, and Portland, Oregon areas. In the Vancouver Police Department, she established a Digital Evidence Cybercrimes Unit that has worked on or assisted all levels of crimes. In addition, Investigator Holbrook was an invaluable resource for the Washington State Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force and the Seattle Police Department. Her efforts of the task force to investigate, prosecute and convict those individuals who would harm vulnerable children are admirable.

As one of the first investigators in Washington certified in Peer to Peer child pornography investigations, Investigator Holbrook brought her proactive approach to child sexual exploitation investigations. She quickly became proficient in the very technical and labor intensive methods for identifying Internet Protocol addresses of offenders offering to share child pornography files across the Internet. Through these cases, she identified one child sexual-abuser after another and used the expertise and credibility she'd developed to convict them in court. Investigator Holbrook is considered a leading expert in these types of investigations, has certified hundreds of other investigators in the use of Peer to Peer investigative technology and assisted many more with investigations.

Due to Investigator Holbrook's hard work and collaborative nature, she paved the way for the Vancouver Police Department to become an Affiliate Agency for the Department of Justice's Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force in Washington State. Through this task force, Investigator Holbrook has made hundreds of referrals to agencies statewide and internationally that have resulted in the arrest and conviction of numerous Child Sexual Exploitation offenders.

For example, Investigator Holbrook was called to conduct the forensics on a particularly difficult child pornography case where proving possession was critical to obtain a successful prosecution. Investigator Holbrook initially identified a Peer to Peer user sharing child pornography and forwarded this information to Cowlitz County authorities for investigation. The resulting search warrant led to the identification and seizure of 13 child pornography files on the defendant's computer. Further investigation, however, revealed the defendant had successfully deleted hundreds of files that he had been sharing over the course of eighteen months. Holbrook assisted the Assistant U.S. Attorney Grady Leupold and the team who successfully litigated the perpetrator. Investigator Holbrook's selfless dedication to an investigation far beyond her case responsibility played a pivotal role in bringing this person to justice.

Over the years, Investigator Holbrook has been a tremendous and valuable partner to law enforcement agencies across the state as well as many federal partners: Department of Homeland Security Child Exploitation Unit, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the U.S. Marshals Service, the United States Postal Service and the U.S. Secret Service.

Holbrook has had an outstanding career that has been dedicated in not only the successful criminal investigations and rescues of children, but in building resources to assist others in their efforts. Her work have contributed to training the next generation of investigators, forensic examiners and even prosecutors to carry on this extremely necessary and valuable work.

Southwest Washington is proud to have had such an extremely talented and dedicated individual as Investigator Holbrook. Her contributions and accomplishments in support of the Washington State ICAC Task Force mission will positively impact Southwest Washington for generations to come. I want to thank Investigator Holbrook for her tireless work and congratulate her on her retirement.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LOBAR, INC.

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I offer my sincere thanks and congratulations to Lobar, Inc. on its upcoming 50th Anniversary on January 19, 2017.

Lobar, Inc. is one of Central Pennsylvania's largest construction services firms. Family owned, Lloyd and Barbara Eichelberger started Lobar, Inc. in 1967 and quickly built a reputation for reliability. Today, Lobar Inc. is a multi-million dollar business that offers construction services throughout Pennsylvania.

Lobar Inc. has earned a reputation for excellence in customer relations and quality of work. Their mission statement sums up perfectly the reason for their success: ''To provide superior construction services for our customers at fair prices and at the same time, have our customers enjoy working with Lobar, Inc. Our goal is to have our customers want Lobar, Inc. to do their construction work.''

On behalf of Pennsylvania's Fourth Congressional District, I thank and congratulate the employees of Lobar, Inc., both past and present, on their 50th Anniversary and wish them continued great success in the years to come.

HONORING JOHN MULLER

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor John Muller, better known as Farmer John, for his 10 years of public service on the Half Moon Bay City Council, including one year as mayor. As a farmer, John has deep roots in the community and always strives to nurture the quality of life of all residents of the coastside. I am very grateful to have worked with him for more than three decades and to call him a dear friend.

