United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 2017 No. 3

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 o'clock and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

God of Heaven and Earth, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Lord, You know our capabilities as a nation. You know our limitations better than we know ourselves. You see clearly the needs of our day and the steps that must be taken.

For the Members of the people's House, be a gentle light. Lead them forth day by day along the path of consistency and integrity, that the knots of contradiction would be unraveled and together Your people will walk with clarity of vision, determination of purpose, and a new depth of human understanding.

Bless all the people of our Nation, especially those in most need of Your mercy.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WALZ 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.

READING OF THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 5(a) of House Resolution 5, the Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for the reading of the Constitution.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, for the fourth time in the history of the House of Representatives, we will read aloud on the floor of the House the full text of the U.S. Constitution.

It is our hope that this reading will help demonstrate to the American people that the House of Representatives is dedicated to the Constitution and the system it establishes for limited government and the protection of individual liberty. We also hope that it will inspire many more Americans to read the Constitution themselves.

The text we will read today reflects the changes to the document made by the 27 amendments to it. Those portions superseded by amendment will not be read.

In order to ensure fairness to all those interested in participating, we have asked Members to line up to be recognized on a first-come, first-served basis. I will recognize Members based on this guidance. Each Member will approach the podium and read the passage laid out for him or her.

In order to ensure relative parity and fairness, I may recognize Members out of order in order to ensure bipartisanship and balance. Additionally, because of his long-term leadership on civil rights issues, I will recognize the gentleman from Georgia, Representative JOHN LEWIS, to read the Thirteenth Amendment.

I want to thank the Members of both parties for their participation in this historic event. I will begin by reading the preamble to the Constitution:

''We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.''

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Article I, section 1:

''All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Section 2:

''The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. ''No person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

''The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ).

Mr. WALZ. ''The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty-thousand, but each State shall have at least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to chuse three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode-Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one,

Printed on recycled paper.

Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. ''When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

''The House of Representatives shall chuse their Speaker and other officers; and shall have the sole power of impeachment.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Section 3:

''The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

''Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. ''The seats of the Senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, of the second class at the expiration of the fourth year, and of the third class at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one-third may be chosen every second year.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. ''No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. ''The Vice President of the United States shall be President of the Senate, but shall have no vote, unless they be equally divided.

''The Senate shall chuse their other officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. ''The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: and no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

□ 1015

Mr. LOUDERMILK. ''Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States: but the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment and punishment, according to law.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Section 4:

''The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of chusing Senators.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Section 5:

''Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members, in such manner, and under such penalties as each House may provide.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. ''Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behaviour, and, with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

''Each House shall keep a Journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. ''Neither House, during the session of Congress, shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other place than that in which the two Houses shall be sitting.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Section 6:

''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. They shall in all cases, except treason, felony and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. ''No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been encreased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

Mr. GUTHRIE. Section 7:

''All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. ''Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States: if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. ''If after such reconsideration two thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two thirds of that House, it shall become a law.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. ''But in all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DUNN).

Mr. DUNN. ''If any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. ''Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to

the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. ABRAHAM: 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; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. ''. . . to borrow money on the credit of the United States;

''To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

''To establish an uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON. ''. . . to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

''To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

''To establish post offices and post roads; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

Mr. CARBAJAL. ''. . . to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. ''. . . to constitute tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

''To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offences against the law of nations; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

Mr. BERA. ''. . . to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

''To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. ''. . . to provide and maintain a navy;

''To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

''To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. ''. . . to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. ''. . . to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. ''. . . and 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.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Section 9:

''The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. ''The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it.

''No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. ''No capitation, or other direct, tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken.

''No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).

Mr. VARGAS. ''No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from, one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. ''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.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. ''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.''

□ 1030

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Section 10:

''No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. ''No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws: and the net produce of all duties and imposts, laid by any State on imports or exports, shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and controul of the Congress.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER).

Mr. YODER. ''No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Article II, section 1:

''The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and, together with the Vice President chosen for the same term, be elected as follows:''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. ''Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of

trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. ''The Congress may determine the time of chusing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. ''No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty five years, and been fourteen years a resident within the United States.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. ''The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services, a compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. ''Before he enter on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation:—'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.' ''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Section 2:

''The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States; he may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices, and he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offences against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. ''He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law: . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. ''. . . but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. ''The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Section 3:

''He shall from time to time give the Congress information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

Mr. BACON. ''. . . he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both Houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. ''. . . he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. Section 4:

''The President, Vice President and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Article III, section 1:

''The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their offices during good behaviour, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Washington and the majority conference chairman (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS).

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Section 2:

''The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;—to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls;—to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. ''. . . to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;—to controversies between two or more States,—between citizens of different States,—between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States, and between a State, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA. ''In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be party, the supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. ''The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Section 3:

''Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort. No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. ''The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason, but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture except during the life of the person attainted.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Article IV, section 1.

''Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY).

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Section 2:

''The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

''A person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice and be found in another State, shall on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FASO).

Mr. FASO. Section 3:

''New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. ''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH).

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Section 4:

''The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. 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 . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

□ 1045

Mr. MOOLENAAR. ''. . . 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 the year one thousand eight hundred 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.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

Mr. KEATING. Article VI:

''All debts contracted and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

''This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. ''The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Article VII:

''The ratification of the conventions of nine States, shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. ''Done in convention by the unanimous consent of the States present the seventeenth day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty seven and of the independence of the United States of America the twelfth in witness whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. George Washington, President and deputy from Virginia.

Delaware: George Read, Gunning Bedford, Jr., John Dickinson, Richard Bassett, Jacob Broom.

Maryland: James McHenry, Daniel of St Thomas Jenifer, Daniel Carroll.

Virginia: John Blair, James Madison, Jr.

North Carolina: William Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Hugh Williamson.

South Carolina: John Rutledge, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Charles Pinckney, Pierce Butler.

Georgia: William Few, Abraham Baldwin.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. New Hampshire: John Langdon, Nicholas Gilman.

Massachusetts: Nathaniel Gorham, Rufus King.

Connecticut: William Samuel Johnson, Roger Sherman.

New York: Alexander Hamilton.

New Jersey: William Livingston, David Brearley, William Paterson, Jonathan Dayton.

Pennsylvania: Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris, George Clymer, Thomas FitzSimons, Jared Ingersoll, James Wilson, Gouverneur Morris.

Amendment I:

''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Amendment II:

''A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Amendment III:

''No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Amendment IV:

''The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Amendment V:

''No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. ''. . . nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against

himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Amendment VI:

''In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Amendment VII:

''In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Amendment VIII:

''Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.''

Amendment IX:

''The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Amendment X:

''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Amendment XI:

''The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Amendment XII:

''The electors shall meet in their respective States and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN).

Ms. ROSEN. ''. . . the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—the person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. ''. . . the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. ''The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. ''. . . a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Amendment XIII, section 1:

''Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.''

Section 2:

''Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Amendment XIV, section 1:

''All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOYCE).

Mr. JOYCE. ''. . . nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.''

Section 2:

''Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

Mr. SOTO. ''But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the Members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Section 3:

''No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA).

Ms. SINEMA. ''. . . or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM).

Mr. DENHAM. Section 4:

''The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Section 5:

''The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.''

Amendment XV, section 1:

''The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Section 2:

''The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.''

Amendment XVI:

''The Congress shall have 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.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Amendment XVII:

''The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

''When vacancies happen in the representation of any State in the Senate, the executive authority of such State shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies: . . .''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. ''. . . provided, that the legislature of any State may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct.

''This amendment shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator chosen before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.''

Amendment XIX:

''The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

''Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. Amendment XX, section 1:

''The terms of the President and the Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.''

Section 2:

''The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.''

Section 3:

''If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Section 4:

''The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.''

Section 5:

''Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.''

Section 6:

''This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission.''

Amendment XXI, section 1:

''The 18th Article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.''

Section 2:

''The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States for delivery or use therein of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.''

Section 3:

''This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by conventions in the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Amendment XXII, section 1:

''No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.''

Section 2:

''This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Amendment XXIII, section 1:

''The District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall appoint in such manner as Congress may direct:

''A number of electors of President and Vice President equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives in Congress to which the District would be entitled if it were a State, but in no event more than the least populous State; they shall be in addition to those appointed by the States, but they shall be considered, for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President, to be electors appointed by a State; and they shall meet in the District and perform such duties as provided by the twelfth article of amendment.''

Section 2:

''The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.''

Amendment XXIV, section 1:

''The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay poll tax or other tax.''

Section 2:

''The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Amendment XXV, section 1:

''In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.''

Section 2:

''Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.''

Section 3:

''Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.''

Section 4:

''Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

''Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office until the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

''Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Amendment XXVI, section 1:

''The right of citizens of the United States, who are eighteen years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.''

Section 2:

''The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Amendment XXVII:

''No law, varying the compensation for the services of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the reading of the Constitution. I would like to thank all of the Members who participated.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to revise and extend remarks and insert omitted material in the RECORD during the reading of the Constitution.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 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. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at noon.

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.

LAKE TRAVIS CAVALIERS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2016 Lake Travis Cavaliers on winning their sixth State championship in Texas. I am proud to say that the L.T. takeover of class 6A high school football is complete.

The Lake Travis Cavaliers, led by their head football coach, Hank Carter, defeated The Woodlands in grand fashion by a score of 41–13. Coach Carter has assembled a great coaching staff and built Lake Travis into one of the best high school football programs in the State of Texas. I look forward to seeing what the program will continue to accomplish in the coming seasons under Coach Carter's leadership.

I would also like to congratulate senior quarterback Charlie Brewer who was the Texas Associated Press Sports Editors' high school player of the year. Charlie led the offense to a big win and finished the season with a record-breaking 75 percent completions. I wish Charlie and the rest of the seniors the best of luck in their future endeavors.

This season will go down in the history books for Lake Travis High School. Great job to Coach Carter and the 2016 team.

Mr. Speaker, Texas is the greatest football State in America, and because Lake Travis High School is the greatest team in Texas, it most certainly must be the greatest high school team in the country, if not the world if you ask me.

Go Cavaliers. In God We Trust.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act works, but the majority of Republicans want to make America sick again. Republicans have voted more than 60 times to roll back the historic progress that has been made to expand health care to 20 million-plus Americans and to improve coverage for those who already have it. At every turn, they have undermined the law at the expense of American families and now are setting the path for full repeal.

2.6 million Texans stand to lose healthcare coverage, including 20,000 in our district. Fifty thousand of my constituents would gain coverage if Texas would have expanded Medicaid along with more than 1 million Texans. Texas stands to lose $62 billion in Federal funding for Medicaid, CHIP, and financial assistance for marketplace coverage if the new President and Congress repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Making America sick again is not the solution. Let's don't have a repeal until we have a replacement.

THE LEGACY OF PRESIDENT OBAMA

(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, in an Associated Press article titled, ''As Obama accomplished goals, the Democratic party floundered,'' the disastrous statistics of the Obama legacy were revealed.

The Associated Press analyzed:

There's one number you will almost never hear: more than 1,030 seats. That's the number of spots in State legislatures, Governor's mansions, and Congress lost by Democrats during Obama's Presidency. It is a statistic that reveals an unexpected twist of the Obama years.

The Associated Press went on to say:

The defeats have all but wiped out a generation of young Democrats, leaving the party with limited power in statehouses and a thin bench to challenge an ascendant GOP majority eager to undo many of the President's policies . . . but, say experts, Obama's tenure has marked the greatest number of losses under any President in decades.

When it comes time to the battle of programs, American families overwhelmingly choose limited government and expanded freedom over the alternative: Big Government and lesser freedom. This is clear with the failing of ObamaCare destroying jobs.

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

Congratulations to our colleague Congressman TED POE on his remission under treatment of cancer. God bless TED POE.

OPPOSITION TO GOP AGENDA TO REPEAL THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of the GOP agenda which will repeal the Affordable Care Act and cause 30 million Americans to lose healthcare coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Republicans to please examine the harm that this will do. Because of the Affordable Care Act, the uninsured rate in Texas has fallen by 28 percent and still has the largest number of uninsured Americans, allowing 1.7 million Texans to gain coverage.

While Texas did not expand Medicaid, the State still benefits from many other reforms brought by the Affordable Care Act. For instance, Sean, a Ph.D. candidate in economic development at the University of Texas at Dallas and his wife, Jamie, relied on the Affordable Care Act when their son was born prematurely and with a heart defect that required surgery and a transfer to another Dallas hospital. Sean was reassured that, with his family's ACA marketplace plan, his newborn son would not be denied coverage for lifesaving treatment.

It is unconscionable to me that the GOP refuses to look at what works and what needs improvement in this law instead of a full repeal as the only option. This will deeply harm American families.

ENDING THE REGULATION NATION

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the problem of excessive government.

The United States of America, the land of the free and the brave, a country created to provide everyone an equal opportunity to survive and thrive, has now become the regulation Nation.

In my travels across the great State of Minnesota, I have met and talked with people from all walks of life: farmers and manufacturers, teachers and entrepreneurs, community bankers and credit unions, and they are all crying out for relief from the excessive, overly burdensome, and duplicative regulation that is stifling growth and stealing opportunity.

For the past 8 years, opportunity in America has been under attack by regulations and unelected regulators from Washington. If every American is to have the opportunity to pursue the American Dream, this must end. That is why policy reforms such as the REINS Act are so important.

Under this vital legislation, any major rules from a Federal agency will require congressional approval. This is a great step to end the regulation Nation. We in the people's House must continue to work together to make life easier for the American people, not more difficult.

In the 115th Congress, we must—and we will—work with the incoming administration to roll back excessive and unnecessary regulation so that American families and businesses not only survive but can once again thrive.

DON'T REPEAL THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Americans today have better health coverage and health care, thanks to the Affordable Care Act.

The ACA has expanded and protected coverage for millions of Americans. More than 20 million previously uninsured Americans have newfound health security, including 95 percent of America's children.

I just want to mention two of my constituents who tweeted me within the last day or so about the ACA. One is from Laurence Harbor. It said: ''The ACA provided additional health care for my autistic son who had aged out on my employer's health plan. Attempts in the interim to find a healthcare plan for him were thwarted by insurance companies that did not want to cover him.''

Another one of my constituents from Marlboro, New Jersey, said: The ''ACA helped me to stay on my parent's healthcare for 3 years after college, which was a huge relief in a tough job market.''

There are so many cases, Mr. Speaker. I could go on all afternoon. The bottom line is the Affordable Care Act is also controlling costs for millions of Americans. Premium growth has slowed over the last 6 years, compared to the years before the ACA.

Mr. Speaker, if Republicans proceed with repealing the ACA, they will make America sick again. They will rip health care away from 30 million people and raise premiums for millions of others.

Repealing the ACA will move us from true care to total chaos. Republicans are blinded to the success of the Affordable Care Act. Repealing the Affordable Care Act is not logical, it is ideological, and I would strongly urge my Republican colleagues to start looking at this practically rather than ideologically.

REMEMBERING RONNIE HAWKINS

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a dear friend, constituent, and tremendous public servant in North Carolina, Cleveland County Commissioner Ronnie Hawkins.

Ronnie passed away right before Christmas, after a lengthy illness, but it wasn't one that slowed him. Throughout his illness, Ronnie displayed the same passion for helping others he showed throughout his career of public service.

A native of Cleveland County, Ronnie was an Army veteran and devoted husband to his wife, Libby. He was a respected and compassionate funeral director, comforting families in their time of need and grief. He took the same type of caring and compassionate approach to his service as one of Cleveland County's longest-serving elected officials, serving 16 years on the Cleveland County Commission, as well as 12 years on the Kings Mountain School Board. He never forgot who was actually his boss at home: his constituents.

Ronnie was a dear friend, and I extend my thoughts and prayers to his wife, Libby, his family, and his friends.

FEDERAL WORKERS

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to defend jobs.

In my region, Federal workers at Olympic National Park, which brings millions of visitors to our area, help that park run smoothly. They provide needed health services and care for our veterans at local VA facilities. Federal workers serve our Nation and help our sailors and submariners be safe through their work at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, which has been operating for 125 years.

We should have admiration and respect for the work they do. I don't think that this Chamber did right by them this week. That is because the

House approved a rule that would allow any Member to add an amendment to spending bills to cut Federal jobs and lower the pay of workers.

These workers shouldn't be unfairly singled out on the House floor. This is not the way to do business. Having worked in the private sector, you would never see a successful employer treat their employees with the disrespect that Congress treats the Federal workforce.

It is time to tell everyone at that shipyard, at the park, at the VA, and all Federal workers in my region and throughout this country that Congress respects and honors the work that they do. It is time to do away with this rule.

SMART BORDER ACT

(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, I have traveled to the southern border dozens of times over the years, and the problem is always the same. The people who defend our border—really, defend our country—do the best they can with what they have got, but they are outmanned, outgunned, and outfinanced by the drug cartels and the people coming across from the other side.

The continued failure to protect our border threatens our national security and the sovereignty of America. The reality is that the majority of the southern border territory is controlled by someone other than the United States. Why? Because there is no workable plan. Also, there is no moral will by this administration to protect our border.

My bill, the SMART Border Act, outlines a robust border protection strategy that includes achieving operational control of the border within 1 year, provides smart border technology, and mandates more boots on the ground, including 10,000 National Guard troops at the request of the four border State Governors.

Mr. Speaker, we must have the moral will to protect our borders. All types of people are crossing the border into the United States illegally—the good, the bad, and the ugly—and those days need to end. No one should come into America without America's permission.

And that is just the way it is.

ACA AND WOMEN

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

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, House and Senate leaders are working on a dangerous plan to dismantle the Affordable Care Act and strip more than 20 million Americans of their health insurance. And if they succeed, it will have devastating consequences for our constituents, particularly women.

Repealing the ACA means allowing insurance companies to charge women more, simply for being a woman; endangering access to care for 65 million women with preexisting conditions; and stripping more than 55 million women of free preventative care, like birth control and cancer screenings.

It is easy to forget how broken the system was before the Affordable Care Act. But make no mistake: dismantling it now means being a woman will once again be treated as a preexisting condition. It will mean fewer options, less access, and higher costs for tens of millions of women.

We should be building on the progress we have made, not turning back the clock. Women deserve better.

□ 1215

MEDIA SHOULDN'T DECIDE WHAT IS FAKE

(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, you may have heard about this new phenomenon called fake news. Fake news usually consists of false and made-up stories. Actually, it is not new and it has been around as long as there have been media.

What is new is that a few liberal media organizations are going to label news stories suspect if they feel the stories are not true. This should be of great concern to anyone who believes in free speech.

It works this way: nearly half of all Americans get information from Facebook. Facebook has now decided to let liberal media like ABC News and the Associated Press determine whether news is fake or not. This represents the liberal mindset that the media know better than the American people what is good for them.

A better idea is to trust the American people and let them determine what is real news and what is not. The American people will learn to discern the good from the bad if the media stops telling them what to think.

SAVING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Affordable Care Act, a law that has made a real difference in the lives of Minnesotans and Americans.

After 7 years of attacking the ACA, Republicans still have not come up with a plan to replace this law. Instead, they plan to work with President-elect Donald Trump to repeal the law and destroy the progress we have made.

Repealing the ACA would leave tens of millions of Americans uninsured. Repealing the ACA would let insurance companies deny coverage to more than 2 million Minnesotans with preexisting conditions. Repealing the ACA would eliminate free, high-quality preventive health care for hundreds of thousands of families in my district. Make no mistake, Republicans' ACA repeal plans would turn back the clock, leaving millions of Americans just one illness away from bankruptcy.

For the sake of Minnesotans and all Americans who have benefited from this law, join me in fighting to save the Affordable Care Act.

SUPPORT THE REINS ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as the House is set to begin debate on H.R. 26, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act, commonly referred to as the REINS Act, as a cosponsor of this bill, I rise to express my strong support for its passage.

This bill requires that any Federal regulation with a significant economic impact be subject to an up-or-down vote in both Chambers of Congress. Currently, the President has the power to implement regulations over executive agencies on a broad basis with little congressional consent.

The balance of power in Washington has often shifted increasingly toward the executive branch. This enables executive agencies to create regulations that Congress would never have approved. The pace and volume of Federal regulations and rules are increasing. In 2016 alone, the Obama administration broke all records in printing more than 97,000 pages and by issuing more than 3,800 rules and regulations in the Federal Register.

Unfortunately, the bureaucracy has been empowered to create punitive regulations rather than promoting collaborative efforts with States, businesses, and the average citizen. Mr. Speaker, I encourage each of my colleagues to think of the American people and vote ''yes'' on the REINS Act.

REDUCING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, a little over a month ago, I attended the funeral of Javon Wilson. Javon was the grandson of my good friend, Congressman DANNY DAVIS, and he was just 15 years old when he was shot and killed in Chicago.

At the funeral, Javon's best friend remembered their talks. ''We were going to be the ones that never died . . . if we get shot, we were never going to die,'' he said.

No child should grow up in a world where gun violence is so common that this talk seems normal.

This week, we turn the page to a new Congress. There is no reason that commonsense measures like universal background checks, making gun trafficking a Federal crime, and reinstating the ban on military-style assault weapons should fall victim to partisan gridlock.

Together, we have the opportunity to save lives and make our communities safer. This is a priority for me and my constituents, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make progress on reducing gun violence and building a safer future for all our children.

SUPPORTING OUR NATION'S VETERANS

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, as the 115th Congress kicks off this week, I remain committed to supporting our Nation's veterans. We made some good progress last year, but there is still much more work to be done.

While our military spends over 6 months preparing soldiers for assignment, we only spend 5 days preparing them to reintegrate to civilian life. I will be making it a priority to ensure veterans have a robust transition and support system for returning home.

We also must bring greater accountability and transparency to the VA. If a VA employee fails to do their duty to care for our Nation's heroes, they should be swiftly terminated. We need to turn around the culture of mediocrity at the agency. I look forward to working with Chairman ROE and my colleagues on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs this year to stand up for our men and women in uniform.

COOL SCIENCE TOPICS

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to continue a series of 1-minute speeches on cool science topics. Today I recognize the work of scientists working in the McMurdo Dry Valleys of Antarctica to develop geological metal maps. Researchers developed a three-dimensional electronic mapping system that is being used to detect large precious metal deposits in the United States.

With funding from NSF, researchers mapped out the Nokomis deposit in northern Minnesota, which is estimated to contain 10 billion pounds of copper, 3.1 billion pounds of nickel, 4 million ounces of platinum, 9 million ounces of palladium, and 2 million ounces of gold. The value of these metal deposits will more than pay for the science investment to develop this technology.

Congress should support research that furthers the understanding of our incredible universe, including the ground beneath our feet.

HONORING THE LIFE OF A. WARREN KULP

(Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of A. Warren Kulp, Jr., better known as Sonny, who passed away on New Year's Eve in West Palm Beach at the age of 81.

Sonny's life was the American Dream personified. After graduating from Hilltown High School in Pennsylvania in 1953, he worked as a self-employed dairy farmer for most of his life. He also earned his real estate license and worked as the head of the real estate department for 8 years in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. After moving to Florida with his wife, Judy, he worked at the Palm Beach Kennel Club until his retirement in 2007.

Outside of work, Sonny pursued many different interests. He was a loyal, lifelong Republican and served as an officer and committee chairman for the Pennridge Republican Club in Pennsylvania. He was a consummate grassroots advocate and always could be relied upon for sound advice on both politics and sports.

Mr. Speaker, our thoughts and prayers are with Judy and the Kulp family and the entire community as they mourn his passing today. He will be greatly missed.

REPEALING THE ACA IS UNACCEPTABLE

(Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the majority's efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act and make America sick again.

It is atrocious that Republicans intend to repeal ObamaCare without any plan for replacement. It is barbaric to take health care away from 30 million Americans. It is cruel and disgraceful to go back to the dark times when there were annual and lifetime limits on care for all Americans. It is gutless to repeal the law that protected breast cancer survivors like me and up to 129 million Americans with preexisting conditions. It is fraudulent to tell the American people that we can keep popular provisions like that one without any mechanism to share risk to keep health care affordable.

It is greedy to give insurance and drug companies billions of dollars in tax breaks but cut funding for Medicaid expansion. It is heartless to take away free preventive services like cancer screenings from 55 million Americans, particularly seniors and people with disabilities in Medicare. It is indefensible to roll back the $23.5 billion in prescription drug savings realized by seniors on Medicare in the donut hole.

It is past time—long past time—that my Republican colleagues understand from A to Z that repeal is unacceptable and a disaster waiting to happen.

LET'S GET TO WORK ON OBAMACARE

(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, the American people gave my party control of the entire Congress and the White House because of the promise-breaking, job-killing bill known as ObamaCare, the craziest thing in the whole world, according to President Bill Clinton. On November 8, we were ordered to repeal ObamaCare, and that is just what we are going to do.

Fearmongers on the other side are telling Americans they will lose their health insurance like that. That will only happen if we follow their example and pass a bill that becomes law before we have the time to read it. House Republicans will take time to listen to doctors, nurses, hospitals, patients, the American people to give them the health care they deserve at a lower cost, higher quality with the doctor of their choice. We have our orders. It is time to go to work.

PROTECTING THE ACA

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is not a matter of politics. It is a matter of life or death for the people back home. In the San Diego region, repeal of the ACA would mean nearly 300,000 people could lose access to health care.

I heard from one constituent just this week who was diagnosed with an autoimmune disease where the rheumatoid arthritis is not just attacking her joints, but her organs as well. She needs a double lung transplant to stay alive. Her 7-year-old son, she writes me, tells her, ''Mommy, I'm scared. I hope you get your new balloons soon.'' She lives with the anxiety and the fear of how the repeal of the ACA may affect her treatment every day because of her preexisting condition.

I implore my Republican colleagues to remember the people that this decision will impact. The effect of this repeal has much more important consequences than politics. Let's not be responsible for any child who sees a mother suffer or even lose her life without the treatment she needs.

OUR NEW ADMINISTRATION WILL SUPPORT ISRAEL

(Mrs. WAGNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to express my extreme disappointment in the Obama administration's betrayal of Israel. The administration's destructive decision to undercut Israel has given leverage to anti-Israel boycotters and anti-Semites across the world.

This act screamed of personal vengeance and hostility, directly harmed American interests, and undermined peace in the Middle East. It was a cowardly and foolish parting shot for an administration that flagrantly ignores serious global challenges—Syria, Aleppo, ISIS, Iran, China, Russia, and the list goes on.

By abstaining from the vote to censure Israel, President Obama vetoed the U.S.-Israel alliance and violated the faith of the American people. I look forward to a new day, to a new administration that will support Israel and refuse to abandon our allies on the world stage.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. McEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my observation that often in this body there are people who would suggest to us that their actions are motivated and guided by an adherence to the Judeo-Christian ethic.

Mr. Speaker, in Jesus' first sermon, He said, among other things, ''The spirit of the Lord is upon me to bring good news to the poor.'' We have done that with the enactment of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, the notion of taking away the Affordable Care Act by repealing it, I would suggest to this body, is antithetical to those Judeo-Christian values. More than 20 million Americans of all socioeconomic backgrounds have benefited from this act.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that reason will prevail and that while we may tweak the Affordable Care Act, it will not be repealed.

□ 1230

TWO-STATE SOLUTION IN ISRAEL

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we are going to be taking up a resolution that is designed to reflect our discontent with the resolution of the United Nations. I am totally in favor of expressing our discontent. I think we ought to cut our funds to the U.N. until such time as Resolution 2334 is repealed.

But the resolution today, at four different places, refers to our push in the United States for a two-state solution in Israel. Look, Hebron is in what was the promised land. David ruled from there for the first 7 years he was King over Israel. Hebron is part of the two-state solution going to the Palestinians. How did the Palestinians deserve the land that was given as the promised land 1,600 years before Muhammad even existed?

I can't vote for the resolution when we are advocating what Joel 3 says will bring judgment down upon our Nation for trying to partition Israel—can't do it.

WE MUST NOT MAKE AMERICA SICK AGAIN

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to read a letter from my constituent, Mrs. Karen O'Hern, of Alexandria, Virginia:

''Congressman BEYER,

''We are a family of four. The company my husband worked for went bankrupt in 2009 after the 2008 financial meltdown—losing income, retirement savings, and health care.

''He now owns a small business and we now get our healthcare insurance through healthcare.gov.

''We need you to defend the ACA. We depend on the availability of this insurance option.

''My son had surgery on December 30 at Fairfax Hospital to remove a brain tumor. His prognosis is good. I cannot imagine how we would manage financially without this health insurance.

''Please be strong on this matter and represent the needs of your constituents.

''I need my Affordable Care Act health insurance.

''Regards, Karen O'Hern.''

Mr. Speaker, millions like Karen O'Hern will lose their coverage if the Affordable Care Act is repealed. We must not make America sick again.

WEST VIRGINIANS WANT THEIR VOICE TO BE HEARD

(Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on the REINS Act, which will hold our agencies accountable to the people of America. I am a proud cosponsor of this regulation, this legislation. If a regulation has a high economic cost, then the people, through Congress, have to approve it before it goes into effect.

The REINS Act is one of several bills we will be considering this week to stop business as usual in Washington. We will be saying ''no'' to the overregulations of the last 8 years, ''no'' to the radical anti-coal agenda that has closed coal mines and cost my State of West Virginia thousands of jobs, ''no'' to a Federal Government that won't even come to West Virginia to hear how their regulations affect us.

West Virginians have had enough. They want change. They want their voice to be heard. They want to work hard and put food on their table.

I am here to stand up for West Virginians: families, miners, and small businesses. I urge my colleagues to support the REINS Act.

OFFERING A 28TH AMENDMENT

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, we came together this morning to read the United States Constitution and its 27 amendments. I offer a 28th amendment, an amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's disastrous decision in Citizens United:

Section 1. To advance democratic self-government and political equality, and to protect the integrity of government and the electoral process, Congress and the States may regulate and set reasonable limits on the raising and spending of money by candidates and others to influence elections.

Section 2. Congress and the States shall have power to implement and enforce this article by appropriate legislation, and may distinguish between natural persons and corporations or other artificial entities created by law, including by prohibiting such entities from spending money to influence our elections.

Section 3. Nothing in this article shall be construed to grant Congress or the States the power to abridge freedom of the press.

Mr. Speaker, Citizens United let unlimited money flood into our elections and compromise our democracy. I ask all of my colleagues in this 115th Congress to join our effort to overturn it.

REPEALING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT WILL BE DETRIMENTAL TO OUR HEALTHCARE SYSTEMS AND MEDICAL RESEARCH COMMUNITY

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Affordable Care Act. It is a promise to the American people that we must keep. It guarantees access to affordable, high-quality health care as a right for all Americans. Backing out of this commitment is irresponsible, inexcusable, and reprehensible.

As a Member from a congressional district that houses some of the largest hospitals in the country, health is a crucial issue for my constituents. Under the ACA, millions of Americans now have access to affordable health care through individual marketplaces and Medicaid expansion. Children in New York can remain on their parents' plan through the age of 29. An insurance company cannot discriminate against patients with preexisting conditions.

Repeal will be detrimental to our healthcare systems and medical research community. Without a plan to

replace the ACA, Republicans are openly gambling with the health care of millions, many of whom will be affected, like the elderly and disabled who cannot afford to return to the old system of skyrocketing costs.

I will fight for those Americans who rely on the ACA, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

BENEFITS OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the lifesaving impact of the Affordable Care Act.

This week, I have heard from dozens of constituents who have been calling my office and reaching out on social media to tell me their ACA stories.

I heard from one constituent whose mother had two devastating lung diseases. While she had good insurance, unfair lifetime spending caps priced her out of receiving the lifesaving treatment she needed. When the Affordable Care Act passed, we ended the cruel practice of lifetime spending caps. With these new protections, she was able to resume her treatment and stay healthy to spend time with her daughter and granddaughter.

Mr. Speaker, the ACA works. It reduces healthcare costs, enables young people to stay on their parents' insurance, and ensures low-income and struggling families that they can access the care they need.

If Republicans repeal this law without a viable replacement, there will be real consequences to real people. Let me be clear: by repealing the ACA, Republicans would end healthcare coverage for millions of families, put the insurance companies back in charge, and, yes, make America sick again.

I urge my colleagues to consider what is at stake here—real costs, real lives, not just a political football.

Let's do the right thing and protect families' health care.

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. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 22 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 22

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union 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. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. 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 in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 11) objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace, and for other purposes. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. 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 House Resolution 22, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 11, a resolution regarding United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334. It provides for 1 hour of debate on H. Res. 11, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Additionally, this rule provides for consideration of legislation that I introduced, H.R. 26, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny, or REINS, Act. It makes in order 12 amendments from Members on both sides of the aisle, and provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee received testimony from the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs Committees.

Mr. Speaker, the beginning of this new Congress is a time of hope and a time to establish clear priorities and goals. This is a time to show the American people that we, as their elected representatives, will have the courage to stand on principles that made us worthy of their trust. This rule provides for two pieces of legislation that represent our commitment to the integrity and transparency of this institution.

H. Res. 11, introduced by Chairman ROYCE and cosponsored by Ranking Member ENGEL, objects to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace. It calls for the resolution's repeal and makes clear that the current administration's failure to veto the U.N. resolution violated longstanding U.S. policy to protect Israel from such counterproductive U.N. resolutions. Importantly, it also provides a foundation for the next administration to take action to counteract the damaging effects of the U.N. Security Council resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I support H. Res. 11, yet it shouldn't be necessary. President Obama's refusal to veto the U.N. Security Council's resolution was a radical and dangerous departure from U.S. precedent.

Prior to this most recent Security Council resolution, President Obama has exercised the veto power of the United States on every resolution relating to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. His failure to do so this time jeopardizes and undermines our relationship with our strongest ally in the Middle East, and it has the potential to undercut the peace process.

I stood in this Chamber numerous times before and demanded support for Israel, and I am going to do so here again today. I refuse to sit idly by and watch misguided anti-Israel policies take root.

We have to take a stand. The administration's failure to act, to even participate in the vote, was an act of cowardice. It can't be erased, and we must take steps to address it. This resolution is a step in the right direction.

As a new President is sworn in this month, I am hopeful that we, as the House of Representatives, and the United States will reaffirm our support

of Israel and return to policies that strengthen the relationships between our two nations.

Mr. Speaker, as the new Congress starts, we also must look at domestic policies and how to grow our economy. We are going to do that right here in the House by taking the lead on regulatory reform to help lift the burden of an intrusive government by jump-starting the economy.

□ 1245

As part of this effort, I introduced H.R. 26, the REINS Act. This bill was originally authored and introduced by former Congressman Geoff Davis in 2009. Last Congress, now-Senator TODD YOUNG introduced the bill in the House. This Congress, I am proud to carry the torch for this commonsense legislation. I also thank Chairman GOODLATTE and his staff for all of their hard work on this bill.

Article I, section 1 of the United States Constitution grants legislative powers to Congress—we read about that right here on the floor this morning—but, for too long, Congress has ceded that power to the executive branch, which has resulted in an onslaught of regulation. This is a problem that we have seen under the administrations of both parties, and Members on both sides of the aisle should be concerned.

In recent years, this problem has exploded. In 2015 alone, the executive branch issued over 3,000 rules and regulations, and 76 of these regulations were major regulations. Let me explain that. Unelected bureaucrats, without input from the American people or their Representatives in Congress, issued 76 major regulations that would impact our economy by more than $100 million each in 1 year alone. The consequences of these rules are massive. Even worse, we have seen this administration promote regulations with burdens that far outweigh their benefits. The REINS Act would require Federal agencies to submit major rules to Congress for approval. Under this bill, major rules would have to be accepted by both Chambers and signed by the President to become effective.

This bill restores accountability to the legislative process and ensures that lawmakers, not nameless bureaucrats, are the ones making the laws, just like our Constitution outlines. We have seen the harm that can come from an out-of-control regulatory regime. Right now, hardworking Americans across the country are paying the price. In fact, on average, each U.S. household is bearing an annual economic weight of $15,000 in regulatory burdens. The oppressive costs of regulation, coupled with the impact on jobs, demand action.

One regulation, put forth by the Environmental Protection Agency in 2015, would have cost my home State of Georgia over 11,000 jobs; and we are all familiar with the waters of the United States rule, which, essentially, asserted authority over all groundwater in the country. If you have been to northeast Georgia, you know that water collects in pools and puddles and streams at certain times of the year. If all of that were to be regulated under this rule, it would be a disaster for not only my district but for all of the country, but that is what this administration has tried to do. That rule has been halted by a court, but were it to go into effect, it would cut farmers, ranchers, Realtors, and small businesses off at the knees.

With the number of major rules this administration has propagated, I could far exceed my time in just illustrating the problems these regulations can create; but, with the REINS Act, we have a chance to carve out a better way in going forward. The American people elected us, in this body, to represent them. The REINS Act allows their voices to be heard more clearly.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter what party is in the executive branch because the legislative branch is the one that makes and accepts the bills, not the unelected bureaucrats. This bill creates a sensible way to move forward with legislative business while better protecting our economy from suffocating regulations that Americans never voted to enact.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for yielding the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, before I speak on today's legislation, I want to take a moment to express my continued deep concern and uneasiness about the Russian hacking in order to influence the outcome of the 2016 Presidential election and the deeply troublesome response from our President-elect.

American democracy was attacked, in 2016, by Russian hackers who sought to tip our Presidential election in favor of Donald Trump. That is not I who is speaking—that is the CIA, the FBI, and 14 other United States intelligence agencies that have reached a clear consensus on this matter. Yet, even in the face of the overwhelming evidence, President-elect Trump has continued to sow seeds of confusion by publicly attacking and trying to discredit our country's intelligence agencies and the brave men and women who risk their lives every day to keep us safe.

Today, intelligence officials are testifying before the Senate on this matter. In one of his most alarming actions yet, President-elect Trump has said that he would rather trust the words of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange—an accused sex offender, who is holed up in the Ecuadorian Embassy in the U.K.—than the consensus of the Directors of the U.S. intelligence agencies. When Speaker RYAN was asked about Julian Assange, he called him a sycophant for Russia who leaks, steals data, and compromises national security. Yet, America's next President puts more faith in him than in the 16 U.S. intelligence agencies that he will soon oversee.

This is not normal behavior by a President-elect, let alone by a President, and we cannot allow it to become normal. I appeal to my fellow Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats—and especially the Republican leadership—to reach out to the President-elect and ensure that there is a clear understanding about how damaging these statements and actions are to America's credibility, to our national security, and to the morale and responsibilities of our intelligence agencies. I appeal to my colleagues to get him help now.

America faces serious threats across the globe, and we cannot afford to have a Commander in Chief at war with the very intelligence agencies that are responsible for keeping our country safe. Whatever his motivation, President-elect Trump must clearly and unequivocally join Republicans and Democrats who seek answers. We need a bipartisan, independent commission to uncover the truth about Russian hacking, and we need all of our leaders to support it.

It is time Mr. Trump's Twitter sideshow comes to an end. It only confirms what many of us feared during the campaign—that he is temperamentally unfit to be President. We must be united in protecting the integrity of our elections against Russians and all foreign influence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get to the underlying bills.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule, which provides for the consideration of H.R. 26, the REINS Act, under a structured process, and for H. Res. 11, a resolution objecting to a recent United Nations Security Council resolution on Israel, under a completely closed process.

Before I get into discussing the merits of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to first express some serious concern with the process used to rush this legislation to the floor. The deadline for amendments to be submitted to the Rules Committee was 10 a.m. on Tuesday. That is 2 hours before Members were sworn in and before the 115th Congress officially began. Now, it is true that some of the amendments that were received after the deadline were made in order for consideration on the floor. But, really, is this the way we want to begin the consideration of legislation in this session of Congress? All Members should have had the opportunity to review the legislation and offer thoughtful amendments to the REINS Act. Wouldn't it have been something to have considered this bill under an open process? If you hadn't wanted to have done that, maybe you could have waited a couple of days before you brought it to the floor so that everybody, especially the freshmen,

would have had an opportunity to evaluate it, and maybe they would have had some good ideas that they would have wanted to offer. But, here we are, right out of the gate, limiting the process and prohibiting Members from offering their ideas on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, we have a process for reviewing rules promulgated by the executive branch. Congress should—and, indeed, can—examine regulations. Not all regulations are perfect. There are such things as bad regulations, and we should get rid of the ones that don't work. There is no debate on that. We have the ability to override regulations with new laws, and we have reauthorizations, appropriations, spending limitations, oversight hearings, investigations, GAO audits and studies, and the Congressional Review Act, just to name a few. We have a process that can and should work, but, because my Republican friends don't always get what they want, they want to undermine that process.

I don't think my Republican colleagues are really interested in a thoughtful review of these regulations. In fact, I find it hard to believe that this Republican Congress even has the capacity to utilize the process that is outlined in this bill so as to consider the 100 or so regulations—some of which are highly technical and would require experts in specialized fields to analyze—that could come up in any given year; but I guess that is the point. This bill would make it nearly impossible to implement much-needed regulations that ensure consumer health and product safety, environmental protections, workplace safety, and financial protections, just to name a few.

It would be a dream come true for industry and the wealthy, well-connected Republican donor class who, for example, are interested in blocking all attempts to rein in Wall Street, to combat climate change, or to protect workers and their public health. One simply needs to look at the intensive lobbying that has gone into fighting these regulations and supporting antiregulation legislation like the REINS Act—groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Koch brothers, the American Petroleum Institute, just to name a few.

Industry groups already use their seemingly unlimited resources to delay and prevent commonsense regulations from taking effect by tying rules up in court. This bill is just one additional tool for the wealthy and powerful to delay and destroy commonsense consumer protections.

In short, this bill is not about creating jobs, so nobody should be fooled. It is about rewarding special interests, plain and simple. It is about making it more difficult to rein in Wall Street, to control polluters, or to protect workers. But this is in keeping with the philosophy of the Republican majority, so no one should be surprised. I urge my colleagues to strongly oppose this effort.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me just say a few words about the closed rule on H. Res. 11, the resolution condemning U.S. abstention on Israel at the U.N. Security Council.

The peace and security of the State of Israel are priorities for every Member of Congress. Let us not try to obscure or confuse that truth. I can't think of any Member of this House who doesn't support peace in the Middle East and a safe and secure Israel. We may disagree about how to achieve those goals. Most of us believe that a two-state solution that provides peace, security, and prosperity to all of the peoples of the region—Israeli, Palestinian, and their Arab neighbors—is the best option to securing a just, lasting, and durable peace.

I have always voted in support of economic and military aid for Israel, but this does not mean that I always agree with the policies of a particular government in Tel Aviv. Sometimes I have been critical of the Israeli Government just as I am often critical of my own government and of other governments in the region.

For the past four decades or more, the United States, under Republican and Democratic Presidents alike, has strongly opposed the expansion of settlements and the demolition of Palestinian homes. This has been a bipartisan consensus. We oppose the settlements as a violation of basic human rights; we oppose them as creating obstacles to a lasting two-state solution; and we oppose their rapid expansion as potentially creating a reality on the ground that, therefore, closes any possibility of a two-state solution.

Since 1967, under Presidents Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, George H. W. Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama, the United States has voted in favor or has abstained on more than 50 U.N. Security Council resolutions that are critical of Israel, including resolutions on settlements or the demolition of Palestinian homes. Of the more than 30 abstentions that have been cast by the U.S. over nearly five decades, only one was cast by the Obama administration—just one.

H. Res. 11 does not precisely express that fact accurately. It implies that the U.S. always opposes or vetoes such regulations when that is hardly the case, nor does U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 impose a solution on Israel outside of direct bilateral negotiations to end the conflict. Some of us who are strong supporters of Israel have difficulties with some of the wording in H. Res. 11 on a straightforward factual basis.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment to allow this House to debate a substitute offered by our colleagues, Congressman DAVID PRICE, Congressman ELIOT ENGEL, who is a cosponsor of H. Res. 11, and Congressman GERRY CONNOLLY. The Price-Engel-Connolly amendment expresses the House's strong support for Israel, a two-state solution, and direct negotiations between the parties to the conflict. It is reasonable and balanced and is very much deserving of debate and this House's attention.

Regrettably, the Republican majority on the House Rules Committee rejected allowing that amendment to be brought before the House and debated. Instead, it decided to begin this new year and this new Congress with yet another closed rule—in fact, the second closed rule this week with no debate, with no thoughtful alternatives, and with no ability of the Members of this body to deliberate such serious issues and choose between alternative proposals—just politics, politics, politics, politics as usual.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and to please send a clear message to House leaders that we would like to be able to debate reasonable alternatives and amendments to bills, like the Price-Engel-Connolly amendment. If we don't start out the year demanding fairness and openness in our debates of important issues then I don't want to even speculate as to what the rest of the year will look like.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate my colleague's concerns. I think it is interesting to note, though, that, if he were concerned about a closed rule, there were many of us who were very concerned about a closed voice from America at the U.N. Security Council in not defending Israel.

Also, on the other subject here, when we look at this going forward, there was a substitute that was actually offered in support of a resolution that does take a stand against what happened. It was not even mentioned in the substitute resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), a fellow member of the Rules Committee.

□ 1300

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share my strong support for this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater friend to the United States than Israel. Israel is a beacon of hope in a very dangerous part of the world. They are an important economic and military partner of the United States, and they play a critical role when it comes to fighting radical Islamic terrorism.

Given the importance of the U.S.-Israel relationship, I was deeply disappointed to see the United States recently passed a flawed anti-Israel resolution that will only make it more difficult to achieve peace in the Middle East. Even more disappointing was the fact that the United States just stood by and did nothing as it happened. Instead of vetoing the resolution, the United States Ambassador abstained from voting at all.

In other words, the United States turned its back and looked the other way as the U.N. passed a flawed resolution attacking Israel. This represents a

dangerous break in a longstanding and bipartisan policy to protect our sole democratic ally in the region from one-sided resolutions at the U.N.

Let's be clear, this resolution does absolutely nothing to make peace more likely in the region. Instead, it muddies the water and only further complicates what is already a very complex issue.

No solution to the ongoing problems with Israel and the Palestinian Authority is going to come from an international body like the United Nations telling them what to do. Any real solution must come through negotiations between the involved parties.

Honestly, given the many blunders of the Obama administration on the world stage, I guess this most recent action shouldn't be all that surprising. But this action is one of the most irresponsible acts ever by an outgoing President. It will be a dark stain on an already disastrous legacy.

By abstaining and allowing this resolution to pass, the Obama administration has upset decades of bipartisan policy as it relates to Israel and put a pathway to peace even further out of reach. Now is the time to be standing up for Israel, not turning away from them.

It is my hope and my belief that under President-elect Trump the United States will once again stand arm in arm with Israel, and this resolution is an important step in that direction.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

I hope that my colleague from Alabama uses some of that passion to convince the President-elect to stop cozying up to Vladimir Putin, who is no friend of democracy, no friend of Israel, and no friend of human rights.

All we are trying to do here, Mr. Speaker, is to have a little democracy on the House floor. People can vote whichever way they want to vote. But the Rules Committee last night, staying true to form, actually denied us the ability to bring to the floor and debate an alternative, which we think is, quite frankly, more appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will make in order H. Res. 23, the David Price-Eliot Engel-Gerry Connolly resolution, to provide an alternative viewpoint.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution again was blocked by the Rules Committee, right along party line. Republicans said ''no'' to an open debate, even though it complies with all the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss the proposal, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule and the underlying resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there is a legitimate debate to be had concerning U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 and the United States' decision to abstain, but H. Res. 11 does not engage on those issues. Instead, it misrepresents the motives of the Obama administration as it made the tough decision to abstain, and it distorts the content of the U.N. Security Council resolution, apparently for political purposes. In fact, H. Res. 11 runs a real risk of undermining the credibility of the United States Congress as a proactive force working toward a two-state solution.