While on the council, Councilman Muller served on the Chamber Government Affairs Committee, the Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside, the League of California Cities Coastal Cities Issue Group, the San Mateo County Airport Land Use Committee, the Association of Bay Area Governments, and the City County Association of Governments.

John was instrumental in restoring Half Moon Bay's fiscal health. The Great Recession combined with a multi-million dollar land use settlement put the city at the brink of bankruptcy. Through strategic decisions, collaboration and meticulous work, John and his fellow councilmembers managed to balance the budget and placed the city on solid financial footing. Today, Half Moon Bay is a thriving

community and destination for people from all over the Bay Area and the country. Main Street is a colorful collection of artisan stores, sustainable restaurants and small hotels. Signature events, such as the Pumpkin Festival, Farm Day, Nights of Light, the Seafood Festival, and Pacific Coast Dream Machines, show off the best that Half Moon Bay has to offer.

In addition to his duties on the council, John served on the Regional Water Quality Control Board for 21 years, 13 of them as chair, having been appointed by four California governors. He is also a former member and chair of the Coastside County Water District Board, former chair of the Society of American Florists Government Relations Committee, former member of the Secretary of Agriculture's Special Committee to streamline management of the USDA, and a past president and current member of the San Mateo County Farm Bureau. He still serves on the U.S. EPA's Local Government Advisory Committee, the Agricultural Technical Advisory Committee for Fruits and Vegetables, and the California Agricultural Education Foundation.

With his council duties and the additional volunteer work, it is somewhat of a miracle that Farmer John still manages to do his day job. He is the owner of Daylight Farms and John's Pumpkin Farm in Half Moon Bay. He and his wife of 47 years, Eda, are also fixtures at the Half Moon Bay Farmers Market every week. I've had the pleasure of seeing John's connection to the land when he is tending to his pumpkins, produce and chickens in his fields. Not only does he grow beautiful decorative pumpkins that my office purchases for my annual senior conference, he also grows monster pumpkins that he enters into the World Champion Pumpkin Weigh-Off in Half Moon Bay.

John and Eda are true stewards of our planet. They were honored with the U.S. EPA's Presidential Volunteer Service Award for their leadership in sustainable, urban agriculture and with the Agriculture Water Quality Alliance award for exemplary efforts to protect water quality within the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary.

John was born in Palo Alto in 1946 and served in the U.S. Navy from 1963 to 1966. He graduated from the FBI Citizens Academy in 2007.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing John Muller for his dedication to public service and his lifelong commitment to our community and country. John is a man with a big heart who loves to share. He deeply cares for all the people on the coast and quietly and with great humility helps them out in any way he can—no fanfare, no attribution. He is a true Good Samaritan and a one of a kind leader. How lucky we have been to have him in elected office for a decade. I admire him and Eda more than they will ever know.

HONORING STEVEN KINSEY

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Steven (Steve) Kinsey as he retires from the Marin County Board of Supervisors after serving the people residing in the Fourth District, and Marin County, with exceptional distinction for nearly 20 years. Throughout his tenure, Supervisor Kinsey has been steadfast and passionate in his pursuit of social equity, protection of the agricultural landscape and historic ranching community in West Marin, and improved transportation infrastructure and services, among many other noble causes. Most importantly, he has been productive through the decades, accomplishing many victories for the people and places of Marin.

Born in Wilmington, Delaware in 1952, Supervisor Kinsey earned his B.A. in Architecture from Arizona State University. He moved to Forest Knolls in 1978 where he raised a family, owned and operated his own design/build business for 18 years, and volunteered in the community. As a member of the Marin Conservation League Board of Directors, he was recognized for promoting water conservation strategies and advocating for a Bayland Corridor to increase protections for bayside wetlands. A stalwart public school advocate, he secured for the Lagunitas School District funds for facilities improvements and school-based health and support services for its students and families.