As we enter a period of great geopolitical uncertainty, that principle has never been more important. In the face of new threats to democracy and stability, we must join together to reaffirm the most fundamental tenets of our foreign policy, including our strong and unwavering support for Israel. But we must also demonstrate to the world that we are still committed to diplomacy that defends human rights and promotes peace.

In an effort to make that unifying affirmation, I, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CONNOLLY offered an amendment in the Rules Committee yesterday in the nature of a substitute for H. Res. 11. Our substitute was intended to put forward clear, consensus language that omitted the flaws of the underlying legislation and reaffirmed America's longstanding commitment to Israel and to peace in the region.

Our alternative didn't attempt to solve all the region's problems. We didn't pass judgment on recent events at the United Nations. In fact, those of us working on this resolution have varying views on that question. Nor did our resolution include politically charged attacks on the foreign policy priorities of the other party.

Instead, our resolution is carefully designed to allow a broad, bipartisan consensus to speak in one voice in support of a two-state solution as the most credible pathway to peace.

Unfortunately, this substitute amendment was not made in order by the Rules Committee, which instead moved forward with the closed rule we have before us. The alternative resolution has now been introduced separately as H. Res. 23, and it is available for cosponsorship.

Today, however, we don't have that before us because of this rule.

Members don't have the opportunity to vote on this or any other resolution that accurately affirms both our vital relationship with Israel and the longstanding bipartisan consensus that supports a viable two-state solution. Instead, we are presented with an extreme resolution that badly distorts the history—and we have heard that again here this morning—and that recklessly maligns U.S. diplomacy, all to embarrass the Obama administration for political gain. It is not worthy of this body.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question, ''no'' on the rule, and ''no'' on the underlying resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a bright young member of the Rules Committee who today is offering the rule on two very important issues that face this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. I rise in support of the work that the Rules Committee did for the right reason and I will yield the right results.

The American people spoke on November 8, and they asked for change, a change from business as usual. Mr. Speaker, that does mean you can look at geopolitical facts and draw a conclusion as opposed to geopolitical facts and ignore things that happen in the world, and that is exactly what we are doing here today.

The American people no longer want unelected bureaucrats promulgating rules. They no longer want Washington to be so important in their lives. They want and need to be able to have an opportunity to make their own decisions and to work well within the law. They have spoken; and they want what I believe the Republican House, the Republican Senate, and a Republican President will bring to the country. It is called accountability.

The REINS Act, sponsored by Mr. COLLINS today, addresses many of the issues that I just discussed. The legislation requires that a joint resolution must be approved and must be passed by both Chambers of Congress and signed by the President before any major new rule or regulation is promulgated by the executive branch before it can take place. These are rules written by the Congress, rules then associated and determined by the executive, but with the intent of Congress to make sure that the American people are not further harmed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have just heard an opportunity to discuss what was—this discussion that we are having about Israel and the administration. The bottom line is that the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative ED ROYCE, came before the committee yesterday and said he really did not take issue with what they were doing. He would not support it because it did not address the problem that occurred when the Obama administration, for political purposes, hung the people of Israel and the State of Israel out for the world to condemn and take

advantage of. It bypassed years and years of American foreign policy. It stunned not only Members of Congress, but it also stunned people who recognize that Israel is in a fight for their life.

Mr. Speaker, we did not, based upon the determination of the Rules Committee, make in order the bill that they had asked for. They can bring it to the floor today, and we are not going to make it available because it does not even discuss the basic facts. That is, the President of the United States unilaterally allowed the State of Israel, who is a dear friend of the United States, to be hung out in the political and the economic world and the world of foreign affairs to be tarnished and taken advantage of.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to say that we were appalled by what our government did and we are going to stand up and call it for what it is. America should always be a trusted friend to Israel, and we are doing exactly that here today.

Mr. Speaker, I predict an overwhelming vote that will take place today to enunciate what we believe is correct and also what was wrong.

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

The distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee said that the American people don't want business as usual. Yet, here we are on this opening week and what we see is business as usual, more Putin-like, closed rules coming to the floor. The 113th and the 114th Congresses were the two most closed Congresses in the history of the United States. Here we are beginning the new session with, again, this closed process.

The Speaker, on opening day, made a promise to uphold the rights of the minority.

Well, you know what?

That means that the minority ought to be able to be heard on the House floor, that we ought to be able to bring amendments and substitutes to the floor. Yet, we get rejected time and time again.

This is not the way the most deliberative body in the world should be run. This is not the way Congress should be run. By closing down this process the way the majority does, it does a great disservice to the American people

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this rule, which was pushed through the Rules Committee as a closed rule and did not make in order an amendment, which I support, offered by my colleagues, Mr. PRICE, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. ENGEL.

Their amendment, like H. Res. 11, objects to the U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334, which I believe was an unfair and one-sided resolution that placed undue blame upon the State of Israel for the impasse on peace negotiations.

Like the Obama administration, I am frustrated by the lack of progress in recent years toward achieving a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian crisis. However, I do not believe that the resolution passed by the Security Council contributes in any way to positively moving this process along.

Let's not mistake the fact that the Palestinian Government, which currently includes the terrorist faction Hamas, has done little to support peace negotiations. By refusing to publicly recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, condoning terrorist activity and pursuing unilateral actions at international institutions in violation of the Oslo Accords, the Palestinians have continuously placed roadblocks to achieving peace.

Let me be clear, the ongoing settlement activity sanctioned by the Israeli Government is also counterproductive to the peace process. If the Israeli Government wants to remain a beacon of freedom and democracy in the Middle East, they must recommit themselves to achieving a peaceful two-state solution where a Jewish Israel exists peacefully with the Palestinian state.

With the events of recent years, I am extremely fearful that the two-state solution is, if not dead, in critical condition. There are those within both the Israeli and Palestinian Governments who are actively working to ensure its demise. I think, as Members of Congress who strongly support Israel, we should be doing everything we can to convey to both the Israelis and the Palestinians that we will not stand by and watch them torpedo the hope of a peaceful solution to this crisis.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule governing these pieces of legislation and, in particular, the underlying legislation, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny, or REINS Act, H.R. 26.

Mr. Speaker, during the first two terms that I have served in this Congress, the most common question posed to me by my constituents in central and eastern Kentucky is: What is the biggest surprise that you have confronted as a Member of Congress?

Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, the biggest surprise that I have discovered as a Member of Congress is that Congress is no longer in charge. Regrettably, unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats in the executive branch run the country.

□ 1315

Most of the laws that are enacted in this country at the Federal level come out of unelected bureaucrats in administrative agencies in the executive branch. Members of Congress, even though we are elected by the American people to be the lawmaking branch under Article I of the Constitution, we can't stop it. We can't stop these rules and regulations.

So I am proud to have consistently supported the REINS Act because it reasserts the powers of this body and this Congress under Article I of the Constitution, which provides: ''All legislative powers herein granted shall be invested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.''

What does this mean?

The most important word in Article I of the Constitution is that first substantive word, ''all,'' implying that none of the legislative powers should be in any other branch of the Federal Government, and it certainly shouldn't be exercised by the executive branch. We know this as the nondelegation doctrine, the principle that Congress may not and should not delegate its administrative power to administrative agencies.

The nondelegation doctrine forces a politically accountable Congress to make policy choices rather than leave this to unelected administrative officials. Yet what we have seen over the last several decades, and especially over the last 8 years, has been the rise of an unaccountable, out-of-control administrative state. Over time, legislative powers that are vested exclusively in Congress by the Constitution have been increasingly and unconstitutionally claimed, assumed, and exercised by the executive branch.

Now unaccountable, unelected bureaucrats decide how you work, what goods and services you can buy and sell, and what you can do with your own property, all without accountability at the ballot box. So this state of affairs is fundamentally in conflict with the foundational, constitutional principle that Congress alone possesses the Federal legislative power.

Look, this has enormous economic consequences. It is costly to our economy, and I don't have to go into that. The estimates are $1.8 trillion in costs to the American economy. But the bigger issue is that none of these rules from these agencies have been approved—let alone, even considered—by Congress, even though they have a profound impact on the economy. So the measure we are considering today would simply require those regulations with the greatest economic impact to be approved by both Houses of Congress prior to their implementation.

This has two positive outcomes. First, obviously, it has the effect of blocking costly rules. Secondly, and more importantly, it will no longer allow Members of Congress to delegate their constitutional responsibility to the executive branch.

I will conclude, I heard my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, make the argument that Congress is not even interested in these regulations and we are not capable of seriously reviewing these rules. This is about making sure that experts with specialized expertise in the executive branch review and promulgate these rules. But what are we doing here if

that is true? We should turn out the lights, lock the door and leave, and give the keys of the government to the executive branch.

We had a Democratic administration over the last 8 years. We have a Republican administration coming. This is not about Republicans and Democrats. This is not a partisan issue. This is about the integrity of the institution of Congress. Let's stand up for the Congress and pass the REINS Act.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his steadfast commitment to ensuring global peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and H. Res. 11, which is a flawed and misguided effort as currently written. Let me be clear: H. Res. 11 would undermine longstanding and bipartisan U.S. policy on a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This resolution is deeply flawed because it does not accurately portray U.S. policy on Israeli settlements. What is worse, this resolution completely mischaracterizes the United Nations Security Council resolution and the United States' abstention vote.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee shamefully rejected an alternative introduced by Congressman PRICE, Congressman CONNOLLY, and Congressman ENGEL, which reflects current U.S. policy that would have reaffirmed our commitment to a negotiated and peaceful two-state solution. This is the only pathway to peace and security. It is appalling—but really, it is not surprising—that Republicans pushed through a closed rule and hurried this to the floor.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, the lack of a debate is a disgrace. But you know what? There are some of us here who are not going to be gagged. There are some of here who are going to speak our mind, and there are some of us here who are going to put forth our views. That is our constitutional responsibility. We have the right to debate, whether you agree or disagree. It is really, really a very sad day for our democracy when bills like this come to the floor with rules like this which don't allow debate. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am so glad that the gentlewoman just got a chance to debate herself on the floor and to use that freedom of speech. That is what this floor is for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding.

I rise today to support this rule and to express my strong disapproval of President Obama and his administration's refusal to veto the anti-Israel resolution adopted by the United Nations Security Council on December 23, 2016.

Since its establishment, Israel has worked tirelessly to forge peace with its neighbors. They have sought neither violence nor conflict. In fact, the territories discussed in the misguided U.N. resolution were areas Israel gained in self-defense during the 1967 Six-Day War. These areas include the Old City, with the Temple Mount and Western Wall, areas that, thousands of years ago, were the origin of the Israeli culture, heritage, and religion.

Israel did not seek to take this land. Rather, when threatened by their Arab neighbors in 1967, they were forced to act in self-defense and repel these attacks. Since that time, Israel has successfully reached peaceful agreements with many of the Arab countries who, at that time, sought to wipe them off the map.

Israel is the only thriving democracy in the Middle East who practices and protects human rights regardless of ethnicity, gender, religion, or citizenship. Additionally, the State of Israel has been committed to implementing initiatives to promote economic growth in the region, including creating opportunities for Palestinians and others. Israel is a shining example of taking care of those who are around them, even as they face constant threat of violence and terrorist attacks.

I have been appalled over what has taken place under the direction of President Obama and Secretary Kerry and others within the administration. In response, I also introduced a resolution condemning these intolerable actions. By failing to direct the United States to veto the one-sided, anti-Israel U.N. Security Council resolution, the President turned his back on Israel and, as a result, turned his back on America.

The anti-Israel resolution adopted by the U.N. Security Council threatens peace and stability in the Middle East. It will most likely incentivize further violence and radical boycotts.

While President Obama and Secretary Kerry's long list of foreign policy failures has been well-documented over the years, none to date have been this deliberate and calculated. That is why I have come to the floor to support Chairman ROYCE's bipartisan resolution.

As Republicans and Democrats alike have expressed their contempt for the President's lack of action, I look forward to working with my colleagues and President-elect Trump in correcting President Obama's anti-Israeli tactics as we work to form a stronger bond with Israel and as we work to promote peace in the Middle East.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to Mr. ROSS, my friend, I agree with just about every single thing you say about the great State of Israel, but I disagree with you about this resolution. Let me explain why.

Israel is a Jewish democratic state. It has been our strong ally. We have supported it through thick and thin, most recently with a $38 billion appropriation for their security over the next 10 years. I supported that. But this question that we face fundamentally comes down to whether we are going to support a two-state solution or move toward a one-state solution.

The bottom line here is that settlement activity, every settlement that is made—600,000 settlers living in the West Bank and Jerusalem—makes it ever-more difficult to achieve that two-state solution.

President Obama, in his abstention on that veto, was acknowledging what has been the policy of this country. Ronald Reagan was opposed to settlements. You know, you get a family that settles anywhere, but in the West Bank, they put down roots. They are good people. They have a belief that the West Bank belongs Biblically to Israel. That is their view. Many politicians, including Netanyahu, appear to be embracing that. That is not the international position. It is not the unified position in Israel. Many folks in Israel think the settlements are a threat to the possibility of achieving the secure borders and the security of Israel and the maintenance of it as a democratic Jewish state.

Mr. Speaker, there is another issue. With 600,000 settlers, with 4.5 million Palestinians in the West Bank and also living in the State of Israel and 6.5 million Jewish members of the State of Israel, the demographics, long term, are going to reach a tipping point where there could be more Arab voters than there are Jewish voters, and then the State of Israel will have to make the decision Jewish or democratic. I want the State of Israel to continue to be that Jewish and democratic state that it is, and that is why I oppose this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, nothing unites Indiana's Sixth Congressional District quite like the simple phrase, ''we must stand with Israel.'' Throughout most of my rural district that has far more Christian churches than synagogues, Hoosiers are united in their support of the Jewish state.

Hoosiers, myself included, were deeply distressed when the Obama administration stood silent as our great ally was demonized by the U.N. Israel is our most important friend in the region, and among America's best partners in the world. President Obama's silence and defection from Israel was unconscionable, and he has made our ally less safe and peace less likely.

I am eager to vote today to send a strong signal to the world that the

American people reject the U.N.'s one-sided, shortsighted U.N. Security Council resolution, and the American people stand united with Israel. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Israel is a special place in a troubled and storied landscape, sacred ground for three of the world's major regions.

Israel's security is important to me and the people I represent. The Jewish homeland is the only democracy in this broader region of continuing conflict. I abhor the terrorist acts. Israel's security merits our support, which is why the Obama administration, with Congress' approval, just awarded an unprecedented amount of military aid over the next 10 years.

But, unfortunately, Israel's future is being threatened by its own actions as well as by its adversaries. For years, reckless settlement expansion has been opposed by the United States and the rest of the world. They are confiscating Palestinian land in a way that is not just contrary to longstanding American policy, but is often illegal under Israeli law.

It looks like the incoming Trump administration is reconsidering 50 years of bipartisan policy, urged on by the extremist views of his proposed Ambassador whose position on settlement expansion is on the fringe of even Israeli politics.

H. Res. 11 sends the wrong signal to the incoming President, to Israeli politicians, and especially to the Israeli people. It drives a wedge between Israel and the majority of Americans, including the majority of Jewish Americans. It weakens that special relationship and furthers the isolation of Israel, in evidence as the resolution was approved unanimously by the other 14 countries. Israel will become more vulnerable and, candidly, it will likely embolden forces that are hostile to the Jewish state.

Instead of this resolution, we should reject the rule and support the resolution I cosponsored with Mr. PRICE that reaffirms our commitment to the longstanding American policy in support of a two-state solution and to help secure Israel's future as a stable, democratic, peaceful state.

□ 1330

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

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

Mr. Speaker, I support the REINS Act and the rule that brings it to us, but I want to underscore the point made earlier by Mr. BARR.

The REINS Act says that any regulation—that is, an act with the force of law—adopted by the executive branch and costs more than $100 million must then be approved by Congress to take effect.

As necessary as this bill is in the current environment, I am afraid it has got it completely backwards. Under the Constitution read on this floor today, it is not the role of the executive branch to make law and for the legislative branch then to approve or veto it. Quite the contrary, making law is the singular prerogative of the legislative branch; the executive then approves or vetoes that law.

The REINS Act is necessary solely because for years Congress has improperly ceded its lawmaking powers to the executive, and it is time we restored the proper role of the legislative branch to make law and for the executive branch to faithfully execute it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, for his leadership and for managing this rule.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the closed rule for H. Res. 11.

Ranking Member ENGEL, Mr. PRICE, and I have submitted an amendment to H. Res. 11 when it came before the Rules Committee. Our amendment offered a balanced approach and strongly reaffirmed longstanding, bipartisan principles that undergird U.S. policy on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. We introduced that amendment as a reasonable alternative that would allow all of us to convene the broadest possible bipartisan coalition here in the House.

Personally, I believe the U.S. should have vetoed the U.N. Security Council resolution, and, notably, our resolution supported the U.S. veto of any one-sided or anti-Israel U.N. Security Council resolution or any resolution that seeks to impose a resolution to the conflict.

Our resolution also condemned boycott and divestment campaigns and sanctions that target Israel, and it reiterated support for a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution that reaffirms Israel's right to exist as a democratic, Jewish state. We all agree that there can be no substitute for direct bilateral negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. As we transition into a new administration and begin this new Congress, we should resist temptations to rewrite U.S. policy on the peace process in a misguided attempt to further drive a wedge where none should exist.

The point of H. Res. 11 seems to be to bash Obama on the way out, and the fact that there are distortions on history and fact seem not to bother us. On this point, I would note that H. Res. 11 mentions settlements but makes no attempt to reaffirm longstanding U.S. opposition to those very settlements. It is more important now than ever that Congress maintain its consistent, bipartisan policy toward the conflict. We believe the carefully constructed language in our resolution did just that, but we were not allowed the opportunity by the Rules Committee to bring it before the floor for a vote.

So I urge my colleagues, especially my Democratic colleagues, to vote ''no'' on H. Res. 11 and the rule and to support and cosponsor H. Res. 23, a much more bipartisan and balanced approach.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST), who is a great new Member.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the current administration has literally undermined peace with their shameful failure to veto U.N. Resolution 2334.

Condemning Israel is condemning the most peaceful country in the Middle East, and it is done simply to appease Palestinians—a group that has been historically defined by their responsibility for terror—and this does not bring us one step closer to peace.

I can tell you that after defending freedom in the U.S., I chose to volunteer alongside the Israeli Defense Forces because our countries do share the uncommon ideals of freedom, democracy, and mutual respect for all people. During my time with the IDF, I did learn at the tables of Israeli families just how much each one of them truly desire peace.

By failing to veto this hateful U.N. resolution, the administration has sent a terrible message. We must counter this underhanded condemnation of Israel with a unanimous show of support today for H. Res. 11.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this House contains many friends of Israel, Republican and Democratic. Indeed, as long as I've been here, I have never found an enemy of Israel in this House. Certainly that friendship was very apparent when only a few weeks ago President Obama approved giving Israel $38 billion of American tax money in military assistance. But like the Knesset in Jerusalem, we sometimes do disagree about what the best way is to ensure peace and security, and lively debate is important to that.

Unfortunately, this rule is about stifling Knesset-style debate. It restricts and denies any amendment and any alternative. This strict limitation on debate and this surprise presentation of today's measure with no public hearing and little warning show how fearful our Republican colleagues are of a legitimate discussion of this troubling issue. This is a horrible way to make critical foreign policy. It is only a step above doing it by tweets, which seems to be the approach of the day.

Today's resolution, which purports to support Israeli security, actually undermines that security. It favors going it alone with the current Israeli Government in defiance of our other allies and the 14 countries that unanimously voted for this Security Council measure.

Isolation—more and more isolation—is not the way to protect Israel. Those who demonstrate their friendship with Israel by following Mr. Netanyahu on one right turn after another are boxing in America and Israel. He is moving us further and further to the extremes so that we eventually go off a cliff into chaos. As Tom Friedman noted in urging a negotiated two-state settlement: ''A West Bank on fire would become a recruitment tool for ISIS and Iran.''

Vote for peace. Reject this resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH), who is another freshman that we welcome to the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying REINS Act because I was sent to Congress to help hardworking Hoosiers create jobs, keep jobs, and raise wages. As a small-business owner myself, I understand how difficult it is to build a business in today's economy, and I want the Hoosiers of Indiana's Ninth Congressional District to have control over their futures without fear of unaccountable government bureaucrats with political agendas creating regulations to restrict their pursuit of success.

I believe the REINS Act will ensure the constituents in Indiana's Ninth District will not only have a voice, but also a choice in the laws that govern this great Nation. Hardworking Hoosiers are shining examples of what Americans can do with the freedom to make their own economic decisions, and I don't want unelected bureaucrats in Washington impeding the job-creating growth of Indiana's and America's businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and vote ''yes'' on the underlying bill.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), who is another new face that is looking forward to making a difference here.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and the underlying legislation. Today the Federal Government's rules exceed 97,000 pages—the most in American history. So we ask ourselves: Do we really need 20 pages of rules governing vending machines? Could we cover fuel standards in less than 578 pages? Would the Union crumble if we didn't have 61 pages of regulations on residential dehumidifiers?

Each of these rules has compliance costs that exceed $100 million.

In my home State of Florida, we passed a version of the REINS Act. The result has been repeal or replacement of over 4,000 job-killing regulations. We can only make America great again if we make Americans free again—free from the tyranny of unelected Washington bureaucrats huddled in windowless cubicles dictating to Americans how they should live their lives, build their businesses, and protect their own property. Voters sent us here to drain the swamp, but with so many regulations, we would be lucky to get permission to mop up a puddle.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to address you and my privilege to be recognized by the gentleman from Georgia.

I wanted to address this rule, and I share some of the sentiment that came from the gentleman from Massachusetts. I like to have open rules. I like to have open debates. I would like to have more than one debate on what we might do with this resolution that is before us. I would like to have a debate on the one-state solution versus the two-state solution because I believe that the two-state solution has run its course and we need to pack up our tools, ship those off to the side, and start all over again with a new look.

I believe we needed to have a resolution that refreshes this in such a way that it completely rejected Resolution 2334, that vote that took place in the United Nations and said to the Trump administration: Let's start this fresh with a new look rather than a direction of being bound by implication to a two-state solution.

But that is not what we have ahead of us. What we have ahead of us is a resolution that has come to the floor under a closed rule that sends a lot of a good and right message to the rest of the world that America and the United States Congress reject what happened in the United Nations the other day and that decision to abstain from that vote. On the other hand, we really don't have the focus here to take on the rest of this issue. I am hopeful that we will.

I will be introducing a resolution later today that addresses the two-state resolution in a way I would like to have done it with a resolution here.

As I said to the gentleman from California, it is not my intent to blow up his bill or his initiative. I want to see the best success we can on what is going on here today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), who is the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, the problem with this U.N. resolution is not simply that it criticizes Israeli actions; it is that it is fundamentally one-sided. It is anti-Israel, and that is a departure from longstanding, bipartisan U.S. policy.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 does not address the Palestinian Authority's failure to end incitement of hatred. Frankly, they encourage it. The violence that we see against Israeli civilians comes from the encouragement of PA officials. It doesn't address the Palestinian Authority's continued payments. An incentive payment in their budget—over $300 million a year—is paid to those who would carry out attacks against Israeli civilians. The more mayhem you create, the longer the term you have in prison, the larger the stipend. That comes right out of the budget of the Palestinian Authority.