Elected to the Board of Supervisors in 1996, Supervisor Kinsey took office on January 7, 1997, and served for five terms, representing all of the coastal areas of Marin County as well as several bay side communities. As an elected official, including five times as Board President, he focused on watershed and fishery restoration, sustainable agriculture, the integration of transportation and land use planning, and sound fiscal management. He championed the needs of children and families, and has worked closely with communities of color to reduce the barriers to equal opportunity.

He served on the boards of numerous organizations including the Board of the Marin Agricultural Land Trust, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Marin Transit, and the Transportation Authority of Marin, which he chaired from 1998 to 2011. He joined the California Coastal Commission in 2011, was its chairman three times, and served on the board of the California State Coastal Conservancy.

Under his leadership, Marin has become a national leader in biking and walking, including Safe Routes to School, and established the Bay Area Ridge Trail. During thirteen years as Chair of Marin's Transportation Authority and Congestion Management Agency, Supervisor Kinsey led Marin's efforts to improve mobility along the 101 corridor and throughout his district. Drawing on his consensus-building skills, he secured community support and funding for voter-highway improvements in the Twin Cities area, and extending the Sonoma Marin Area Rapid Transit (SMART) train to the ferry.

It has been my honor and pleasure to join with Supervisor Kinsey to solve significant and complex community issues. From defeating the proposed expansion of Death Row at San Quentin State Prison in 2011, to procuring affordable housing in surplused U.S. Coast Guard facilities in West Marin, to crafting a long-term solution to traffic congestion in Muir Woods and Muir Beach, to fighting to protect continued historic ranching families in Point Reyes National Seashore, and to ensuring the upcoming SMART system reaches its intended breadth of service up and down the line, Supervisor Steve Kinsey has been a tireless strategic and practical thinker, and an effective civic representative.

Steve Kinsey's legacy is one of dedicated service to the environment and health and well-being of Marin County. Please join me in congratulating him on his retirement, expressing deep appreciation for his long and exceptional career and outstanding contributions throughout the County, and wishing him well in his next adventure.

HONORING OUR NATION'S VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. RALPH LEE ABRAHAM

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, in honor of our Nation's and the State of Louisiana's Vietnam veterans, I introduce Louisiana House Concurrent Resolution 43.

This resolution recognizes November 13, 2013 through November 11, 2025, as the commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the Vietnam War. It is important that we recognize our Nation's heroes who served with valor and honor through this long war, which in many ways defined an entire generation of Americans. By the end of the Vietnam War, nearly 3 million American servicemen and servicewomen had served within the borders of Vietnam in some capacity. We would like to take this time to honor all Vietnam veterans and, especially, the more than 58,000 patriots who paid the ultimate sacrifice during this difficult and painful period of war.

Of the millions of Vietnam veterans who served our country, over 106,000 reside in my home State of Louisiana. Though we remain thankful for all of those who have served our great Nation, we would like to take this time to remember the 50th Anniversary of the Vietnam War. It is important that we honor our veterans while they are still alive so that they can take honor for the sacrifices and know that they do not go unnoticed.

HCR NO. 43 A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

To recognize November 13, 2013, through November 11, 2025, as the commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the Vietnam War.

Whereas, in observance of the 50th Anniversary of the Vietnam War, it is important as a nation and state that we reflect upon the valor of a generation that served with honor and although long and controversial in nature, this war in many ways defined an entire generation of Americans; and

Whereas, although American involvement in the conflict of Vietnam spanned several decades and presidencies, the ground offensive officially began in March of 1965, with the deployment of 2,500 Marines and by the end of that year, nearly 200,000 American troops were in Vietnam. The strength of the Allied Armed Forces peaked at 543,482 troops during the Vietnam war; and

Whereas, we draw inspiration from our Louisiana heros who suffered unspeakable tragedies. Approximately 153,303 veterans suffered nonmortal wounding, 14 were held as Prisoners of War, and 24 remain unaccounted for; and