The U.N. resolution did not call upon Palestinian leadership to fulfill their obligations towards negotiations. The Middle East Summit is planned next month. So, first, the administration abstains on this, and next month in France there is real concern that another damaging Security Council resolution should follow.

That is why this dangerous policy must be rejected, hopefully unanimously, by this House.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule. It is not fair. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question so that Mr. PRICE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CONNOLLY can bring up their alternative to H. Res. 11.

Mr. Speaker, let me say, finally, that I am deeply concerned that the institution of Congress has been undermined time and time again by this tendency to be overly restrictive and outright closed. We are supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, but the problem is we don't deliberate very much. Everything that is brought to this floor tends to be a press release substituting for legislation.

□ 1345

There is no bipartisanship. There is none. There is no working together. There is none. And that is unfortunate. I think one of the messages of this last election for the American people was they want to see things happen here. Not just whatever the Republicans want or whatever the Democrats want, they want us to see us working together.

I served here as a staffer during a time when there was collegiality, when Republicans and Democrats came together and passed appropriations bills and authorization bills and passed major reform bills. That doesn't happen anymore.

On the issue of regulatory reform, I think you can actually get a consensus on regulatory reform. There is nobody in this House that thinks the regulatory process is perfect. The problem is, when you bring a bill to the floor that is so one-sided, that is poorly written, that is impractical, we can't support it.

On the issue of Israel, we could have come to a consensus, I think, and spoken with one voice to show our unwavering support for the State of Israel. But instead, we have a bill that comes to the floor that is politically charged—I think that is very clear, based on the tone of some of the speeches here today—but also has factual errors in it.

The frustration level has grown to the point where some of us in the minority have taken to protesting. We had a sit-in in response to the fact that we couldn't get legislation to the floor that said if you are on a terrorist list, you can't fly, then you can't buy a gun, and a bill that called for universal background checks.

We thought we had a promise to be able to bring some of this to the floor. My friends could have voted against it. But we were told, no, you don't even have the right to debate these bills.

I am going to say to my colleagues sincerely that, unless things change, you are going to see the discord, the anger, and the frustration build on this side of the aisle, and you are going to see it build throughout the country.

There is a reason why people hold Congress in such disdain. It is because they see this place not as an institution where we can solve problems but as a place where it is all about obstruction or ''my way or the highway.''

This is a lousy way to start the new year. Please vote ''no'' on the previous question and vote ''no'' on this rule.

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

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

It is amazing to me some of the stuff that I have just heard, Mr. Speaker, just in the last few minutes. And I appreciate my friend across the aisle, but the debate that we have been having here is amazing. So that is something I want to talk about, but also something that came up, just to take a few steps down the road.

It had been mentioned many times here on the floor today that a unanimous vote by the Security Council in some way implies that it was right or that it was proper. I am sorry, the groupthink of the United Nations Security Council on this issue was wrong.

The one that was left silent was the beacon of freedom to the world, the United States, and instead of engaging, instead of working as we have in the past abstained or voted against, there have been times when we actually, as my friend said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, worked together. When that did happen in the past, there were times in which Israel and the U.S. worked together to soften or change, and we had, at that point in time, something that—not liked, but something that could be lived with. In this case, it was nothing Israel said. This is bad. America turned its back.

Where was the voice? It was silent. Where was the voice? We voted absent. That is not what the leader of the free world should do. That is not what the leader of the free world should do to his closest ally in the Middle East. That is why we are talking about this.

There are other things we can discuss today. There are other discussions on two-state solutions on another case on the settlement, but the bottom line here is that it goes deeper than the other issues. The deeper part here is that we simply sat silent while the world mocked and criticized our strongest ally, Mr. Speaker.

So don't talk to me about working together. I get it. But where was the working together on this? It was absent. A unanimous vote, especially of the United Nations Security Council, using that as your justification, I think we need to talk.

But also, Mr. Speaker, when we come to the end, regulatory environment, the REINS Act is simply saying: Congress, do what Congress is supposed to do. Congress, work as the voice of the American people. Work for the voice of helping companies start and create jobs. Work with the American people to relegate them forward instead of moving backward.

The REINS Act simply says: let's do our job here. Not the ones who are closed off from input but the folks who are elected to come to this place, to come to these hallowed halls and debate what we are talking about today: debate the regulatory environment, debate the environment. When we do that, then that is what we need to do.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

I oppose this rule because it makes in order H.R. 26, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act, which is a radical measure that could make it impossible to promulgate safety regulations to protect the public.

I oppose this rule because it would effectively shut down the entire U.S. regulatory system, amending in one fell swoop every bedrock existing regulatory statute.

The legislation is clearly designed to stop all regulation dead in its tracks—no matter the threat to health, safety or the economy.

It would neuter the current system's reliance on science, expertise, and public participation in developing regulations.

H.R. 26 would reshape the regulatory system to work as it did in the 19th Century, before the abuses of the robber barons led Congress to create a modern and more efficient system to protect public health and safety.

The REINS Act would require both houses of Congress to approve any major rule within a limited period of time in order for it to take effect.

Effectively, this would allow either house of Congress to block rules simply through inaction, even when an existing statute required action.

The legislation would disempower every federal agency, effectively rendering their rulemaking activities advisory opinions with no force of law.

Under REINS, even rules to handle emergencies could be in effect for only 90 days absent Congressional approval.

H.R. 26 is so grossly slanted against regulation that it will allow lawsuits to proceed against any regulation Congress could actually manage to approve.

And the latest version of the bill delays its effective date for a year so that any Trump Administration efforts to repeal existing regulations would not get caught up in the REINS Act trap—another indication that the REINS Act would be expected to stop any regulatory action from moving forward (because repealing regulations must be done through regulation, so repeals would in fact trigger REINS.)

In addition to representing an overwhelming threat to the public, H.R. 26 is also bad for business.

The legislation would require businesses to have to lobby Congress for each and every significant regulatory change they wanted—no matter whether those were new regulations, changes in regulation or repeal; no matter whether the regulatory issues involved disputes between different industries; no matter how technical the issues involved.

H.R. 26 would, in fact, make the regulatory system less predictable for industry and would disadvantage any industry that did not have a large political presence.

It is difficult to exaggerate how fundamentally this alarming piece of legislation would change American government and how hard it would make it to protect the public.

This legislative effort is the ultimate giveaway to special interests.

Under H.R. 26, any special interest could simply use its political clout in one chamber of Congress to sideline such vital public protections as limiting the amount of lead in children's products, preventing salmonella contamination in eggs, reducing emissions of toxic air pollutants or banning predatory banking practices.

The REINS Act constitutes the ultimate overreach as well, not only because of the impact it would have, but because Congress already has ample tools to control the regulatory system.

Congress is already vested with the authority to vote to block a specific regulation at any time.

And regulation is permitted only pursuant to statutes that Congress has passed and can amend or repeal.

Under current law, agencies must keep a record of their interactions with industry and other entities interested in the regulatory process and provide a clear record of their decision-making (which often must be able to hold up in court).

Because agencies often take years to review the scientific and technical evidence relevant to a decision, throwing every final decision to Congress would undermine this entire process.

In addition, courts can review regulations and an elaborate public process that can stretch out for years must be followed to issue a regulation.

Instead, under this legislation, Congress would have to make relatively rapid decisions, often behind closed doors, and it would not be legally held to any standard of technical review.

Businesses would no longer have an incentive to cooperate with agencies and provide

arguments and evidence because they could just take their chances with the political process, which they would no doubt try to influence with campaign contributions.

Ultimately, decisions on regulations would be determined solely by political horse-trading among Members of Congress.

Agencies issue 50 to 100 major rules a year dealing with everything from Medicare reimbursement to railroad safety to environmental protection.

But, under H.R. 26, Congress would have 70 legislative days to second-guess each and every decision covered by the Act.

Because failure to take action would kill any safeguard, Congress would be forced to hold hearings in a short time on technical issues—or worse, forgo hearings and race the 70-day clock with even less information and debate.

This body has already allowed backlog to clog the channels of its current docket, and this legislation would require that as many as 100 additional measures come to the floor.

This is not an effort to drain the swamp; this is a divisive and manipulative tactic employed to clog the drain.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, this merry-go-round legislative scheme and the irresponsibility of the House majority in wasting time trying to shut down the entire regulatory system (because it cannot win through time-honored, Constitutional legislative processes) entirely disregard the administrative public support efforts in place to protect food safety, air and water quality and to limit the manipulation of our economic system by special interests.

The REINS Act is tantamount to a coup—a right-wing takeover to block future agency actions regardless of public desires.

The exceptional Americans we serve deserve a Congress that does its job and keeps our time-honored institutions functioning.

For these reasons and more, I oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 22 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to the consideration, without intervention of any point of order, in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 23) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives and reaffirming long-standing United States policy in support of a negotiated two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 23.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled ''Amending Special Rules'' states: ''a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.'' (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: ''Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.''

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 188, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—235

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 (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
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
Poe (TX)
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
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

NAYS—188

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
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
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)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
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)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
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
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Davis, Danny
Gallego
Lawson (FL)
Mulvaney
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush
Zinke

□ 1412

Messrs. NADLER and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 9.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was allowed to speak out of order.)

RECOGNIZING TIM BERRY

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, when we as Members of Congress are first elected, before we are sworn in, before we introduce our first bit of legislation, the first thing we do is begin to hire, to form a team, and much of the success that happens on this floor is a lot of work that is done behind the scenes by our staff. They do a tremendous job for this country in the public service they provide.

I personally count myself blessed to have had Tim Berry as my chief of staff for the whole time I have been in leadership. Today is his last day on our floor. Tim has had 18 years of service in this institution. He has been in other leadership offices. He went into the private sector, but when I got elected majority whip, I asked him if he was willing to come back.

Tim has always demonstrated political wisdom, personal resolve, dedication, but, most importantly, distinct moral clarity.

He has been here in some of the most difficult times in this institution. He was in the office when people were actually shot when an intruder came and took lives in this institution. He has worked on legislation, he has worked on friendships, and he has worked across the aisle. But if there were one thing I would define this man as, it is a family man.

Today, we are lucky to have his wife, Lisa, and daughter, Maeve, in the gallery with us. And to his other children, Ella and Chris, I want to thank you for your sacrifice on loaning your father. For every dinner he has missed, or every phone call he had to take, or maybe that one or two lacrosse games he couldn't coach, I want to thank you.

But to Tim, I want to thank you for your dedication, I want to thank you for your friendship, and I want to wish you the very best on behalf of a very grateful nation and institution. Thank you.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, my colleague, the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, for yielding.

I rise to thank and to pay tribute to Tim Berry.

Mr. Speaker, the American public sees us so often when we are confronting one another—disagreeing strenuously sometimes and disagreeing sometimes disagreeably. What they don't see is the staff working with staffs across the aisle in a constructive effort to reach consensus and to move democracy forward. What they don't see is the collegiality that is engendered through the years between staff who have the responsibility of ensuring not only that their Members have full knowledge of what is being considered and their advice and counsel, but also of assuring that there is positive communication across the aisle even when we disagree.

Tim Berry has been one of the most adept, most cordial, most positive, and most effective staffers in effecting that end. We Members sometimes mask how effective our staffs are. I am sure they will lament that from time to time.

Tim Berry, I want you to know—we are very proud—is from Silver Spring, Maryland. He grew up in Silver Spring and grew up in our State. Tim Berry is a proud son of our State. Yes, he is a Republican; yes, he has been on staff on the other side of the aisle; but he is an American first, who has cared about his country, who has cared about this institution, and who has cared about showing respect and concern for staffs on both sides of the aisle.

I have had a number of chiefs of staff, one of whom is Cory Alexander, now the vice president of UnitedHealth. Cory Alexander and Tim are good friends. They worked together very constructively when Tim was with Tom DeLay. Mr. MCCARTHY is in that office, and I had the privilege of using that office for 4 years. There was never a time when we walked down that hallway that we didn't think of Detective Gibson losing his life and Officer Chestnut losing his life outside that door. Tim Berry was there to serve. Tim Berry served, notwithstanding the dangers that were self-evident.

Lisa is in the gallery and his children who have been mentioned by Leader MCCARTHY. Young people, you can be extraordinarily proud of your dad. I know, Lisa, you are as well. He has made this institution a better institution. He has made the relationship between the parties more positive in times when it was greatly strained.

Tim, thank you. Thank you for your service to the Congress, thank you for your service to the country, and thank you for your service to each and every one of us. God bless you and Godspeed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 231, noes 187, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

AYES—231

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)
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
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
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
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
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
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—187

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
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
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
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
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
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
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Becerra
Buchanan
Butterfield
Collins (NY)
Gallego
Meeks
Mulvaney
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rush
Velázquez
Walberg
Zinke

□ 1430

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. 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 H.R. 26.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 22 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 26.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1433

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the 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, with Mr. HULTGREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, regulatory reform plays a critical role in ensuring that our Nation finally achieves a full economic recovery and retains its competitive edge in the global marketplace. Congress must advance pro-growth policies that create jobs and restore economic prosperity for families and businesses across the Nation and make sure that any administration and its regulatory apparatus is held accountable to the American people.

America's small-business owners are suffocating under mountains of endlessly growing, bureaucratic red tape; and the uncertainty about the cost of upcoming regulations discourages employers from hiring new employees and expanding their businesses. Excessive regulation means higher prices, lower wages, fewer jobs, less economic growth, and a less competitive America.

Today, Americans face a burden of over $3 trillion per year from Federal taxation and regulation. In fact, our Federal regulatory burden is larger than the 2014 gross domestic product of all but the top eight countries in the world. That burden adds up to about $15,000 per American household—nearly 30 percent of average household income in 2015.

Everyone knows it has been this way for far too long; but the Obama administration, instead of fixing the problem, has known only one response: increase taxes, increase spending, and increase regulation. The results have painfully demonstrated a simple truth: America cannot tax, spend, and regulate its way to economic recovery, economic growth, and durable prosperity for the American people.

Consider just a few facts that reveal the economic weakness the Obama administration has produced. In the December 2016 jobs report, the number of unemployed workers, workers who can only find part-time jobs, and workers who are now only marginally attached to the labor force stood at 9.3 percent. They number 15 million Americans. America's labor force participation rate remains at lows not seen since the Carter administration, and median household income is still below the level achieved before the financial crisis, which is after the entirety of the Obama administration.

The contrast between America's current condition and the recovery Ronald Reagan achieved as President is particularly stark in that, 4½ years after a recession began in 1981, the Reagan administration, through policies opposite to those of the Obama administration's, had achieved a recovery that created 7.8 million more jobs than when the recession began. Real per capita gross domestic product rose by $3,091, and real median household income rose by 7.7 percent.

To truly fix America's problems, the REINS Act is one of the simplest, clearest, and most powerful measures we can adopt. The level of new major regulation from the Obama administration is without modern precedent. Testimony before the Judiciary Committee during recent Congresses has

plainly shown the connection between skyrocketing levels of regulation and declining levels of jobs and growth.

The REINS Act responds by requiring an up-or-down vote by the people's representatives in Congress before any new major regulation, which is defined in the bill generally as a rule that has an effect on the economy of at least $100 million, can be imposed on our economy. It does not prohibit new major regulation. It simply establishes the principle: ''no major regulation without representation.''

The REINS Act provides Congress and, ultimately, the people with a much-needed tool to check the one-way cost ratchet that Washington's regulatory bureaucrats too often turn. During the 114th, 113th, and 112th Congresses, the REINS Act was passed multiple times by the full House of Representatives, each time with bipartisan support.

I thank Mr. COLLINS of Georgia for reintroducing this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the REINS Act.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I listened intently to my colleague's opening remarks, and he seemed to try to justify the passage of the REINS Act, which I rise in opposition to, by the way, by saying that it has been the Obama administration's job-killing regulations that have put our economy in its position, which is one that is not good.

Despite trying to convince the American people of that allegation, the American people are aware of the facts. They are aware of the fact that, 8 years ago, when President Obama came into office and under a Republican stewardship that used trickle-down economics as its model, this economy neared that of the Great Depression's. In fact, we call it the period of the Great Recession. This country almost went into a depression, and it went into a Great Recession because of George Bush's and the Republicans' policies of trickle-down economics, which Daddy Bush—George Herbert Walker Bush—once referred to as ''voodoo economics,'' and he was right about that.

Let's look at where we were then and look at where we are now and ask ourselves: Are we not better off now than we were then?

There are not many voices that could say, No, we are not better off now than we were then, because they know, since then, there have been 81 straight months of positive private sector job growth.

They know that over 15.6 million new jobs have been added to our economy by President Obama. They also know that 30 million more people have health insurance and access to the healthcare system now than they did back then. They know that regulations had to ensue from the passage of the Affordable Care Act in order to enable those 30 million people to have coverage now. That is why they want to introduce this legislation to cut regulations. They want to try to hurt the Affordable Care Act. They also know that regulations had to spring forth from the Dodd-Frank, Wall Street regulation, legislation that was passed in this body. They know that those regulations have protected the finances and the financial security of Americans who are doing far better now than they were 8 years ago when President Obama took office.

The American people know that they are much better off now. They know that bankruptcies have gone down. They know that foreclosures have gone down. They know that they have better jobs. They know that things are better now than they were back then.

You will remember and the American people will remember that on the very day of President Obama's first inauguration, MITCH MCCONNELL and a cabal of Republicans met from both the House and Senate, crying in their beers at a Capitol Hill bar. They embarked on a strategy to—what?—make sure that President Obama would be a first-term President. So they resolved to oppose everything that he proposed, and they certainly did. Despite unprecedented opposition from the Republicans' just saying ''no'' to everything, the American people know that they are in a better position today than they were at this time 8 years ago when coming into the Obama administration.

The Republicans want to introduce legislation to do away with the rules and the regulations concerning the Affordable Care Act and the Dodd-Frank legislation, which has protected the financial security of Americans over the last 8 years. That is why they come forward with this so-called jobs bill. This regulatory reform bill called the REINS Act is not going to produce or create one single job. What it will do is cut measures to protect the health, safety, and well-being of Americans.

□ 1445

This misguided legislation would amend the Congressional Review Act to require that both Houses of Congress pass and the President sign a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days before any major rule issued by an agency can take effect. In other words, this bill would subject new major rules to nullification by Congress through an unconstitutional legislative veto by one Chamber of Congress.

Following Republican attempts earlier this week to gut ethics and oversight rules that are necessary to police corruption, it is telling that the REINS Act is the next bill that the House would consider in the 115th Congress. Americans should understand what the game plan is of the Republicans. They want the fox to guard the henhouse. That is why the very first act that they tried to get passed was reform of the House ethics regime. They wanted to neuter it, place it under the control of the Republican-controlled House Ethics Committee, where it would then languish and die like a prune on a vine that was unwatered.

That is the first thing they came up with, and the American people called them on it and wouldn't let them pass it. So they have postponed it. America needs to keep their eyes on this Congress to make sure that they don't follow through with that measure that would install the foxes over the henhouse. What they want to do is install the corporate foxes over America's henhouse with this REINS Act.

The REINS Act is central to the Speaker's so-called Better Way agenda, which is really only a better way for rich, corporate elites to further insulate themselves from public accountability and is emblematic of the same tired and crony-capitalist proposals that have been kicked around by opponents of environmental and public health protections since the 1980s. In fact, in 1983, Chief Justice John Roberts, who was then a counsel to President Reagan, criticized a similar proposal as unwise because it would hobble agency rulemaking by requiring affirmative congressional assent to all major rules and would seem to impose excessive burdens on the regulatory agencies.

In addition to being an unmitigated disaster for public health and safety, proposals like the REINS Act will actually do major harm to regulatory reform attempts, as the late Justice Antonin Scalia wrote in 1981. Then a professor at the University of Chicago Law School, Justice Scalia cautioned: ''Those in the Congress seem perversely unaware that the accursed 'unelected officials' downtown are now their unelected officials, presumably seeking to move things in their desired direction; and that every curtailment of desirable agency discretion obstructs (principally) departure from Democrat-produced, pro-regulatory status quo.''

Now, it is not often that I quote Justice Scalia, but, ironically, I do so today.

The REINS Act also imposes deadlines for the enactment of a joint resolution approving a major rule that could charitably be referred to as Byzantine. So as not to use too lofty language, I will just declare that this thing is like throwing a monkey wrench in a well-oiled machine.

Under new section 802, the House may only consider a major rule on the second or fourth Thursday of each month. In 2014, for example, there were only 13 such days on the legislative calendar. I think on the legislative calendar for 2017, there are only about 13, maybe 14 or 15, such days where we could consider these major rules on this legislative calendar. I would point out that there are approximately 80 such rules of importance that come through in a typical year.

Furthermore, under new section 801, Congress may only consider such resolutions within 70 legislative days of receiving a major rule. This creates a lot of red tape that threatens to end rulemaking as we know it, and that is the exact, precise intent of this Congress. Even if agencies reduce the number of major rules in contemplation of a bill's onerous requirements, Congress would still lack the expertise and policy justifications for refusing to adopt a major rule.

As over 80 of the Nation's leading professors on environmental and administrative law noted in a letter in opposition to a substantively identical version of this bill, without this expertise, any ''disapproval is therefore more likely to reflect the political power of special interests, a potential that would be magnified in light of the fast-track process.''

Lastly, by flipping the process of agency rulemaking so that Congress can simply void implementation by not acting on a major rule, the REINS Act likely violates the presentment and bicameralism requirements of Article I of the Constitution.

It is my pleasure to oppose this bill. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the REINS Act. I would like to thank my colleague from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for taking charge of this bill in the 115th Congress and Judiciary Chairman GOODLATTE for quickly bringing it to the floor.

This week and next, the primary focus of debate here in the House is the stranglehold of regulation on the economy and its intrusion into the everyday lives of Americans. These onerous burdens are well-known to Members of Congress on both sides.

Over the past several years, I have spent countless hours traveling across the nearly 6,600 square miles of my district. I have met with my constituents in their homes, in their workplaces and social halls. They have pleaded with me for release from the regulations that limit their ability to prosper, innovate, and grow.

Unlike the nameless, faceless, ever-growing bureaucracy here in Washington, we have listened to the people's concerns. We have made regulatory reform a priority and the focal point for jump-starting our economy. By placing final approval of major regulations in the hands of Congress, the REINS Act is an important launch point in our efforts to dismantle the administrative state and make government more accountable to the American people.

Our Founders vested in Congress—and Congress alone—the power to write the laws. Unfortunately, over our history, we have delegated much of that power away. The Founders could not have imagined our current scenario where the complaints of many fall on the deaf ears of an unelected few in Washington.

Thinking over the past 8 years, the REINS Act could have prevented numerous regulations that the American people knew were threats to their very way of life. Perhaps a trillion dollars in costs could have been avoided. I cannot even imagine how many jobs might have been saved or created if we avoided the regulatory barrage brought on by the Obama administration.

For example, we could have prevented the waters of the United States regulation that impacts the farmers near my home in rural Pennsylvania. The FCC's net neutrality rule might have been overturned, a classic rulemaking bait and switch where the FCC ignored the mountains of public comment to achieve its own political ends. An unaccountable sum of environmental regulations might have been avoided before destroying large swaths of our industry and imposing huge costs on taxpayers.

Our prime takeaway from these instances and others is that the runaway regulators issued wide-ranging and economy-destroying regulations with complete disregard for the hard-working American citizens whose livelihoods were at stake.

Today we take an important step to reassert the voice of the American people in our government. The REINS Act reestablishes the Congress as the final judge of whether or not any particular regulation actually does what the Congress meant it to do.

Returning this responsibility to the branch of government most attentive and accountable to the people adheres to the principles of our Nation's founding. It is an effort that all elected to Congress should support.

I urge my colleagues to support the REINS Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the eloquence of the gentleman from the great State of Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), my friend out of the great city of Memphis.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I can live up to those words, but I certainly appreciate them.