Whereas, by the official end of the Vietnam War in April of 1975, nearly three million American servicemen and women had been on the ground, in the air, on the rivers, and

at sea within Vietnam's borders serving in some capacity during the conflict. As a grateful nation, we honor more than 58,000 patriots who paid the ultimate sacrifice during this difficult and painful period; and

Whereas, of the 7,391,000 Vietnam veterans, the United States Department of Veterans Affairs estimates that roughly 106,148 reside in Louisiana. In the half century since the official beginning of the Vietnam War, our nation has grappled with the sensitive effects of this struggle which accompanies all wars. Yet, we remain thankful to those who fought in this conflict and honor the legacy of service that they built; and

Whereas, the freedom and liberties we are blessed to enjoy today are a direct result of the courage, devotion, and sacrifice of the members of our Armed Forces. We are grateful for their brave service and draw inspiration and pride from all that they are; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana hereby recognizes November 13, 2013, through November 11, 2025, as the commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the Vietnam War.

HONORING MARY ANN NIHART

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mary Ann Nihart for her eight years of service on the Pacifica City Council. Her tireless commitment to her community has improved this wonderful coastal town for residents and visitors alike. Her service even helped shine a national spotlight on Pacifica. I am proud to count Mary Ann as a constituent, colleague and friend.

Mary Ann was first elected to the council in 2008 and served as mayor in 2011 and 2014. She was also the C/CAG representative to Pacifica, the Fog Fest Liaison, and she served on the North Coast County Fire JPA. Her council committee assignments included the Financing City Services committee, Economic Development, the Beautification Advisory Committee, and the Articulation Committee. Pacifica's quality of life was greatly improved through her representation on the San Mateo County Transportation Authority and at the Association of Bay Area Governments.

As mayor, Mary Ann re-instituted Mayor's Walks to personally connect local business owners with the city government and city staff. She also reinstated the Economic Development Committee to develop an economic plan for Pacifica. She helped her town receive transportation funding for shuttle services and street paving. She initiated and led the Beautification Task Force which designated 25 sites for make-overs. To date, nine of them have been completed. Among her proudest accomplishments was a city-wide effort to have Pacifica designated as one of the most scenic cities in America. The town was one of six finalists in the country.

Another of Mary Ann's priorities has been environmental protection. She initiated the process to designate Pedro Point Headlands as a priority conservation area and worked to complete the coastal trail from Pacifica to Devil's Slide, a San Mateo County Park with some of the country's most phenomenal ocean bluff views. She helped ban plastic bags and foam containers in Pacifica and supported protections for the Western Snowy Plover, a tiny shore bird listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act.

During her tenure, Mary Ann continually strove to bring community members together and to heal divides. This may be explained by the outstanding professional experience she brought to the council. Mary Ann is the Clinical Director and Chief Nurse of Mental Health Services at the San Francisco Veterans Affairs Health Care System. She holds a BSN and two Masters degrees in Nursing and in Clinical Psychology. Her passion to help veterans is noteworthy. There are thousands of veterans who owe their mental health in part to her management of outstanding psychiatric mental health treatment at our VA. Through her efforts and those of her colleagues, lives are saved each year. Mary Ann is also an Associate Clinical Professor at the University of California, San Francisco, and a past president of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association which honored her with the Psychiatric Nurse of the Year Award in 2012.

Mary Ann speaks nationally and internationally on the integration of biology into psychiatric nursing care, crisis intervention and de-escalation. She brought those skills to the coast after two tragic police shootings of mentally ill individuals in Pacifica and neighboring Half Moon Bay. She worked with local law enforcement to provide additional education and to amend the training for officers encountering mentally ill individuals in violent situations.