I was the ranking member on this committee, and I was chair at one point. We have had this bill over the years. It is indeed a monkey wrench or a monkey in the wrench, as JOHN MCCAIN might have said. It will mess up the entire system that we have of Congress passing laws, delegating, giving the executive the ability to enact them in ways that make them functional and appropriate and come up with the details that the Congress does not have enough expertise to do.

The other side refers constantly to people that prepare these rules—which take many, many years and have much, much input—as bureaucrats, as if it is some type of pejorative. Bureaucrats are government employees who have expertise in certain areas and who study an area and become so much more expert than we are on the subject that they can come up with fine-tuned laws that are checked and balanced to make sure that the laws are implemented in the way that Congress intends. If Congress doesn't like it, Congress can pass a bill by both House and Senate to repeal it. We have already got that possibility.

Under this unique approach, either one of the houses of Congress can stop a regulation, a rule from going into effect because both Houses would have to approve a rule and the President would have to sign it before it could go into effect. That gives one House the ability to veto, basically, an executive action.

It is the executive in our system that has the power to veto acts of the legislature and not vice versa. We can pass laws in a bicameral spirit, which is what our Constitution has, when the House and the Senate agree. But neither House, independently, is given any power to veto laws or legislation. This would break that and, I believe, be unconstitutional. That is why I oppose H.R. 26, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2017.

Indeed, the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act is most appropriate this year as we start, because in 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, we are, indeed, going to have an executive in need of scrutiny. So I thank the Republicans for naming this bill appropriately because we are, indeed, in the times of an Executive in need of scrutiny.

We need scrutiny over income tax returns that have been hidden from the public that might disclose conflicts of interest or loans from characters that might be considered oligarchs and have some type of an influence over our foreign policy and our domestic.

We need an Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act that deals with these conflicts, with income taxes that haven't been released, with businesses in the District where people could go to hotels and curry favor with the Executive.

Indeed, we do have an Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act, so I appreciate the well-named bill that the Republicans have brought us and the awareness that, through this bill, they have seen that we need some concern about the Executive coming because he certainly needs scrutiny.

□ 1500

This bill, though, is the worst of corporate special interest because it will give corporate special interests the opportunity to override rules that take effect unless both Houses pass them. It is difficult enough for this House and the Senate to get legislation passed in the days that we often give to legislation, but to have both Houses have to agree, in which case if you can't, it is, in essence, a pocket veto, and it doesn't even have to be scheduled for a

vote because the House would have to positively pass and the Senate positively pass. So if the Speaker doesn't want to do it, the Speaker can pocket veto the regulation. It doesn't even have to be scheduled.

This is not draining the swamp. It will heighten the influence of corporate lobbyists in Congress where they can come to the Speaker and ask that agency rules they don't like that might protect the lives of children because they are regulations dealing with toys that seem to possibly be defective, or automobiles where they need safety devices, or other consumer protections that interfere with business interests—business is good and important, but sometimes businesses do things that are injurious to the public.

To give this opportunity to stop rules and regulations from going into effect that protect the public is wrong. It was suggested maybe it will help the economy, but at what cost? What is one life worth—or several lives—if lives are lost because safety regulations are not approved by this House and the Senate, or one or the other, and then don't go into effect? As I mentioned, this is seriously constitutionally defective.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, the ranking member mentioned Justice Scalia. I will mention Chief Justice John Roberts who criticized nearly identical legislation in the 1980s when he was a White House lawyer because it would ''hobble agency rulemaking by requiring affirmative congressional assent to all major rules'' such that it would ''seem to impose excessive burdens on regulatory agencies.'' That was John Roberts.

Some of the underlying facts given were about the economy. No matter what you say, President Obama has been effective on the economy. We saved the housing market. We saved this country from the Great Recession. We brought about recovery. That is not something we should disparage but we should praise. The stock market has gone up to record highs. Unemployment is down. Jobs are up. The automobile industry has been saved.

I ask Members to reject this bill because it is unconstitutional. It will cost lives of American citizens because safety regulations won't be passed.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, our Founding Fathers intended for us to have a limited government. If they saw what we have today, they would be appalled. Our government has gotten huge. It is out of control, and an alphabet soup of government agencies and unelected bureaucrats are writing the laws. They call them regulations, but they have the effect of laws.

I am going to disagree with my friend and colleague from Tennessee, any power these agencies have to write regulations was delegated to Congress. We are pulling some of that power back, back to Congress, back to people elected by the people; in fact, to where the Founding Fathers put it in Article I of the Constitution.

That is why I am here today, to support the REINS Act. It says that if an agency enacts a regulation that has an economic impact of more than $100 million, that has to come back before Congress for a positive vote before it takes effect.

Now, quite frankly, because the Constitution vests all of the legislative power in Congress, I think every single regulation that one of these agencies does should have to come back before Congress, but the REINS Act is a great start.

Throughout President Obama's administration, a flood of regulations has put extreme pressure and burdens on American job creators and American families. Take, for example, the EPA's waters of the U.S. rule. It is a power grab by the EPA attempting to regulate any body of water on a private land basically that is any bigger than a bathtub. It goes way beyond what the Clean Water Act says they can do.

Using its new interpretation of WOTUS, the EPA has full authority to bully land-owning American citizens like Wyoming rancher Andy Johnson who got a permit from the State and local government to build a stock pond so his cattle could have something to drink. Well, guess what, the EPA said, nope. They came in after the fact and said: if you don't take that out, we are going to hit you with $37,500 a day in fines. Finally, after drawn-out litigation, the EPA was slapped back and Johnson's $16 million in fines was erased.

This is just one of the many examples of the huge power grab these Federal agencies are doing.

We need people who are elected and answerable to the American people writing the laws, not unelected bureaucrats. That is why we need the REINS Act, and that is why we need to restore the constitutional power granted to this body in Article I. The REINS Act is a great start, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from Texas cites Article I giving the legislative branch authority to make the laws, and no one can argue with that. However, I would point out that Article II, section 3 imposes upon the President, the executive, the obligation to take care that the laws are faithfully executed, and so rulemaking comes up under that authority, that constitutional authority. So what we have is a move by the legislative branch to intrude upon and to indeed regulate. And certainly we have that power to do so. But is it wise? Is it prudent? Or does it simply positively impact our campaign contributors, the people who put money into our campaigns? Is that the sole reason why we are doing this?

We need to give care and thought into what we are doing here in Congress in this House of Representatives even though one party has all of the power now. They have the majority in the House, they have the majority in the Senate, and they have an incoming President. It doesn't mean they should go off the rails with a philosophy that is not in keeping with where the American people are.

I would point out to them that there is no mandate that they have, even though they do have control of the legislative branch and the executive branch of government and they have held up, what some say actually stolen an appointment for the U.S. Supreme Court that President Obama was placed in a position to make last February upon the untimely demise of Justice Scalia. So since February, the U.S. Supreme Court has had to suffer through politics being played by the legislative branch in not confirming a presidential appointee, and now they have the opportunity to make that appointment under these conditions.

Even though they have played loose and fancy with the protections of the Constitution and with the well-being of the American people and indeed our Republic by playing these political games, I would ask my friends on the other side of the aisle to stop and think about what they are doing and the ramifications of it. Even though you want to get at the EPA to make it easier for oil companies to pollute our environment without regulations to prevent it from happening, is that good for our Nation? Is it good for our children? Is it good for our elderly? How does it leave us with regard to asthma rates which have continued to skyrocket in this country? Do you want to gut the Dodd-Frank Wall Street reform to put us back in the situation where people are losing their homes and banks are being bailed out because they have become too fat to fail? Do we want to put ourselves back in that position again? Well, if we do then we will pass regulations like this one, the so-called REINS Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for all of his leadership on this matter.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 26, the REINS Act, which will restore the constitutional authority of Congress and rein in runaway government.

Mr. Chairman, as we have seen over the last 8 years, our economy has been strangled by Federal regulations which are burying small businesses and families. Federal regulations imposed on

America's job creators and households created a staggering economic burden of almost $2 trillion in 2014. That is almost $15,000 per U.S. household, and 11.5 percent of America's real GDP.

But today, the House has an opportunity to cut through the red tape and restore the balance of powers. Economic growth cannot happen from Washington, D.C., it can only come from Main Street. That is why I adamantly oppose unelected and unaccountable bureaucrats issuing their own closed-door regulations in place of congressional regulations. The REINS Act will restore Congress' Article I powers and give a voice back to the American people. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 26.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), currently a member of the Judiciary Committee but soon to move to another committee.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 26, the REINS Act. In a minute, I want to share an experience I had a few months ago which will explain why, aside from the Constitution, I think it is important that we rein in unelected bureaucrats.

When we talk about regulatory reform, it is sometimes hard to understand the impact regulations have on our economy. That is for the simple reason that someone who goes in for a job interview never sits there and is told by the employer: I would love to offer you the job, but I can't because of the crushing regulatory burden coming out of Washington. And that is because the crushing burden of regulations causes the job not to be created in the first place; and, hence, there is no interview for the job.

The experience I had a couple of months ago, I was back home, and I met with the Michigan Restaurant Association. There were 8 or 10 folks sitting around and telling me about the issues that are important to them. They said they were dying because of the EPA, because of the FDA, because of the EEOC, because of the ACA, because of the overtime rule from DOL, and because of the CFPB. I quickly surmised that the restaurant industry is dying, and it is death by acronyms. That is what is happening in this country. That is why we are not creating jobs.

If you come in from the airport, you come across the 14th Street bridge and you enter the city, all you see is cranes. There was never a recession in Washington. Today, there are 277,000 people who write and enforce rules in this country in Washington, D.C., and around the country. That is more than the entire employee base of the VA.

A few minutes ago, my friend from Tennessee said that all of these great regulations have saved our country. Well, if that had happened, I would have expected a different result on November 8.

A few minutes ago, my friend from Georgia, who I was proud to serve on the Judiciary Committee with, talked about all of the problems with our plan.

□ 1515

I say to my colleague, the next time you pull up in front of your favorite Outback Steakhouse restaurant and it is closed, it is not because the cook quit, it is not because of the cost of beef, and it is not because the restaurant was poorly managed. It is because of death by acronyms. I ask everyone to support H.R. 26. It is time we rein in unelected bureaucrats, follow the Constitution, and create some jobs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to see my friend, Mr. TROTT, leaving the Judiciary Committee. We have appreciated his being there and we hate to see him go, but the gentleman is going on to bigger and better things.

I would say to the gentleman that it is surprising to me that the Bloomberg Government reports show that of all of the job cut announcements made by industry during the year of 2016—and that was a year, by the way, which was not unlike previous years. Basically, the Obama administration has created about 1.9 million new private sector jobs per year.

I am just startled by this statistic here for the year 2016 as far as the number of job cut announcements by reason. The reason given for government regulation being responsible for the job cut is 1,580. That is out of 1.9 million new jobs created during the entire 2016 year, 1,580 jobs lost due to government regulation. That's almost as many as were lost due to the listeria outbreak, legal trouble, or grain downturn. Government regulation, 1,580 jobs lost out of 1.9 million created.

So this argument that we keep hearing from my friends on the other side of the aisle that there is a strangulation or a stranglehold on job creation by Obama's regulations, nothing could be more false than that.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on our side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 26, the REINS Act. This bill is the beginning of making America great again. That is because it puts Americans back in charge of the laws being imposed upon them.

How does the legislation do that?

Under our Constitution, we have three branches. The executive branch is supposed to enforce the law. The judicial branch is supposed to resolve disputes arising under the law. The legislature—this House and the Senate, the branch directly elected by the people—is supposed to make the law.

Over the last decades, we have seen more and more of the lawmaking in this country migrate to the unelected bureaucrats in the executive branch. Those bureaucrats churn out regulation after regulation that have the full force and effect of law. The problem with this setup is that the people of this country are supposed to consent to laws being imposed upon them. They do that through their elected representatives in Congress. In short, this legislation goes to the heart of what self-rule is all about.

Let me be clear: this legislation does not end regulation. It is the beginning of accountability for regulation. If there is a good regulation that a Member believes makes sense and does not unduly burden jobs and wages, that Member may vote to approve the regulation. If the people that Member represents disagree, they get to hold him or her accountable at the ballot box.

My colleagues across the aisle should not fear taking responsibility for the laws and regulations coming out of Washington, D.C. Over the last 7 years, Washington regulations have hurt many working families. We have seen coal miners and power plant workers lose good jobs. We have seen small, Main Street community banks and credit unions forced into mergers. We have seen farmers worried about puddles on their farms. We have seen people lose their health insurance and their doctors, and we have seen the Little Sisters of the Poor have their religious freedom threatened—all without the consent of the people.

It is time for the people, Mr. Chairman, to put the American people back in charge and not the unelected bureaucrats. Let's take the power away from Washington. Let's restore self-rule. Let's pass this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have just tallied up the number of jobs that would be created by passage of this legislation. I did that by multiplying by eight the figure of 1,580, which is the number of jobs lost due to government regulation in 2016. If I multiply that eight times, I come up with 12,640 jobs. That is how many jobs would be created by this legislation—a paucity.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the REINS Act, legislation that I and many of my colleagues are proud to have cosponsored to help bring expensive and expansive regulations under control.

Over the past several years, major regulations have cost small businesses, States, local government, and individuals billions of dollars and have cost them jobs. So this is a commonsense bill to enhance transparency and give Americans greater say in their government, and I thank Representative COLLINS of Georgia and Chairman GOODLATTE for their leadership on this issue.

By requiring Congress to approve any major regulation with an annual economic impact of $100 million or more on the economy, the bill opens the process so our constituents—the people—can have their voice heard in the process.

I'm also pleased an amendment I offered last year, which was accepted by this body, is included in the bill's base text, section 801. That provision requires more transparency by forcing agencies to publish the data and justification they are using to issue the rule. It's important the American people have access to the information in which these conclusions are made. Section 801 directs the regulatory bodies to post publicly the data, studies, and analyses that they use to come up with their rules and conclusions so that we can all be on the same page. Transparency.

Too often I hear concerns from Iowans about how overreaching regulations are hurting their farms and businesses and impacting their daily lives. From how our kids are taught, how we manage our personal finances, or even drain the water in our communities, we have seen how regulations and those who craft them have an enormous impact.

I hear from constituents how these regulations are out of touch, don't reflect the basic, fundamental understanding of the important sectors driving our economy or the daily lives of Iowans and all Americans. These regulations, which have the full force of law, are putting Americans out of work and increasing costs for consumers.

The REINS Act is an important, commonsense bill to help address this problem. We must do more. I appreciate Chairman GOODLATTE's commitment to work with me on my Fingerprints bill to ensure further transparency and accountability by naming those who author and write these regulations. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Representative COLLINS of Georgia for prioritizing the REINS Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there are approximately 2.8 million civil servants out there. Americans who work for the Federal Government go to work every day. They work hard and play by the rules. They have a good, middle class job. Your jobs are at stake, Federal employees.

There are those who say that we have too many Federal employees. Well, the number of Federal employees that we have now is at the same level as they were in 2004, which was when President Bush was in office. Basically we are at a 47-year low, as far as the number of Federal employees, since 2013.

The Federal regulatory regime, which is just simply Federal workers—Federal civil servants—is not out of control, but your jobs are going to be lost when these Republicans finish doing what they want to do to these regulations.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his fine work on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the REINS Act because it fulfills a promise Congress made to American businessowners to get onerous regulations off the backs of job creators.

It sets a very reasonable standard. If a new regulation has an economic impact of $100 million or more, it needs to come to Congress for an up-or-down vote. Congress will then have a say. We will debate the merits, and then we will decide.

The Obama administration handed down a record-breaking 600 major new regulations imposing hundreds of billions of dollars in costs on the U.S. economy and millions of hours of compliance busywork on the employers and employees across the country.

All of that excessive red tape places a huge burden on small- and medium-sized businesses that create jobs in New Jersey, the State I represent, and across the Nation. I have toured quite a few businesses, and the consensus is clear: let American workers innovate, build, and create, and not spend time complying with regulations that are impractical and often a waste of time and money.

The REINS Act is constitutional. It does not violate the Chadha doctrine because it does not permit Congress to overturn valid regulations. Also, a joint resolution satisfies the bicameralism and presentment requirements of the Constitution.

The REINS Act will bring an important check against out-of-control Federal regulations and foster stronger economic growth. It is an important start to the agenda of the 115th Congress, and I urge all of our colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I stand here today with an urgent plea to my colleagues. We were elected by the good men and women of the United States who believe in our vision of America and who believe in our dedication to doing whatever it takes to ensure the American Dream is alive and achievable. It is for these reasons the REINS Act must pass.

Federal regulations imposed on American the job creators and households, an estimated $1.9 trillion burden in 2015.

Who pays that?

The American citizen does. It costs on an average, as Chairman GOODLATTE brought up, $15,000 per U.S. household.

Could that money be better used to offset the cost of a college education or maybe the staggering cost of health care due to the Affordable Care Act?

Let me give you a real-life illustration from my district. A couple of years ago, a constituent, a dairy farmer, was targeted by an incredibly vague, broad, and costly EPA rule called WOTUS, Waters of the United States. The EPA sued and won this case not due to environmental damage, but due to the vagueness of this rule and the determination in court. It cost my constituent over $200,000 in fines and court costs for a natural depression in his pasture that the EPA determined could qualify as navigable waters.

The rule states that any water or any land that becomes seasonably wet is affected. I live in Florida. We get 54 inches of rain a year. That is my whole State of Florida.

This is downright outrageous. This is just one example of the many times the EPA has overstepped its authority by enforcing vague regulations unfairly on individuals. The REINS Act will prevent these costly job-killing regulations from going into effect and safeguard against Federal bureaucrats imposing the heaviest burdens on the American economy, and this will increase the livelihood of the American people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the REINS Act, H.R. 26, for any number of reasons.

I can't help but point out that I have heard my esteemed colleagues in opposition to this bill refer on multiple occasions to the Federal bureaucracy as a well-oiled machine. Mr. Chairman, there are, indeed, well-oiled machines that undergird this institution, but I would submit the Federal bureaucracy is not one of those.

We have heard that the regulatory burden, as it relates to the loss of jobs, is equal to a listeria outbreak. What I would submit is that if we could avoid a listeria outbreak, would we not choose to do just that?

□ 1530

While looking at the loss of jobs as related to Federal regulation, we overstep the argument by avoiding the jobs not created as a result of Federal regulations. Should these things also not be amongst the items that we consider?

A wise man once said that the bureaucracy will continue to expand to meet the expanding needs of the bureaucracy. In 2017, in the United States, indeed, it seems we find ourselves in that very situation.

Arguments that the REINS Act is contrary to the Constitution, I would submit, are actually 180 degrees from the truth. In fact, Article I of the Constitution gives the power to make law to this legislative branch of our government and gives the power to generate revenue, here, as well as spend.

The definition of ''law,'' according to the Oxford Dictionary, is: ''The system of rules which a particular country or community recognizes as regulating the actions of its members and which it may enforce by the imposition of penalties.''

I will submit that the very regulatory overreach that we consider here today is, in fact, tantamount to law and extraconstitutional in and of itself.

My esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania suggested, and I agree, that the REINS Act is but a good start. The power to spend is Article I. The power to make laws is Article I.

REINS is a rudder on the ship of constitutionality that will right that ship and move it only in the correct direction. Regulations that have the power to take liberty or property rights or the wealth of those earned by their own labor are tantamount to law and, indeed, extraordinary constitutionally as it relates to an executive branch entity, and they should not be exercised.

Mr. Chairman, we hear that the people's House is responsible for this and the people's House is responsible for that. Well, the people's House is to ensure that the people have a voice in the matters of spending and lawmaking that our Founders who laid out Article I of the Constitution envisioned, and currently, that is simply not the case. H.R. 26 is simply a step back towards that right direction of constitutionality.

With that in mind, I strongly support the legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my friend.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman just spoke about liberty. My friend from Pennsylvania spoke about self-rule. Today we are talking about bureaucrats, but what we really should be talking about is the effect of this bill on our agencies in Homeland Security and our intelligence agencies, given the unprecedented intrusion by the Russians in our elections and other affairs of this Nation. If we don't stay focused on that liberty and the foundation for freedom so that another country doesn't interfere with our affairs, we as Members of Congress are ignoring the oath that we just took 2 days ago.

So I would suggest to my friends that I appreciate there can be overregulation, but I would suggest you have to look closely at how this bill affects our ability to protect our liberties and our freedom. I am afraid it affects it badly, in the face of interference that we haven't seen from another country since 1776.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I come from the private sector; so when I come to the House and I listen to the debate going back and forth, I almost feel like I am somebody not from a different planet, but from a different galaxy.

When we talk about overregulation, when we talk about the effects of unelected bureaucrats leveling on the American people $2 trillion and an impact to the economy, then somebody ought to sit up and listen.

All we are talking about is scrutiny, scrutiny of any piece of legislation, any executive order that comes out that is going to have an impact of $100 million or more on the economy. Around here, $100 million sounds like nothing. From where I am from, it is unbelievable that we would even think that $100 million should be the point that we look at.

What could be more common sense than to look at the heavy burden we are putting on everyday Americans and saying that, somehow, unelected bureaucrats who have never walked in their shoes, who have never done their job, who have never worried about meeting a payroll, who have never had to worry about regulation and taxation that make it impossible for them to compete, these poor, stupid folks just don't get it?

705,687 people in your districts are who you represent. Whether they voted for you or not is not the point. The point is we represent them. Why in the world would Congress cede its power to the executive branch and to unelected bureaucrats to determine what the American people are going to be burdened with? It is just common sense. Why can't we not see what is right in front of us right now?

I invite you to please go home to your districts, walk in those shops, walk in those little towns, talk to those people and find out the two things that really inhibit them from being successful are overtaxation and overregulation. We can handle both those things right here in the people's House.

This is not a Democratic House. This is not a Republican House. This is America's House. We should be looking at things that benefit the American people.

If we truly want to act in a bipartisan way, then let's stop this back-and-forth debate about what Republicans want, what Democrats want, and let's talk about what is good for the American people. That is who sent us. That is whose responsibility we have on our shoulders. If we can't do that, we ought to go home.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As far as unelected bureaucrats that we have heard people rail against, speaker after speaker today being concerned, those are nothing more than the civil servants that make our government work. They protect our water, protect our air. They protect us, as a matter of fact—the FBI, the law enforcement. These are good people who go to work every day, work hard, like my dad did, for instance. He was a civil servant. I guess you could call him an unelected bureaucrat. He did everything during his job that he needed to do, and he retired with dignity.

There are so many others who work for the post office. They work for TSA, Homeland Security. They are doing nothing but working a job honestly, and they deserve more than to be referred to derisively. We need them.

Mr. Chair, I am in opposition to this legislation. We need real solutions for real problems. In stark contrast, however, the REINS Act attempts to address a nonexistent problem with a very dangerous solution.

We need legislation that creates middle class financial security and opportunity, not legislation that snatches that away.

We need sensible regulations that protect American families from economic ruin and that bring predatory financial practices to an end.

We need workplace safety regulations that ensure hardworking Americans who go to work each day are protected from hazardous environments on the job.

We need strong regulations that protect the safety of the food that we eat and the air that we breathe and the water that we drink.

Unfortunately, H.R. 26 does nothing to advance those critical goals. This explains why more than 150 organizations strongly oppose this legislation, including Americans for Financial Reform; the American Lung Association; Consumers Union; The Humane Society of the United States; the League of Conservation Voters; Public Citizen; the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; Earthjustice; the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards; the American Public Health Association; the Environmental Defense Action Fund; the Center for American Progress; and the Trust for America's Health. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 26.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

During this debate, my friends on the other side of the aisle have raised quite a few false alarms:

If this bill passes, all important regulation will stop, they say. But that is not true. All regulation that is worthy of Congress' approval will continue;

If this bill passes, expert decision-making will stop because Congress will have the final say on new, major regulations, not Washington bureaucrats. That is not true.

Congress will have the benefit of the best evidence and arguments expert agencies can offer in support of their new regulations. Congress is capable of determining whether that evidence and those arguments are good or not and deciding what finally will become law. That is the job our Founding Fathers entrusted to us in the Constitution. We should not shirk from it.

I will tell you, though, what will stop if this bill becomes law: the endless avalanche of new, major regulations that impose massive, unjustified costs that crush jobs, crush wages, and crush the spirit of America's families and small-business owners. Think about what that will mean to real Americans who have suffered the real burdens of overreaching regulations.

Support the American people and listen to the major organizations across the country, which I include in the RECORD, who support H.R. 26, the REINS Act.

Support the American people. Support the REINS Act.

SUPPORT FOR H.R. 26, THE REINS ACT

American Center for Law and Justice, American Commitment, American Energy Alliance, American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, Americans for Limited Government, Americans for Prosperity—Key Vote, Americans for Tax Reform, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated General Contractors, Club for Growth—Key Vote, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Credit Union National Association, Family Business Coalition, FreedomWorks—Key Vote.

Heating Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Distributors International (HARDI), Heritage Action—Key Vote, Let Freedom Ring, National Association of Electrical Distributors (NAED), National Association of Home Builders, National Center for Policy Analysis, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Taxpayers Union—Key Vote, R Street, SBE Council, Campaign For Liberty.

SMALL BUSINESS & ENTREPRENEURSHIP COUNCIL,
Vienna, VA, January 3, 2017.

Hon. DOUG COLLINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE COLLINS: Serious regulatory reform is needed to revitalize entrepreneurship, small business growth, our economy, and quality job creation. Therefore, the Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council (SBE Council) strongly supports the Regulations from the Executive In Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act of 2017.

U.S. entrepreneurship and startup activity are in a frail state. While economic uncertainty and difficulties accessing capital present barriers to new business formation, excessive government regulation drives uncertainty and creates new obstacles. When the policy ecosystem becomes noxious for startups and small businesses, our entire economy suffers. For existing businesses, overregulation is driving costs higher and undermining confidence, investment and growth. The system is out-of-control, and common sense tools and solutions are needed to rein in the explosive growth of federal red tape.

The REINS Act requires that Congress take an up-or-down vote on every new major rule—defined as having an economic impact of $100 million or more—before such a rule could be enforced. This substantive regulatory reform measure would serve as an important check on the regulatory system, and have a positive effect in terms of how regulation affects small businesses, and therefore, consumers, America's workforce and the economy.

The REINS Act will bring needed accountability to our nation's regulatory system, and SBE Council thanks you for your leadership in spearheading this important legislative effort.

Sincerely,

KAREN KERRIGAN,
President and CEO.

NATIONAL ROOFING CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, January 3, 2017.

To All Members of the House of Representatives.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, The National Roofing Contractors Association (NRCA) strongly supports the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act and urges you to support this legislation when it comes to the House floor for a vote.

Established in 1886, NRCA is one of the nation's oldest trade associations and the voice of professional roofing contractors worldwide. NRCA has about 3,500 contractors in all 50 states who are typically small, privately held companies with the average member employing 45 people and attaining sales of about $4.5 million per year.

The roofing industry has faced an avalanche of new regulations from numerous government agencies in recent years. The cumulative burden of often counterproductive regulations is highly disruptive to entrepreneurs who seek to start or grow businesses that provide high-quality jobs. Most important, federal agencies have failed to work with industry representatives to provide greater flexibility for employers in achieving regulatory goals and minimizing adverse impacts on economic growth and job creation.

NRCA strongly supports regulatory reform to provide small and midsized businesses with much-needed relief from burdensome regulations, and the REINS Act is a key component of regulatory relief. It would require Congress to approve, with an up-or-down vote, any new major regulation issued by a federal agency before the regulation would become effective. Under the REINS Act, a major regulation is defined as any rule that is estimated to have an economic impact of at least $100 million on the private sector; would result in a major increase in costs or prices; and would have significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity or U.S. competitiveness.

NRCA believes the REINS Act, by requiring major regulations undergo a vote in Congress to become effective, would substantially increase accountability among federal agencies seeking to issue new regulations. This legislation would help provide employers in the roofing industry with the certainty they need to invest in their businesses and create more jobs.

NRCA supports the REINS Act and urges you to vote for this legislation in the House. If you have any questions or need more information, please contact NRCA's Washington, D.C., office.

DENNIS CONWAY,
Commercial Roofers Inc., Las Vegas,
NRCA Chairman of the Board.

ASSOCIATED BUILDERS AND CONTRACTORS, INC.,
Washington, DC, 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.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, H.R. 26, the "Regulations from the Executive in Need of

Scrutiny Act of 2017,'' otherwise known as the REINS Act, would amend the Congressional Review Act to require that both Houses of Congress pass and the President sign a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days before any major rule issued by an agency can take effect.

Simply put, H.R. 26 would impose unworkable deadlines for the enactment of a major rule under procedures that could charitably be referred to as convoluted.

Under this bill, the House may only consider a resolution for a major rule on the second and fourth Thursday of each month. Keep in mind that typically 80 major rules are promulgated annually. Yet, there may be as little as just 15 days available to consider such measures based on the majority's legislative calendar for the current year.

Furthermore, Congress may only consider such resolutions within 70 legislative days of receiving a major rule. This process would constructively end rulemaking as we know it.

Now, Mr. Chair, the reason why my friends on the other side of the aisle say we need this kind of gumming-the-works legislation—is because they claim regulations stifle economic growth.

For example, they point to the outgoing administration and say that regulations promulgated during its tenure have hurt our Nation's economy.

What they fail to tell the American people is that it was the Republican George Bush's administration's economic policies that caused the Great Recession.

Without question, it was the lack of regulatory controls that facilitated rampant predatory lending, which nearly destroyed our Nation's economy.

It led to millions of home foreclosures and devastated neighborhoods across America. In fact, it nearly caused a global economic meltdown.

Nevertheless, as a consequence of strong regulatory policies implemented by President Obama through such measures as the Dodd-Frank Act, our Nation has recovered to a point where the unemployment has been cut nearly in half to less than 5 percent.

Yet, the REINS Act would reverse these gains by empowering Congress to control and override the rulemaking process, even in the absence of any substantive expertise.

More than 80 of the Nation's leading professors on environmental and administrative law have warned in connection with substantively identical legislation considered in the last Congress, that without this expertise, any congressional disapproval is more likely to reflect the political power of special interests.

Lastly, by upending the process for agency rulemaking so that Congress can simply void major rules through inaction, the REINS Act likely violates the presentment and bicameralism requirements of Article I of the Constitution.

As a leading expert on administrative law states: ''The reality is that the act is intended to enable a single House of Congress to control the implementation of the laws through the rulemaking process. Such a scheme transgresses the very idea of separation of powers, under which the Constitution entrusts the writing of the laws to the legislative branch and the implementation of the laws to the executive branch.''

The REINS Act will further encourage corporate giants to hold our country hostage through a deregulatory, profits-first agenda and facilitate a political influence process rivaling the destructive industrial monopolies from the past century.

In sum, H.R. 26, like the ''Midnight Rules Relief Act'' we considered yesterday on the House floor, is yet another blatant gift to big business to weaken the critical regulatory protections that ensure the safety of the air we breathe, the cars we drive, the toys we give our children, and the food we eat.

Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this ill-conceived bill.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 26

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 ''Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process. Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress. Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes. By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

''Sec.
''801. Congressional review.
''802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules.
''803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules.
''804. Definitions.
''805. Judicial review.
''806. Exemption for monetary policy.
''807. Effective date of certain rules.

''§ 801. Congressional review

''(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online, and shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

''(i) a copy of the rule;

''(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

''(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C);

''(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

''(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

''(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

''(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs;

''(ii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of this title;

''(iii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995; and

''(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

''(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

''(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

''(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

''(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

''(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

''(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

''(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

''(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

''(C) necessary for national security; or

''(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

''(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

''(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

''(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days; or

''(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 802 and 803 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

''(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

''(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

''(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day; or

''(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

''(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

''(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

''§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

''(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

''(A) bears no preamble;

''(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.';

''(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.'; and

''(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

''(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

''(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

''(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

''(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

''(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

''(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

''(2) with full recognition of the Constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

''(a) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion

to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the Senate, the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

''(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date; or

''(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

''(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

''(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

''(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

''(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

''§ 804. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter:

''(1) The term 'Federal agency' means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1).

''(2) The term 'major rule' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

''(A) an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

''(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

''(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

''(3) The term 'nonmajor rule' means any rule that is not a major rule.

''(4) The term 'rule' has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

''(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

''(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

''(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of nonagency parties.

''(5) The term 'submission date or publication date', except as otherwise provided in this chapter, means—

''(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

''(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

''§ 805. Judicial review

''(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

''(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

''§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

''Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

''§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

''Notwithstanding section 801—

''(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

''(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.''.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

SEC. 5. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(2) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(3) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Sections 3 and 4, and the amendments made by such sections, shall take effect beginning on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115–1. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115–1.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Subparagraph (A) of section 804(2) of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, is amended to read as follows:

''(A) an annual cost on the economy of $100,000,000 or more, adjusted annually for inflation;''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

I offer this manager's amendment to assure that, just as the REINS Act strengthens Congress' check on rules that impose major new costs on the economy, it does not unduly delay the effectiveness of major new deregulatory actions, those that alleviate regulatory burdens of $100 million or more.

When first introduced in the 112th Congress, the REINS Act incorporated the definition of major rule in the underlying Congressional Review Act—generally, a rule that has ''an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more.''

This was done in the interest of consistency with prior terminology, and it

swept in both actions that imposed costs and actions that lifted costs. But, especially after the regulatory onslaught we have witnessed during the Obama administration, it is time to revise that definition.

We should assure that the REINS Act focuses Congress' highest attention on the rules that hurt the economy the most: those that impose $100 million or more in costs per year. We should likewise make sure that the REINS Act does not impose additional hurdles in the way of the most important and desperately needed deregulatory actions: those that free the economy of $100 million or more in annual regulatory burdens. A deregulatory action with that level of economic effect is one that Congress should be encouraging, not slowing down.

This refinement of the REINS Act's major rule definition is also needed to assure consistency with the major Administrative Procedure Act reform legislation the House is due to consider next week, the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2017. That measure already modernizes the major rule standard for APA purposes to $100 million or more in annual costs imposed on the economy. The REINS Act should mirror it.

I urge my colleagues to support this manager's amendment.

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

□ 1545

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, the Goodlatte amendment clarifies that a major rule is any rule with an annual cost on the economy of $100 million or more adjusted for inflation. This amendment revises the bill's definition for a major rule to include any rule with an annual cost of $100 million or more as determined by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, also known as OIRA.

I oppose this amendment because it focuses only on the cost of regulatory protections while completely overlooking the monetary benefits of these critical rules. It also strips OIRA's ability to consider the benefits of a rule in connection with a rule's cost. I don't understand the logic of that.

In 2015, The Washington Post's Fact Checker blog criticized cost-only regulatory estimates as misleading, unbalanced, and having serious methodological problems. Robert Weissman, president of Public Citizen, likewise observed in 2015 that ignoring the benefits of regulation is akin to grocery shoppers deciding to buy no groceries simply because groceries cost money. That doesn't make any sense to me.

Even Thomas Donohue, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, has stated that ''many of these rules we need, they're important for the economy, and we support them,'' conceding that the benefits of regulatory protections must be considered hand in hand with their costs.

Indeed, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, the Office of Management and Budget regularly has reported to Congress that the benefits of regulations far exceed their costs. During the three hearings on the REINS Act in previous Congresses, we heard from three distinguished witnesses that the benefits of regulation routinely outweigh their costs, according to cost-benefit analysis done by the Office of Management and Budget under administrations of both parties.

For example, in the 112th Congress, Sally Katzen, a former administrator of the OMB's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, testified that ''the numbers are striking: according to OMB, the benefits from the regulations issued during the ten-year period''—from fiscal year 1999 through 2009—''ranged from $128 billion to $616 billion.''

I will repeat. Benefits from regulations ranged from $128 billion to $616 billion.

''Therefore, even if one uses OMB's highest estimate of costs and its lowest estimate of benefits, the regulations issued over the past ten years have produced net benefits of $73 billion to our society.''

Those are the words of Sally Katzen. That 10-year timeframe encompasses the Clinton, Bush, and Obama administrations.

We also heard in the 112th Congress from David Goldston, a former Republican House committee chief of staff, who testified that ''administrations under both parties have reviewed the aggregate impact of regulations and found their benefits to have exceeded their costs (and not all benefits are quantifiable).''

Their testimony is bolstered by the Office of Management and Budget's 2016 Draft Report to Congress, which notes that estimated annual benefits of major Federal regulations reviewed by OMB over the past decade estimated annual benefits of regulatory protections are between $269 billion and $872 billion, while regulatory costs are between $74 billion and $110 billion.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, once again, because it focuses only on the cost of regulatory protections while completely overlooking the monetary benefits of these critical rules, and for that reason I oppose my colleague's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time only to urge my colleagues to support this important amendment and not lose the opportunity to benefit from deregulatory reforms that will grow our economy and save America's economy hundreds of millions of dollars. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115–1.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Section 801(a)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, is amended by inserting after ''the Federal agency promulgating such rule'' the following: ''shall satisfy the requirements of section 808 and''.

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, is amended by adding at the end the following (and amending the table of sections accordingly):

''§ 808. Regulatory cut-go requirement

''In making any new rule, the agency making the rule shall identify a rule or rules that may be amended or repealed to completely offset any annual costs of the new rule to the United States economy. Before the new rule may take effect, the agency shall make each such repeal or amendment. In making such an amendment or repeal, the agency shall comply with the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5, but the agency may consolidate proceedings under subchapter with proceedings on the new rule.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his help on this amendment as well. It is an amendment designed to take an already very good bill and make it just a little better.

A good friend of mine, former Indiana Governor Mitch Daniels, used to say ''you'd be amazed how much government you'll never miss'' when talking about reducing the size of government bureaucracy.

So much of government's excess is created by unelected officials who wield enormous influence over our everyday lives. Last year, Federal agencies issued 18 rules and regulations for every one law that passed Congress. That is a grand total of 3,853 regulations in 2016 alone. In 2015, Federal regulations cost the American economy nearly $1.9 trillion—T, trillion dollars—in lost growth and productivity.

Think about that for a second. A $1.9 trillion tax, a government burden on the American people. That means lost jobs, stagnant wages, and decreasing benefits for workers.

My amendment looks to help change all that. Very simply, my amendment requires every agency issuing a new rule to first identify, then repeal or amend at least one existing rule to offset any annual costs the new rule would have on the U.S. economy. This isn't some new radical idea. President-

elect Trump announced his administration will implement a new practice that for every new regulation, two would have to be repealed.

Governments in Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and the Netherlands have all implemented similar versions of one-in/one-out when addressing new rules and regulations. In fact, in Canada, bureaucrats used the new direction to find and cut more red tape than was even required by the law. My amendment gives the new administration that same flexibility.

Mr. Chair, it is past time we stop bureaucratic abuse and shift the balance of power from government back to the people, where it belongs. That can start today by passing the REINS Act and putting our government on a path to reduce the amount of red tape that our businesses and the American people deal with every day.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I oppose the gentleman's amendment, which would require that agencies offset the cost of new rules, no matter how critical or mundane these protections may be, prior to promulgating new rules. This proposal, also referred to as ''regulatory cut-go,'' appears as title 2 of H.R. 1155, the Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act, or the SCRUB Act, that was introduced in the previous Congress.

In the context of a veto threat of that bill, the Obama administration cautioned that this requirement would make the process of retrospective regulatory review less productive and, in the process, create needless regulatory and legal uncertainty, and that it would increase costs for businesses and for States, local and tribal governments, and it would also impede commonsense protections for the American public.

By enacting Federal statutes, tasking agencies with responsibilities, Congress authorizes agencies to carry out matters that are too complex, routine, or technical for Congress itself to administrate. We must ensure that agencies have the proper flexibility to issue new protections without encumbering other regulations with political obstructions. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), my good friend and the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for offering this amendment, and I rise in support of it.

The cumulative burden of Federal regulation will surely be reduced by the REINS Act, but that burden has two elements: the burden being added by new regulations and the burden already there.

This amendment adds a useful provision to the REINS Act to address the elimination of unnecessary burdens already in the Code of Federal Regulations. It does so, moreover, in a manner that parallels President-elect Trump's promise to pursue a policy of one-in/two-out when it comes to new regulatory actions by his administration.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is long past time to stop the runaway train of the Federal regulatory bureaucracy. I urge support for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115–1.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In section 801(a)(1)(A)(iv), title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, strike ''and'' at the end.

In section 801(a)(1)(A)(v), title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, strike the period at the end and insert a semicolon.

Insert after section 801(a)(1)(A)(v), title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, the following:

(vi) recognizing that climate change is real and caused by human activity, an accounting of the greenhouse gas emission impacts associated with the rule; and

(vii) an analysis of the impacts of the rule on low-income communities and on rural communities.

In section 804(2)(B), title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, strike ''and'' at the end.

In section 804(2)(C), title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, strike the period at the end and insert a semicolon.

Insert after section 804(2)(C), title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, the following:

''(D) an increase of 25,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions per year or more; or

''(E) a potential increased risk to low income or rural communities for—

''(i) cancer;

''(ii) birth defects;

''(iii) kidney disease;

''(iv) respiratory illness; or

''(v) cardiovascular illness.''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, for years my Republican friends have been trying to convince everyone that Federal agencies are scary and unpopular. In reality, Americans support Federal rules that protect them from injuries, diseases, and death. They always have and they always will. The people we represent don't want those rules to go away. They want stronger rules to protect their jobs, their pay, their health, and their fair treatment in the workplace.

Let's remember that it takes years to finalize most rules. Before an agency makes a rule, it considers science, costs, benefits, public stakeholder input, and public comments. Republicans have invented stories about surprise regulations that appear out of nowhere. These stories sound interesting until you realize they were invented to help their corporate friends get where they want. We know where this will lead us. Big banks got away with robbing us and creating a major recession because they weren't regulated strongly enough. Republicans think the answer is making it harder to regulate them.

If this bill passes, it won't be the nameless, faceless, unelected corporate CEOs who feel the pain. It will be the Americans from big cities and small towns who need Federal standards to keep their environment clean, to keep their workplace safe, and to make sure the products they buy won't hurt their families.

My Democratic colleagues are offering amendments today that exempt certain kinds of rules from the unrealistic burdens this bill creates. I support these amendments.

My amendment is a little different. It is not nearly enough to save this terrible bill, but it takes a big step in the right direction. It acknowledges that doing nothing carries a major cost.

□ 1600

It acknowledges human-caused climate change and requires agencies that propose regulations to report on how a rule impacts greenhouse gas emissions. If we require reporting a rule's costs, we should also report its impacts to our planet and to our way of life.

It also requires an analysis of a rule's impacts on low-income and rural communities. My Republican friends are deeply concerned about whether new regulations make big business and Wall Street investors happy. I think it is time we assess the impacts of regulations on the urban poor, the rural poor, or on coastal Native American tribes already fleeing the impacts of climate change, or the farmers in the West and South struggling to cope with drought, flooding, and extreme weather.

Finally, my amendment requires congressional approval of any regulation that would increase carbon pollution by 25,000 metric tons or more, or could increase cancer, birth defects, kidney disease, or cardiovascular or respiratory illness.

If House Republicans are so eager to rewrite the regulatory process, they should be willing to cast recorded votes allowing the release of tens of thousands of metric tons of pollution into our air. They should publicly vote to increase the rates of these terrible diseases among their constituents.

Passing this amendment is the very least we can do to make sure the bill doesn't put Americans at risk of injury and death.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment renders congressional findings on climate change and requires that agencies report to Congress on greenhouse gas impacts associated with a rule. It also requires agencies to report on a rule's effect on low-income and rural communities.

Further, the amendment expands the definition of major rule to include rules that allow increases of carbon emissions by more than 25,000 metric tons per year or that might increase the risk of certain diseases in rural or low-income communities.

I oppose this amendment.

The REINS Act is not designed to address one or two subjects of regulation with heightened scrutiny but not others. It is to restore accountability to the people's elected representatives in Congress for the largest regulatory decisions, whatever subject is involved.

Further, and consistent with that, the addition of congressional findings in one policy area—climate change—but no other, has no place in the REINS Act.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, it should be noted that the REINS Act is one sweeping piece of legislation that does not take into account public health, does not take into account clean air, clean water, and the effects of constituents and the American people, the environment, or the cost attended with increased illnesses. With that sweeping deregulation process that is being proposed by the majority, we have an exposure on issues of public health, clean air, clean water, and the regulations that are in place to protect the public health and the well-being of the American people.

My amendment just requires that, if these sweeping changes are to occur, Members of this body take the votes that would release additional metric tons into the atmosphere that would promote and increase the levels of disease in this country that is harmful to the American people. It is one of disclosure and accountability if the Members, indeed, are the ones that want to make the final decision.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115–1.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that will result in reduced incidence of cancer, premature mortality, asthma attacks, or respiratory disease in children.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes an important exemption to the REINS Act to ensure that policies that protect children from cancer, premature death, asthma attacks, or respiratory disease are not delayed or denied.

For example, the Clean Air Act, which has been in place for over 40 years, and has improved our health and protected all Americans from harmful toxic air pollution, such as ozone, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, and particle pollution, often requires updates based upon the best science, especially when it comes to our kids.

Toxic pollutants, such as ozone, which is a major component of smog, are linked to asthma, lung, and heart disease and result in thousands of deaths every year and up to 1 million missed days of school. Our kids are particularly susceptible to this type of pollution because their lungs are still developing. On average, they take deeper breaths and are more likely to spend long periods outdoors, placing them at higher risk.

The American Lung Association states that inhaling smog pollution is like getting a sunburn on your lungs, and often results in immediate breathing trouble.

I remember very well back in the early seventies, when I was a little girl, what the air was like in my hometown in Tampa. We had a lot of industrial users at the port of Tampa, a lot of industrial plants. I have seen the progress over time that the Clean Air Act has brought to this country. We are not like other countries in the world. We are stronger, and we are better, and we are healthier because of the Clean Air Act.

So let's not go backwards. Let's not throw a roadblock like the REINS Act into the mix here. But we do have to be careful because there still are many communities in America that continue to suffer, and they are often the underserved, economically distressed communities.

Studies have shown that working class communities often bear the brunt of environmental pollution because the only homes they can afford are often located near industrial sites. According to the NAACP, 78 percent of African Americans live within 30 miles of an industrial power plant, and 71 percent of African Americans live in counties that violate Federal air pollution standards.

In addition to that, a study by the Environmental Defense Fund found that our Latino neighbors are three times more likely to die from asthma, often for those same reasons.

Let's not go backwards. Because here, what the REINS Act does is it really complicates the American system of checks and balances. Let's not go backwards. Because it is not only our families and neighbors that would suffer. It is also our economy that would suffer as well.

This type of regulatory scheme of mirrors and false promises would create great uncertainty for many of our businesses. The Clean Air Act is one example. These clean air protections in the United States have a great track record. We have grown as a country. The economic growth has tripled. Our economic base has more than tripled. Clean air protections and environmental protections go hand-in-hand with economic growth.

Since 1970, we have cut harmful air pollution by 70 percent, while our economy has grown like gang busters. I know many of you are probably going to have your eyes on the Tampa Bay area Monday night when we have the college football championship in Tampa with Alabama versus Clemson. I

want you to take a look at our clean skies, the clean air. I wish we could all be there, but I think we are going to be back here in Washington, D.C. But just know, it hasn't always been that way. When you see the beautiful sunset across Tampa Bay with clear skies, that has been because of the Clean Air Act.