As you can surmise from this long yet incomplete list of accomplishments, Mary Ann Nihart is incredibly capable and gets things done. She will retire from the city council due to a flaw in federal law that I intend to fix. I for one will miss working with her on issues that connect local and federal jurisdictions, such as human trafficking, sea level rise and veterans' health.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the members of the House of Representatives to join me in honoring an outstanding professional and public servant who has left her mark on the community she loves. A leader with a big heart and a welcoming smile, Mary Ann Nihart's work is tightly woven into the fabric of Pacifica, a coastal community that I am very fortunate to represent.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, January 5, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's record.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JANUARY 10

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine civilian control of the Armed Forces.

SH–216

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Jeff Sessions, of Alabama, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SR–325

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To hold hearings to examine backpage.com's facilitation of online sex trafficking.

SD–342

JANUARY 11

9:30 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To continue hearings to examine the nomination of Jeff Sessions, of Alabama, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SR–325

10 a.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Betsy DeVos, of Michigan, to be Secretary of Education.

SD–430

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Elaine L. Chao, to be Secretary of Transportation.

SR–253

2 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of General John F. Kelly, USA (Ret.), to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

SD–342

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Interim Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S29–S71

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 21–31, S.J. Res. 3, S. Res. 6, and S. Con. Res. 4. **Pages S59–60**

Measures Considered:

Budget Resolution—Agreement: Senate began consideration of S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026. **Pages S31–45**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 1), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the concurrent resolution. **Pages S30–31**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the concurrent resolution at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, January 5, 2017. **Page S71**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Rebecca Emily Rapp, of Wisconsin, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2019.

Glenn Fine, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of Defense.

David J. Arroyo, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2022.

Brent Franklin Nelsen, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2022.

Jessica Rosenworcel, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2015.

Michael P. Leary, of Pennsylvania, to be Inspector General, Social Security Administration.

Tulinabo Salama Mushingi, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Senegal, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea-Bissau.

Carolyn N. Lerner, of Maryland, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, for the term of five years.

Elizabeth A. Field, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General, Office of Personnel Management.

Robert P. Storch, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General of the National Security Agency. **Page S71**

Messages from the House: **Pages S47–48**

Measures Referred: **Page S48**

Executive Communications: **Pages S48–59**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S60**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S60–65**

Additional Statements: **Page S47**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S65–71**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S71**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—1) **Page S31**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 p.m. and adjourned at 6:45 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, January 5, 2017. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S71

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 56 public bills, H.R. 238–293; and 7 resolutions, H.J. Res. 14–18; H. Con. Res. 4–5, were introduced.

Pages H93–96

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H98**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 22, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 26) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 11) objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–1).

Page H93

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Thompson (PA) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H55**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:30 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H58**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Approving the location of a memorial to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield: H.J. Res. 3, approving the location of a memorial to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield;

Pages H62–63

Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act: H.R. 71, to provide taxpayers with an annual report disclosing the cost and performance of Government programs and areas of duplication among them; **Pages H63–65**

Presidential Library Donation Reform Act of 2017: H.R. 73, to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations;

Pages H65–67

Federal Advisory Committee Act Amendments of 2017: H.R. 70, to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees; **Pages H67–70**

GAO Access and Oversight Act of 2017: H.R. 72, to ensure the Government Accountability Office has adequate access to information; and **Pages H70–71**

Thoroughly Investigating Retaliation Against Whistleblowers Act: H.R. 69, to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, to amend title 5, United States Code, and to provide modifications to authorities relating to the Office of Special Counsel.