But if you bring a regulatory scheme, like the REINS Act, that says you have to come back to Congress for every single little new policy that is based on updates and new science, that is going to complicate everyone's lives. I worry at the outset of this new Congress, because the first bill passed yesterday was one that short-circuited public participation, and now this bill today appears to be a late Christmas gift to corporate polluters who put profits over people. We are better than that. You can prove me wrong, though, by supporting this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment exempts from the bill any rule reducing the incidence of cancer, premature mortality, asthma attacks, and respiratory diseases in children. But do not be fooled. This amendment is not about reducing these maladies. It is about transferring the power to decide how best to do so from elected representatives to unaccountable bureaucrats.

For example, government could substantially reduce teenage mortality by barring teenage drivers off the road. Of course, there would be a substantial cost to that policy, and there are surely less burdensome ways to achieve the same reductions in mortality. The right decision requires a delicate balancing of interest. Agencies can provide valuable expertise, but, when there is a lot at stake, the ultimate decision on how best to strike that balance is properly made by elected officials accountable to the people.

That is the intuition behind the REINS Act and the fundamental point that is lost on those who oppose it.

Reducing the incidence of mortality and serious disease is a goal that all Members share. This bill does not frustrate that goal. It merely ensures that elected representatives decide how best to achieve that policy so that our Republic remains a government by the people as the Constitution designed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, of course, this legislative body has all the power to go back to policymaking after an administrative agency makes a determination, but we are not micromanagers. We are legislators. And I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Castor amendment to protect children's health.

If you won't create an exception for children's health, I wonder, you are not willing to really recognize the fundamental constitutional basis of this government. It is one that relies on checks and balances as the basis of our government.

I urge my colleagues then to also support the Castor amendment but oppose the REINS Act in the end.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115–1.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule relating to the protection of the public health or safety.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 26 would exempt rules concerning public health or safety from the burdensome requirements of this legislation.

Simply put, when a rule is necessary to protect the health and safety of the public, it is critical that the rule be put into effect without unnecessary delay.

If this legislation is enacted without this amendment, it will create an untenable regulatory environment that will make it nearly impossible for agencies to safeguard the public welfare.

This legislation could bring to a grinding halt critical rulemaking such as rules relating to the transportation of hazardous materials by the Department of Transportation, clean air regulations by the EPA, and worker-protection standards by OSHA.

For example, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration implemented an economically significant rule that, by May 2018, all new vehicles must have rearview cameras. This regulation will help drivers have better visibility behind their car, greatly reducing the likelihood of backover crashes which largely involves small children.

But under the REINS Act, this rule would require a joint congressional resolution with an unrealistic timeline for implementation. For every year this rule would be delayed, the Traffic Safety Administration estimates that there would be, on average, 15,000 injuries and 267 fatalities resulting from backover crashes.

Proponents of this legislation may argue that H.R. 26 contains an emergency exemption which allows a major rule to temporarily take effect following an executive order stating that there is an imminent threat to public health and safety. Even when the threat is not imminent, the danger to the public health and welfare may be great and the fundamental responsibility to protect the public remains.

□ 1615

This legislation would substantially hinder the ability of agencies to fulfill this obligation, placing Americans at greater risk for the benefit of powerful corporate interests. In its present form, the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards and the alliance of more than 150 consumer, labor, faith, and other public interest groups predict that, by allowing Congress to even veto uncontroversial rules that protect public health and safety, the REINS Act ''would make the dysfunction and obstructionism that plague our political process even worse.''

In echoing this sentiment, the American Sustainable Business Council, which represents over 200,000 businesses, opposes H.R. 26 because it would recklessly place the burden of proof on the taxpayers in order to protect themselves on environmental, health, and safety issues and would shift responsibility away from powerful corporate interests.

While my amendment will not cure all that ails this legislation—and there is a lot—it will address one of its most glaring flaws and preserve the ability of agencies to protect public health and safety. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment exempts from the bill any rule pertaining to health or public safety.

Health and public safety regulations done properly serve important goals, and the bill does nothing to frustrate the effective achievement of those goals; but Federal health and public safety regulations constitute an immense part of total Federal regulation and have been the source of many of the most abusive, unnecessarily expensive, and job- and wage-destroying regulations. To remove these areas of regulation from the bill would severely weaken the bill's important reforms to lower cumulative regulatory costs and increase the accountability of our regulatory system and the Congress to the people, so I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman just made an assertion that, in fact, nothing in this legislation does anything to frustrate the goals of protecting health and safety; but, of course, it does. It prevents the implementation of rules which, in fact, protect public health and safety.

If my amendment were to pass, that statement would be true—it would do nothing to frustrate it—but without this amendment, it prevents the implementation of a rule that would, in fact, protect public health and safety. It is a reasonable exemption that will ensure that we protect the well-being and the health of our constituents. I urge all of my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 115–1.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that would provide for a reduction in the amount of lead in public drinking water.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would exempt from H.R. 26, the REINS Act, rules issued to reduce the amount of lead in public drinking water.

The ingestion of lead, of course, causes serious harmful effects on human health, even at low exposure levels. That is why the Environmental Protection Agency has set the maximum contaminant level for this toxic metal in drinking water at zero.

According to the EPA, young children, infants, and fetuses are particularly vulnerable to lead because the physical and behavioral effects of lead occur at lower exposure levels in children than in adults. The Agency reports that, in children, low levels of exposure have been linked to damage to the central and peripheral nervous systems, learning disabilities, shorter stature, impaired hearing, and the impaired formation and function of blood cells.

Take, for example, the Flint water crisis, which I have a little experience with, which was a preventable public health disaster. While much blame for the Flint water crisis lies with unelected officials who prioritize saving money over saving lives, the presence of lead in drinking water is, unfortunately, not unique to Flint. In fact, the drinking water of, potentially, millions of Americans may be contaminated by lead.

My amendment highlights one of the most problematic aspects of H.R. 26: that it could slow down or completely block urgent rulemakings that protect health and safety. This is because Members simply lack the requisite scientific or technical knowledge to independently assess the bona fides of most regulations, which are often the product of extensive research and analysis by agencies as well as input from effective entities and the public.

As a result, Members would have to make their own determinations based on their own—usually inexpert—views and limited information. Worse yet, some may be persuaded to disapprove of a rule in response to a wide-ranging influence exerted by outside special interests that favor profits over safety.

My amendment simply preserves current law with respect to regulations that are designed to prevent the contamination of drinking water by lead. Accordingly, I sincerely urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to carve out from the REINS Act's reforms regulations that would reduce the amount of lead in public drinking water.

But, like other amendments, this amendment is not so much about achieving a particular health or safety result. It is about taking the decision on how best to do that away from elected Representatives and handing it down to unaccountable bureaucrats. Agencies can provide valuable expertise, but when there is a lot at stake, the ultimate decision on how best to strike that balance is properly made by elected officials who are accountable to the people. This is the intuition behind the REINS Act, and the fundamental point is lost on its opponents.

Preventing dangerous levels of lead in our drinking water is a goal all Members share. This bill does not frustrate that goal. It merely ensures that elected Representatives decide how best to achieve that policy so that our Republic remains a government by the people, as the Constitution designed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

Protecting the health and safety of our citizens is one of the core responsibilities of our government and Congress, and we trust much of its authority to Federal agencies to implement this obligation. This amendment simply preserves current law with respect to regulations that are designed to prevent the contamination of drinking water by lead.

As the Obama administration has observed, in the context of a veto threat to a substantively identical version of this bill in the last Congress, the REINS Act would delay and, in most cases, thwart the implementation of statutory mandates and the execution of duly enacted laws, create business uncertainty, undermine much-needed protections of the American public, and cause unnecessary confusion. Unfortunately, as I noted in my opening statement, the REINS Act would delay and, worse yet, possibly stop major rules from going into effect that are needed to protect the public's health, safety, and well-being, including those that require us to keep lead from drinking water.

Safety regulations are typically the product of a transparent and accountable process that includes extensive investigation, analysis, and input from

the public and private sectors. It is no answer to say that H.R. 26 contains a limited emergency exception. That provision is insufficient. It merely allows a major rule to temporarily take effect for 90 days without its having congressional approval.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, just to reiterate what our position is, it is about time that we in D.C.—in Congress—take our responsibility back from unelected bureaucrats and make these decisions. We have seen, over the past 8 years, what overburdensome regulation has done to this country as far as crushing jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 115–1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) to present her amendment in her absence.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that pertains to the safety of any products specifically designed to be used or consumed by a child under the age of 2 years (including cribs, car seats, and infant formula).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Jackson Lee amendment exempts from this bill's onerous requirements the congressional approval requirement of any proposed rule that is made to ensure the safety of products that are used or consumed by children under the age of 2.

This amendment should pass for obvious reasons. If protecting public health and safety means anything, it surely must include the protection of our children. Because of the special vulnerability of young children, any regulation affecting their health and safety must not be delayed. Unfortunately, if this bill passes as written without this amendment, that is exactly what will happen. The young children will be vulnerable to products that are unsafe and that could hurt them. For this reason, SHEILA JACKSON LEE has offered this amendment, which I support.

An example is a regulation that is meant to protect a child from death or injury from contaminated formula. Such a rule would be impeded—or the promulgation of such a rule and the enactment of that rule would be impeded—by this administration.

This amendment would declare that, in that case, the rule would not apply. It would be exempted from this legislation. Toxic chemicals, dangerous toys, or deadly falls from unsafe products could be avoided. Therefore, this amendment would protect children under those circumstances. Those kinds of rules need to be implemented promptly to save lives.

For that reason, the Jackson Lee amendment deserves your support. I hope that you can support it out of your heart.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, the amendment seeks to carve out from the REINS Act's reforms regulations intended to protect young children and infants from harm.

Child safety is a goal all Members share, but to shield bureaucrats who write child safety regulations from accountability to Congress is no way to guarantee a child's safety. The only thing that would guarantee is less careful decisionmaking and more insulation of faceless bureaucrats from the public.

The Constitution entrusts to Congress the authority to protect children—and all citizens—from harmful products flowing in interstate commerce. The public should be able to trust Congress—and we should trust ourselves—to make sure that Washington bureaucrats make the right decisions to protect child safety when we delegate legislative authority to regulatory agencies.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the faceless, nameless, deadly bureaucrats out here who mean the public harm, those are our relatives. Those are our mothers, our fathers, who work for the Federal Government. They are the civil servants that serve us. They are not nameless and faceless people of bad will and bad intent. They are good people who go to work every day and try to protect us and protect our children.

All we are asking for with this amendment is for there to be a carve-out to protect the most vulnerable among us, our children.

This legislation is based on the faulty premise that the cost of regulations outweigh the benefits. What is the cost of a benefit when it comes to the health, safety, and well-being of a child?

The people who promulgate these rules mean to protect these children, and this amendment goes to that ability of the regulators to do that. Sometimes regulation is good.

Even though a couple of jobs might go away because of the regulation, isn't it worth the health, safety, and well-being of our children that a couple of jobs could not reach fruition? Everything is not a cost-benefit analysis. Sometimes there is some humanity in the mix that we have to consider.

I urge my colleagues to think about it one more time and be in favor of the very reasonable Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, the REINS Act doesn't prevent the bureaucracy, the agencies, from making recommendations and suggestions to Congress. It simply says Congress will have the last word and not a handful of bureaucrats, and many of them don't even have experience in these areas.

I urge my colleagues to not support this amendment but to support the REINS Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115–1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I offer an amendment to H.R. 26.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: ''; and includes any special rule''.

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that pertains to improving employment, retention, and earnings of workforce participants, especially those participants with significant barriers to employment.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 26, which would exempt from the bill rules that improve the employment retention and wages of workforce participants, especially those with significant barriers to employment. Since one of the justifications, or the main justification, for this underlying legislation is to promote job growth from corporate titans at the expense, by the way, of health and safety of Americans, at least, we could exempt from the bill rules that improve the employment, retention, and wages of workforce participants, especially those with significant barriers to employment.

When President Obama took office in 2009, he inherited the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. This economic quagmire was created by misguided Republican policies that put profits ahead of people, resulting in reckless decisions on Wall Street that cost millions of Americans their homes and jobs. In other words, the Great Recession was caused by the collapse of the financial markets due to an unreliability and instability of the predatory lending market, which had taken hold. There was so much paper out there on Wall Street that was worthless because it was based on these homes that people couldn't pay the notes for, and all of that was caused by deregulation, lack of regulation.

Now we have a period with Dodd-Frank coming into play and the financial markets improving, the protection and economic security of American families increasing, being strengthened.

Now, at the beginning of this Congress, we get legislation to gut the Dodd-Frank regulation and other regulations that would protect people from excesses of the corporate community. I am just asking, in this amendment, that we don't let it apply in the case of situations where the bill improves employment retention or wages or workforce participants, especially those with barriers to employment.

So, according to leading economic indicators, private-sector businesses have created more than 15.6 million new jobs. The unemployment rate has dropped to well below 5 percent to the lowest point in nearly a decade, and incomes are rising faster, while the poverty rate has dropped to the lowest point since 1968. This has all occurred during an administration that is proenvironment, proclean energy, and proworkplace safety.

In fact, during this time, our Nation has doubled our production of clean energy and reduced our carbon emissions faster than any other advanced nation. And the price of gas is down to roughly $2 a barrel, despite all of these cumbersome and oppressive regulations by the Obama administration that the other side complains about.

Notwithstanding this progress that has been made, there is still much work to be done for the millions of Americans who remain out of work, underemployed, or have not seen significant wage growth postrecession.

Congress should be working tirelessly across party lines to find solutions to persistent unemployment and stagnant wages, such as a public investment agenda that will increase productivity and domestic output while turning the page on our historic underinvestment in our Nation's roads, bridges, and educational institutions.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chair, this bill, the REINS Act, is not a jobs bill. It is a legislative hacksaw to the critical public health and safety protections that ensure our Nation's air is clean, our water is pure, and our workplace vehicles, homes, and consumer products are safe.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chair, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act's congressional approval procedures regulations that attempt to improve employment, retention, and earnings, particularly for those with significant barriers to employment.

The danger in the amendment is the strong incentive it gives agencies to manipulate their analysis of a major regulation's jobs and wages impacts. Far too often, agencies will be tempted to shade the analysis to skirt the bill's congressional approval requirement.

In addition, regulations alleged to create new job prospects often do so by destroying real, existing jobs and creating new, hoped-for jobs associated with regulatory compliance. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Clean Air Act rules have shut down existing power plants all over the country, throwing myriads of workers out of work. EPA and OMB attempt to justify that with claims that more new green jobs have been created as a result.

In the end, this is just another way in which government picks the jobs winners and the jobs losers, and there is no guarantee that all of the new green jobs will ever actually exist.

The REINS Act is not intended to force any particular outcome. It does not choose between clean air and dirty air. It does not choose between new jobs and old jobs.

Instead, the REINS Act chooses between two ways of making laws. It chooses the way the Framers intended in which accountability for laws with major economic impact rests with Congress. It rejects the way Washington has operated for too long in which there is no accountability because decisions are made by unelected agency officials.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 115–1.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: ''; and includes any special rule''.

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would exempt from the bill any regulations that pertain to nuclear reactor safety. In other words, my amendment would allow the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or the NRC to continue to issue rules under the current system, thereby making it easier to protect Americans from potential nuclear disaster.

The underlying legislation, the REINS Act, would grind the gears of rulemaking to a halt by requiring all major rules to be affirmatively approved in advance by Congress. A regulation would be blocked from being implemented if even one Chamber declines to pass an approval resolution. The goal of this legislation, quite simply, is to stop the regulatory process in its tracks, regardless of the impact on public health and safety.

One example that highlights the risks and dangers of this legislation is

the subject of this amendment: Nuclear power.

The world watched in horror when an earthquake and resulting tsunami devastated the area around Fukushima, Japan, a few years ago. That disaster then caused its own disaster—the meltdown of three reactors at the Fukushima nuclear power plant. The meltdown led to the release of radioactive isotopes, the creation of a 20-kilometer exclusion zone around the power plant, and the displacement, consequently, of 156,000 people. Just last month, seaborne radiation from Fukushima was even detected on the West Coast of the United States.

The same year as the Fukushima meltdown, Virginia was struck by a relatively rare but strong earthquake, felt up and down the eastern seaboard. While the region was spared a similar disaster, the earthquake required a nuclear power plant near the epicenter to go offline as a precaution and served as a wake-up call that our nuclear reactors needed additional safety protocols.

For me, this concern hits close to home. A nuclear power plant, Indian Point, which has suffered numerous malfunctions in recent years, lies just less than 40 miles away from my New York City district, about 30 miles away from the city. Twenty million people live within a 50-mile radius around the plant, the same radius used by the NRC as the basis for the evacuation zone recommended after the Fukushima disaster.

□ 1645

Indian Point also sits near two earthquake fault lines and, according to the NRC, is the most likely nuclear power plant in the country to experience core damage because of an earthquake.

Because of the catastrophes that can result from disasters, be they natural or manmade at nuclear power plants, prevention of meltdowns is absolutely vital. Since Fukushima, the NRC has issued new rules designed to upgrade power plants to withstand severe events like earthquakes, and to have enough backup power so as to avoid a meltdown for a significant length of time.

The NRC must retain the ability to issue new regulations to safeguard the health and well-being of all Americans. However, this bill is intentionally designed so that new and important regulations, including those to prevent a nuclear power plant meltdown which could affect millions of American, will likely never be put in place, thwarted by either chamber of Congress.

Congress delegates authority to executive agencies because we do not have the expertise or time to craft all technical regulations ourselves. We should defer to the engineers and scientists at the NRC who determine, after careful study, that a particular regulation is critical to our safety and to the safe operation of a nuclear power plant. This bill, however, would all too easily allow Members of Congress to substitute their own judgment or, most likely, the wishes of a narrow group of special interests.

This week we began a new Congress. Later this month we will have a new administration, all controlled by Republicans. Between this bill and the Midnight Rules bill we passed yesterday, they have chosen to make their first order of business the dismantling and destruction of the regulatory process, regardless of the impact on public health and safety. This gives us a good idea of the priorities we should expect to see in the next 2 years.

The least we can do is to try to ensure that the antiregulatory agenda of the Republicans does not have devastating consequences such as a nuclear meltdown. I urge my colleagues to support the Nadler amendment to exempt nuclear safety regulations from the onerous requirements of the underlying bill.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act's congressional approval procedures all regulations that pertain to nuclear reactor safety standards. REINS Act supporters believe in nuclear safety. We want to guarantee that regulatory decisions that pertain to nuclear reactor safety are the best decisions that can be made.

That is precisely why I oppose the amendment. By its terms, the amendment shields from the REINS Act's congressional approval procedures not only major regulations that would raise nuclear reactor safety standards, but also regulations that would lower them.

All major regulations pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards, whether they raise or lower standards, should fall within the REINS Act. That way agencies with authority over nuclear reactor safety would know that Congress must approve their major regulations before they go into effect.

That provides a powerful incentive for the agencies to write the best possible regulations, ones that Congress can easily approve. It is a solution that everyone should support because it makes Congress more accountable and ensures agencies will write better rules. All Americans will be safer for it.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, nuclear meltdowns are a tremendous danger to the life and safety of millions of Americans. The Congressional Review Act provides if the NRC makes such a regulation, Congress can say no. That is appropriate. But to say Congress has to approve any regulation in advance, when there may be thousands of regulations or hundreds of regulations from different agencies, they may not get to it. We may not have time to study it, and lives are at stake. It does not make sense. That is why this amendment at least cuts out nuclear meltdown regulations, nuclear safety regulations, to say Congress can veto them if they don't agree. But the agency should be able to promulgate it in the absence of congressional veto.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, once again, this administration has proven how thousands of regulations have crushed jobs for the middle class people in this country. The REINS Act does designate and allows and wants agencies to make decisions as far as what they think the law should be and send it to Congress.

We do have the time. We have the resources and the knowledge. That is why we have full committees. That is why we have subcommittees and we have experts come in and testify. Yet, we still need to get back—that the 535 Members of Congress, the House and the Senate, make the final decision and not a handful of unelected bureaucrats.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 115–1.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer amendment No. 10 as the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In paragraph (2) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

In paragraph (3) of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Add, at the end of section 804, title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule intended to ensure the safety of natural gas or hazardous materials pipelines or prevent, mitigate, or reduce the impact of spills from such pipeline.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman

from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, recent pipeline incidents have raised serious concerns about the condition of the Nation's pipelines that threaten the safety and health of American citizens. This amendment will ensure that any rule intended to guarantee the safety of natural gas or hazardous material pipelines is not considered a major rule under this bill and would, therefore, be easier to create.

Pipeline safety is a bipartisan issue. Congress has shown that issuing regulations related to pipelines is a priority, as evident with the enactment of the PIPES Act last year.

However, the bill before us today, H.R. 26, contradicts this historic precedent and would have the effect of delaying or preventing any rule on pipeline safety from going forward. Pipeline accidents cause major property damage, serious injuries or deaths, and harms the environment.

There are approximately 2.9 million miles of pipeline in the United States. They travel through rural and urban areas, Republican and Democratic districts, coastlines, inland areas. Everyone is impacted. Quality control measures, new infrastructure, and oversight are paramount.

Unfortunately, we have seen the devastating impact of pipeline incidents throughout the country, including several accidents and spills in California in recent years, such as the spill in Santa Barbara that released more than 100,000 gallons of crude oil.

We have also seen how liquid spills can devastate the people and economies in places like Michigan, and the irreplaceable natural resources like the Yellowstone River in Montana, or the precious coastline of Santa Barbara. Additionally, these explosions and spills cause shortages and price increases that impact Americans far from the site of the accident.

A Colonial Pipeline accident this past September in Alabama leaked roughly 8,000 barrels of gasoline and saw prices increase by up to 31 cents a gallon in metropolitan areas in the Southeastern States.

I agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we want effective and efficient government. But, in reality, pipeline safety regulations are already subject to duplicative and time-consuming analyses, including a rigorous risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis required by the pipeline safety statute. These already duplicative review requirements are among the top reasons why the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration increasingly lags behind the congressional mandate to issue rules that protect Americans from dangerous pipeline incidents.

In fact, this was the subject of a great deal of discussion when the Energy and Commerce Committee marked up the pipeline safety reauthorization bill last year. I worked with Chairman UPTON and Ranking Member PALLONE to address this issue, as both sides of the aisle agreed that the duplicative reviews currently required are already slowing down these critical safety laws to a degree that is frustrating and dangerous.

While we make progress in the PIPES Act, I believe we can and should do more. The last thing we need is one more layer of bureaucracy to further slow down implementation of these critical protections for public health, safety, and the environment. We should work together to prevent spills and work to minimize impacts when spills or other incidents do occur. This includes automatic shut-off valves, leak detection, and technologies to reduce clogging and rupture.

A vote for this amendment is a vote for the safety of the public and the environment. It is a vote to protect the land and water that are threatened by oil spills. It is a vote for industry that wants certainty and clarity and doesn't want to—or benefit from—wait years for rules to be finalized. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to carve out from the REINS Act's reform regulations that concern natural gas or hazardous materials pipeline safety or the prevention of pipeline spills and their adverse impacts.

We all support pipeline safety and the prevention of harm from pipeline spills, but there is no assurance that the amendment would guarantee the achievement of those goals. On the contrary, the amendment would shield from congressional accountability procedures, regulations, that actually threaten to decrease safety. They also would shield from the bill's congressional approval requirements new, ideologically driven regulations intended to impede America's access to new sources of cheap, clean, and plentiful natural gas.

The legislative body is the legislative body. We are trying to have oversight over the bureaucracy. The House and the Senate is not a bureaucracy. It is a legislative body, according to the Constitution that represents the people of the United States. Therefore, the House and the Senate and the President should have the last say in whether something becomes law or not.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, my opponent is right. It is the duty of Congress to provide rules and to provide guidelines and for the agencies to go into the details in creating these rules.