Pages H71–74

Recess: The House recessed at 2:53 p.m. and reconvened at 4:15 p.m. **Page H86**

Midnight Rules Relief Act of 2017: The House passed H.R. 21, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, and to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for ''midnight rules'', by a recorded vote of 238 ayes to 184 noes, Roll No. 8. **Pages H74–86, H86–87**

Rejected the Castor (FL) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 183 yeas to 236 nays, Roll No. 7. **Pages H84–86, H86**

H. Res. 5, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 21) was agreed to yesterday, January 3rd.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, January 5. **Page H87**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H86 and H87. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:02 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING; REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2017; RESOLUTION OBJECTING TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2334 AS AN OBSTACLE TO ISRAEL-PALESTINIAN PEACE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 115th Congress; and hearing on H.R. 26, the ''Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2017''; and H. Res. 11, objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace, and for other purposes. The committee adopted rules of procedure for the 115th Congress and subcommittee ratios. The committee granted, by voice

vote, a structured rule for H.R. 26. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Additionally, the rule grants a closed rule for H. Res. 11. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution. The rule provides that the resolution shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. Testimony was heard from Chairman Goodlatte, Chairman Royce of California, and Representatives Johnson of Georgia, Biggs, Young of Iowa, Engel, Connolly, and Price of North Carolina.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D1159)*

H.R. 6452, to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean. Signed on December 16, 2016. (Public Law 114–327)

S. 2943, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year. Signed on December 23, 2016. (Public Law 114–328)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine foreign cyber threats to the United States, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to receive a closed briefing on recent administration actions in response to Russian hacking and harassment of United States diplomats, 3 p.m., SVC–217.

Select Committee on Intelligence: closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Interim Résumé of Congressional Activity

SECOND SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 4, 2016 through January 3, 2017

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	165	131	..
Time in session	780 hrs., 58′	633 hrs., 15′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	7,184	7,641	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	1,743	..
Public bills enacted into law	72	141	213
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	2	2	..
Measures passed, total	485	659	1,144
Senate bills	97	75	..
House bills	141	450	..
Senate joint resolutions	1	1	..
House joint resolutions	1	1	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	13	7	..
House concurrent resolutions	17	27	..
Simple resolutions	215	98	..
Measures reported, total	*329	*495	824
Senate bills	242	10	..
House bills	49	413	..
Senate joint resolutions	..	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	2	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	6	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	1	5	..
Simple resolutions	31	65	..
Special reports	12	27	..
Conference reports	3	3	..
Measures pending on calendar	462	144	..
Measures introduced, total	1,467	2,714	4,181
Bills	1,122	2,224	..
Joint resolutions	13	29	..
Concurrent resolutions	32	78	..
Simple resolutions	300	383	..
Quorum calls	..	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	163	275	..
Recorded votes	..	346	..
Bills vetoed	2	3	..
Vetoes overridden	1	1	..

*These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying Report. A total of 232 written reports have been filed in the Senate, 525 reports have been filed in the House.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 4, 2016 through January 3, 2017

Civilian nominations, totaling 354 (including 181 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	91
Withdrawn	12
Returned to White House	251
Other Civilian nominations, totaling 2,412 (including 97 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	2,367
Withdrawn	1
Returned to White House	44
Air Force nominations, totaling 7,568 (including 181 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	7,495
Returned to White House	73
Army nominations, totaling 5,899 (including 1,740 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	5,878
Returned to White House	21
Navy nominations, totaling 4,408 (including 5 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	4,401
Withdrawn	2
Returned to White House	5
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 1,246 (including 3 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,245
Returned to White House	1

Summary

Total nominations carried over from the First Session	2,207
Total nominations received this Session	19,680
Total confirmed	21,477
Total unconfirmed	0
Total withdrawn	15
Total returned to the White House	395

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, January 5

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. Con. Res. 3, Budget Resolution.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, January 5

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Reading of the Constitution of the United States by Members of the House of Representatives. Consideration of H.R. 26—Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2017 (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H. Res. 11—Objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Abraham, Ralph Lee, La., E21
Babin, Brian, Tex., E15
Beutler, Jaime Herrera, Wash., E20
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E19
Chaffetz, Jason, Utah, E15
Comstock, Barbara, Va., E17
Granger, Kay, Tex., E15
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E16
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E15
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E19, E21
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E18
Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E18
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E17
Perry, Scott, Pa., E20
Speier, Jackie, Calif., E15, E16, E17, E18, E19, E19, E20, E22
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E17

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.