I know that the other side is opposed to the rules. They have been touting about regulations, but poor regulations reduces jobs, too. It creates monopolies. It creates pollution. But that is not what we are talking about.

What we are talking about is public safety. I think what we need to do is look at what is going to benefit the public safety and what is going to protect people, lives, property, and the environment. That is what this amendment does. It is simple. It exempts pipeline safety from H.R. 26.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, what better group, such as the Committee on Energy and Commerce or other committees here, the full committees, the subcommittees, would be looking out and should be looking out for the public safety and the welfare than the 535 Members of Congress?

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 115–1.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Section 804(4) of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, is amended in subparagraph (B), by striking ''or'' at the end.

Section 804(4) of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, is amended in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''.

Section 804(4) of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended to read by section 3 of the bill, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) any rule that pertains to workplace health and safety made by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration or the Mine Safety and Health Administration that is necessary to prevent or reduce the incidence of traumatic injury, cancer or irreversible lung disease.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would exempt from coverage under the REINS Act any rule which pertains to workplace health and safety made by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OSHA, or the Mine Safety and Health Administration, MSHA, that is necessary to prevent or reduce the incidence of traumatic injury, cancer or irreversible lung disease.

I am offering the amendment because we should not be creating obstacles to the protection of life and limb. We should be concerned about repealing such workplace rules. Actually, this concern is not theoretical. There was a report from the chairman of the Freedom Caucus that actually calls for the repeal of multiple safety and health rules.

□ 1700

One OSHA rule, for example, will reduce slip, trip, and fall hazards, which are actually a leading cause of worker deaths and lost workday injuries. We found that this rule had not been updated since 1971, and OSHA has calculated that over 10 years the rule will prevent nearly 300 worker deaths and more than 58,000 lost-time injuries. The net benefit, cash benefit, of the rule is projected to be over $3 billion over 10 years.

Another rule at risk is the modernization of OSHA's beryllium exposure limit, a 70-year-old standard that was obsolete even before it was issued. Workers who inhaled beryllium can develop debilitating, incurable, and frequently fatal illnesses. One known as chronic beryllium disease also increased lung cancer.

In the 1940s, workers at the Atomic Energy Commission plants were contracting acute beryllium poisoning. To deal with the problem, two scientists agreed to set the exposure limit at 2 micrograms per cubic meter of air while sitting in the back of a taxicab on their way to a meeting. This discredited standard is often called the taxicab standard because there was no data to support it, and there is now significant scientific evidence that show that it has failed to protect workers.

One cost of keeping the so-called taxicab standard is estimated at the loss of nearly 100 lives a year. So we need to make sure that this rule is updated. It is in final stages after 18 years of development. The finalized rule is expected to come out soon. Other rules involve mine safety and other safety and health concerns.

The REINS Act would make it harder to protect workers' health and safety. The bill would create more bureaucracy by requiring that any major rule receive bicameral resolution of support within 70 legislative days prior to the rule taking effect.

This bill even provides for a reach back to consider rules issued last spring. Under this bill, a single House of Congress could block a rule. That raises significant constitutional concerns. By allowing a one-House veto, the bill violates the presentment clause of the Constitution of the United States.

My amendment ensures essential workplace safety protections are not jeopardized by this flawed legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''yes'' vote on my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment carves out of the REINS Act's congressional approval procedures any workplace safety rules issued by OSHA or the Mine Safety and Health Administration to reduce traumatic injury, cancer, or lung disease.

But please do not be fooled. This amendment is not about reducing these maladies. It is about transferring the power to decide how best to do so from elected Representatives, being House Members and Senators, to unaccountable bureaucrats.

Arriving at the right decision requires a delicate balancing of interests. Agencies can provide valuable expertise, but when there is a lot at stake, the ultimate decision on how best to strike that balance is properly made by elected officials accountable to the people. That is the intuition behind the REINS Act and the fundamental point that is lost on its opponents.

Preventing workplace injury is a goal all Members share. This bill does not frustrate that goal. It merely ensures that elected Representatives make the final call about major decisions so that our Republic remains a government by the people as the Constitution's Framers designed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which really is a life-or-death question before the Chamber.

On February 7, 2010, a bunch of workers who were at a natural gas plant construction site early in the morning lost their lives in a horrific explosion because there was a natural gas blow where they intentionally put natural gas through the pipe that was being installed as a way of cleaning it. This is a practice which the pipe suppliers, Siemens, GE, and others have issued serious warning is an unsafe practice. Unfortunately, it wasn't followed that day, so six men lost their lives. One of them was Ronnie Crabb, who was a dear friend of mine.

It never should have happened because, again, in the private sector, the workplace standard was there, but there was no workplace standard in OSHA, which is now, again, trapped in the Chemical Safety Board and the regulatory process.

This bill is just going to do nothing but, again, add additional obstacles so that preventive measures that OSHA is really about—it is about compliance, not retribution. There was a $16 million fine imposed after the fact. The company, the contractor, went out of business and paid just a fraction of it. That is not the way to protect workers' lives. Let's allow a healthy regulatory process with private sector input so that people like Ronnie Crabb won't lose their lives in the future.

Mr. Chairman, again, I strongly support the Scott amendment.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 115–1.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, as proposed to be amended by section 3 of the bill, is amended by adding at the end the following (and conforming the table of sections accordingly):

"§ 808. Review of rules currently in effect

''(a) ANNUAL REVIEW.—Beginning on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this section and annually thereafter for the 9 years following, each agency shall designate not less than 10 percent of eligible rules made by that agency for review, and shall submit a report including each such eligible rule in the same manner as a report under section 801(a)(1). Section 801, section 802, and section 803 shall apply to each such rule, subject to subsection (c) of this section. No eligible rule previously designated may be designated again.

''(b) SUNSET FOR ELIGIBLE RULES NOT EXTENDED.—Beginning after the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this section, if Congress has not enacted a joint resolution of approval for that eligible rule, that eligible rule shall not continue in effect.

''(c) CONSOLIDATION; SEVERABILITY.—In applying sections 801, 802, and 803 to eligible rules under this section, the following shall apply:

''(1) The words 'take effect' shall be read as 'continue in effect'.

''(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), a single joint resolution of approval shall apply to all eligible rules in a report designated for a year, and the matter after the resolving clause of that joint resolution is as follows: 'That Congress approves the rules submitted by the ____ for the year ____.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(3) It shall be in order to consider any amendment that provides for specific conditions on which the approval of a particular eligible rule included in the joint resolution is contingent.

''(4) A member of either House may move that a separate joint resolution be required for a specified rule.

''(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'eligible rule' means a rule that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this section.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to say that I have been a long and strong supporter of the REINS Act. I want to compliment Congressman Geoff Davis of Kentucky for introducing and crafting that legislation. While he was doing that, I was drafting a bill that I named the Sunset Act, and I looked at this from the broad scope of this, that we have a lot of regulations that exist and have existed for decades. Some of them are burdensome and some of them are not.

The effect of the REINS Act, which I certainly will support on a final passage, hopefully with the King amendment adopted in it, but the REINS Act de facto simply grandfathers in existing regulations. So it is only prospective. It addresses the major regulations going forward, but not those that we are stuck with, such as the Waters of the United States, the Clean Power Plan, the overtime rule, the fiduciary rule, the net neutrality rule, the Dodd-Frank rules, and, heaven forbid, the ObamaCare rules if we should fail to repeal ObamaCare.

So what the King amendment does is it directs and allows the agencies and the executive branch of government to send a minimum of 10 percent of their regulations to the Congress each year for the duration of a decade encompassing a full 100 percent of all the regulations in place at the time of passage and enactment of the underlying legislation.

That gives Congress, then, authority and a vote over all of this. It gives us an ability to amend that legislation. We can pass them all en banc, we can amend them accordingly, or we can do what our Founding Fathers envisioned we should do. That is the essence of this.

By the way, President-elect Trump has made some strong pledges on dramatically reducing regulation in the United States. He doesn't have the tools without the King amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the King amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, which establishes an idiosyncratic process establishing an automatic sunset of public health and safety protections. It requires that agencies conduct an annual review of current rules to designate 10 percent of its existing rules to be eliminated within 10 years of the bill's enactment unless Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval for eligible bills.

Now, I understand to the listening public that sounds kind of complicated, but the bottom line is they want to do away—my friends on the other side of the aisle—with net neutrality, which is something that a Federal agency requires. So if you want the Internet, which we all built and paid for through the Federal Government through our taxes and then we turned it over to the private sector, but we still have a public interest in the net being neutral so that all traffic flows equally over the Web without some being slower than others according to how much you can afford to pay. That is not fair.

So this King amendment is a part of a regulatory scheme proposed by this legislation, the REINS Act, which is going to hurt Americans. It is going to hurt the health, safety, and well-being of the people when you are not able to have clean water, clean food, edible food, safe products, clean air, and clean water. These are the things that the REINS Act gets at. It doesn't want Americans to be healthy. It doesn't want the Internet to be neutral. Why? Because corporate America and Wall Street put people in office to do their bidding. That is what the REINS Act is all about. This King amendment will make it worse.

Under current law, Federal agencies already conduct an extensive retrospective review process of existing rules and have already saved taxpayers billions of dollars in cost savings. Since 2011, the Obama administration has made a durable commitment to ensuring retrospective review of existing regulatory protections. Under Executive Orders 13563 and 13610, the administration has required that of agencies.

According to Howard Shelanski, the administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs under the Obama administration, the Obama administration's retrospective review initiative has achieved an estimated $37 billion in cost savings, reduced paperwork, and other benefits for Americans over the past 5 years.

Furthermore, as the Obama administration has stated in the context of a veto threat of a similarly draconian antiregulatory proposal in a previous Congress, ''It is important that retrospective review efforts not unnecessarily constrain an agency's ability to provide a timely response to critical public health or safety issues, or constrain its ability to implement new statutory provisions.'' That is what the King amendment would do.

In fact, because agencies are already committed to a thorough review process to identify and eliminate regulatory burdens, it may be impossible for agencies to make additional cuts without severely affecting public health and safety.

Lastly, while the majority has repeatedly noted that H.R. 26 is forward-looking legislation, this amendment would make the bill apply retroactively to protections and safeguards that exist at the bill's date of enactment, a bald attempt to gut protections adopted by the Obama administration, including net neutrality.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 427—REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2015—REP. YOUNG, R–IN, AND 171 COSPONSORS

The Administration is committed to ensuring that regulations are smart and effective, and tailored to further statutory goals in the most cost-effective and efficient manner. Accordingly, the Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 427, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015, which would impose an unprecedented requirement that a joint resolution of approval be enacted by the Congress before any major rule of an Executive Branch agency could have force or effect. This radical departure from the longstanding separation of powers between the Executive and Legislative branches would delay and, in many cases, thwart implementation of statutory mandates and execution of duly-enacted laws, create business uncertainty, undermine much-needed protections of the American public, and cause unnecessary confusion.

There is no justification for such an unprecedented requirement. When a Federal agency promulgates a major rule, it must already adhere to the particular requirements of the statute that it is implementing and to the constraints imposed by other Federal statutes and the Constitution. Indeed, in many cases, the Congress has mandated that the agency issue the particular rule. The agency must also comply with the rulemaking requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 551 et seq.). When an agency issues a major rule, it must perform analyses of benefits and costs, analyses that are typically required by one or more statutes (such as the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, and the Paperwork Reduction Act) as well as by Executive Orders 12866 and 13563.

In addition, this Administration has already taken numerous steps to reduce regulatory costs and to ensure that all major regulations are designed to maximize net benefits to society. Executive Order 13563 requires careful cost-benefit analysis, public participation, harmonization of rulemaking across agencies, flexible regulatory approaches, and a regulatory retrospective review. In addition, Executive Order 13610 further institutionalizes retrospective review by requiring agencies to report regularly on the ways in which they are identifying and reducing the burden of existing regulations. Finally, agency rules are subject to the jurisdiction of Federal courts.

Moreover, for the past 19 years, the Congress itself has had the opportunity, under the Congressional Review Act of 1996, to review on an individual basis the rules—both major and non-major—that Federal agencies have issued.

By replacing this well-established framework with a blanket requirement of Congressional approval, H.R. 427 would throw all major regulations into a months-long limbo, fostering uncertainty and impeding business investment that is vital to economic growth. Maintaining an appropriate allocation of responsibility between the two branches is essential to ensuring that the Nation's regulatory system effectively protects public health, welfare, safety, and our environment, while also promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation.

If the President were presented with H.R. 427, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire as to how much time may be remaining for each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has half a minute remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I fully support Congressman KING's amendment. It improves the viability of the REINS Act and makes sure that the responsibility of legislation is in the hands of we legislators.

Let me just ask this simple question. My good friend on the other side says that we should let the agencies and departments regulate and make rules. Let me ask this: How has it been going in the last 20 years in this country?

We are $20 trillion in debt, and 20 million people are out of work or underemployed.

Are we going to continue to let bureaucrats make these decisions that crush jobs?

No, I don't think so. It is our responsibility in the House and it is our responsibility in the Senate. We can hear from those individuals, as I have repeatedly said here, in those agencies. We need to make the final decision because just look at the track record over the last 20, 30 years of unelected bureaucrats making these rules, laws, and regulations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we can't blame a $20 trillion deficit or debt on nameless, faceless bureaucrats. We can blame a lot of that debt on the George Bush administration and the legislators who voted for tax cuts for the wealthy that were not paid for and funded two wars that were not paid for. That is what we can blame that $20 trillion debt on.

□ 1715

Again, if you are in favor of net neutrality, you should oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, first, I would say that yes, we can blame a lot of debt and deficit on a burden of regulations. We can blame it because there is a huge cost to our executive branch of government. That cost, much of it, the unnecessary component, all that goes against our debt and deficit.

We saw, as Barack Obama came in as President, we had a $10 trillion debt, which he was very critical of throughout his campaign in 2007 and 2008. Now, as he leaves office here, thankfully, in a couple of weeks, it is a $20 trillion debt, and we can start to ratchet this thing back down.

Looking at the Obama administration and their reports on the costs of regulation, they come up with this number reported to the Heritage Foundation that the annual cost of regulations to the United States, according to the Obama administration, is $108 billion, Mr. Chairman. So that is what we are looking at here for costs.

But I want to get at the real meat of this. Article I of the Constitution says Congress shall make all law. Yet, we have the courts making laws across the street, and we have regulations coming at us at a rate of—and I expressed to the gentleman from Georgia—ten-to-one. For every law we passed in the 114th Congress, there were at least 10 regulations that were poured over our head, and we are sitting in a place where we don't have the tools to undo them.

Now we have a President that is ready, and he wants to undo these regulations. If we make him march through the Administrative Procedure Act, it is heavy, it is burdensome, and it is time-consuming. But the King amendment gives the tools for the next President of the United States to work with Congress to trim this regulatory burden down. And the most important part is, it makes all of us in the House and the Senate accountable then for all of the regulations.

The APA was allowed to dish off this legislative responsibility to the executive branch. Congress took a pass. They ducked their responsibility of being accountable for all legislation and found a way to be producing less than 10 percent of the legislation that exists even in a given year.

The King amendment says that over the period of a decade, 10 percent a year at a minimum, Congress will have to review all the regulations. The people from across America—we the people—will weigh in on that regulation. And then an even better part is not only will we be accountable here in Congress—and we should be—but when the nameless, faceless bureaucrats are across the desk from our constituents and they refuse to listen to our constituents, there is going to be a little bug in the back of their ear that is going to be saying to them: You know what? This constituent that may be losing their business over this regulation, the next stop they make is going to be with their Congressman. These regulations that we promulgated are going to be subject then to being repealed by the United States Congress, as they should be.

Support the King amendment. It puts the authority back into the hands of Article I, we the people.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Mr. POE of Texas, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

OBJECTING TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2334

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 22, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 11) objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 11

Whereas the United States has long supported a negotiated settlement leading to a sustainable two-state solution with the democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a demilitarized, democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security;

Whereas since 1993, the United States has facilitated direct, bilateral negotiations between both parties toward achieving a two-state solution and ending all outstanding claims;

Whereas it is the long-standing policy of the United States that a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict will only come through direct, bilateral negotiations between the two parties;

Whereas it is the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and, if necessary, veto United Nations Security Council resolutions dictating additional binding parameters on the peace process;

Whereas it is the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and, if necessary, veto one-sided or anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas the United States has stood in the minority internationally over successive Administrations in defending Israel in international forums, including vetoing one-sided

resolutions in 2011, 2006, 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001, 1997, and 1995 before the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas the United States recently signed a new Memorandum of Understanding with the Government of Israel regarding security assistance, consistent with longstanding support for Israel among successive Administrations and congresses and representing an important United States commitment toward Israel's qualitative military edge;

Whereas on November 29, 2016, the House of Representatives unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 165, expressing the sense of Congress and reaffirming longstanding United States policy in support of a direct bilaterally negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and opposition to United Nations Security Council resolutions imposing a solution to the conflict;

Whereas on December 23, 2016, the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations disregarded House Concurrent Resolution 165 and departed from longstanding United States policy by abstaining and permitting United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be adopted under Chapter VI of the United Nations Charter;

Whereas the United States' abstention on United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 contradicts the Oslo Accords and its associated process that is predicated on resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict between the parties through direct negotiations;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 claims that ''the establishment by Israel of settlements in the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967, including East Jerusalem, has no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law and a major obstacle to the achievement of the two-State solution and a just, lasting and comprehensive peace'';

Whereas by referring to the ''4 June 1967 lines'' as the basis for negotiations, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 effectively states that the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem and the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, are ''occupied territory'' thereby equating these sites with outposts in the West Bank that the Israeli government has deemed illegal;

Whereas passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 effectively lends legitimacy to efforts by the Palestinian Authority to impose its own solution through international organizations and through unjustified boycotts or divestment campaigns against Israel by calling ''upon all States, bearing in mind paragraph 1 of this resolution, to distinguish, in their relevant dealings, between the territory of the State of Israel and the territories occupied since 1967'', and will require the United States and Israel to take effective action to counteract the potential harmful impact of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334;

Whereas UNSCR 2334 did not directly call upon Palestinian leadership to fulfill their obligations toward negotiations or mention that part of the eventual Palestinian state is currently controlled by Hamas, a designated terrorist organization; and

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 both sought to impose or unduly influence solutions to final status issues, and is biased against Israel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That —

(1) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) the passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 undermined the long-standing position of the United States to oppose and veto United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final status issues, or are one-sided and anti-Israel, reversing decades of bipartisan agreement;

(B) the passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 undermines the prospect of Israelis and Palestinians resuming productive, direct negotiations;

(C) the passage of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 contributes to the politically motivated acts of boycott, divestment from, and sanctions against Israel and represents a concerted effort to extract concessions from Israel outside of direct negotiations between the Israelis and Palestinians, which must be actively rejected;

(D) any future measures taken in international or outside organizations, including the United Nations Security Council or at the Paris conference on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict scheduled for January 15, 2017, to impose an agreement, or parameters for an agreement including the recognition of a Palestinian state, will set back the cause of peace, harm the security of Israel, run counter to the enduring bipartisan consensus on strengthening the United States-Israel relationship, and weaken support for such organizations;

(E) a durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will come only through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties resulting in a Jewish, democratic state living side-by-side next to a demilitarized Palestinian state in peace and security;

(F) the United States should work to facilitate serious, direct negotiations between the parties without preconditions toward a sustainable peace agreement; and

(G) the United States Government should oppose and veto future United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final status issues, or are one-sided and anti-Israel; and

(2) the House of Representatives opposes United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 and will work to strengthen the United States-Israel relationship, and calls for United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be repealed or fundamentally altered so that—

(A) it is no longer one-sided and anti-Israel; and

(B) it allows all final status issues toward a two-state solution to be resolved through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the esteemed Speaker of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read you a quote:

''Peace is hard work. Peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations—if it were that easy, it would have been accomplished by now. Ultimately, it is the Israelis and the Palestinians who must live side by side.''

That was President Obama in 2011, and he was right.

I am stunned at what happened last month. This government—our government—abandoned our ally, Israel, when she needed us the most. Do not be fooled. This U.N. Security Council resolution was not about settlements, and it certainly was not about peace. It was about one thing and one thing only: Israel's right to exist as a Jewish, democratic state.

These types of one-sided efforts are designed to isolate and delegitimize Israel. They do not advance peace. They make it more elusive.

The cornerstone of our special relationship with Israel has always been right here in Congress. This institution, the heart of our democracy, has stood by the Jewish state through thick and thin. We were there for her when rockets rained down on Tel Aviv. We were there for her by passing historic legislation to combat the boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement. And we have been there for her by ensuring Israel has the tools to defend herself against those who seek her destruction.

In every one of those instances, Republicans and Democrats worked together to get these things done. That is because our historic alliance with Israel transcends party labels and partisan bickering. We see that bipartisanship right here on the House floor today in condemning this anti-Israel resolution.

I want to thank our Chairman ED ROYCE, Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, and all of our Members on both sides of the aisle for speaking out on this issue and for helping assemble this legislation. It sends a powerful message, and it turns a page.

It is time to repair the damage done by this misguided hit job at the U.N. It is time to rebuild our partnership with Israel and reaffirm our commitment to her security. It is time to show all of our allies that, regardless of the shameful events of last week, the United States remains a force for good.

I ask the whole House to support this resolution on behalf of the American people.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (DAVID PRICE), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure, and I thank the Speaker for his words.

I want to start by thanking Chairman ED ROYCE, who authored this resolution. I am proud to be the lead Democratic cosponsor and glad to say that more than 30 Democrats representing a

broad cross-section of our party have signed on as cosponsors of this bipartisan legislation.

ED ROYCE and I have worked together for the past 4 years, and we believe that foreign policy should be bipartisan and that partisanship should stop at the water's edge. Frankly, this is what we are doing today. We are condemning what happened because we think it is unfair and unjust.

I want to also mention that I join with my friend from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) in authoring an amendment to this resolution that wasn't accepted which emphasizes a two-state solution. I want to thank Mr. PRICE for his hard work on that approach, and I support it. We talk in this resolution about a two-state solution as well.

Mr. Speaker, throughout its entire history, the State of Israel has never gotten a fair shake from the United Nations. Year after year after year, member states manipulate the U.N. to bully our ally, Israel, to pile on with one-sided resolutions, placing all of the blame for the ongoing conflict on Israel.

We saw a resolution like this come before the Security Council a few weeks ago, and today the House of Representative will go on record saying that that U.N. resolution is wrong, plain and simple. And frankly, we should not have voted for that.

The Security Council resolution is highly critical of Israel yet asks nothing directly of the Palestinians. That is biased, that is unfair, and that is not balanced. Again, we should have opposed it. We should have vetoed it.

The language about Jerusalem is not new but it remains deeply offensive to Jews, whose holiest site lies on the Temple Mount in East Jerusalem. The Kotel, the Holy Western Wall, is simply nonoccupied territory. And it is offensive to hear that.

So in the measure the House is considering today, we repudiate this flawed Security Council resolution. And at the same time, we will say once again that we support a two-state solution, that the only way to reach that goal is through direct negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians, and that this shameful Security Council resolution put that goal further out of reach.

Mr. Speaker, the international community faces the longest suppressing issues: mass killings in South Sudan, a crisis in Yemen, a humanitarian disaster in Syria, Russia's illegal occupation of the Ukraine, and North Korea's nuclear weapons program. Yet, rather than deal with those critical problems, the member states of the U.N. have chosen instead to use the international body to embarrass Israel. It is outrageous. This House Resolution that I am cosponsoring with Mr. ROYCE rightfully says that it is outrageous.

I think it was a mistake for the current administration to abstain on this vote in the U.N. I have been very clear about that, but I want to be fair. Before anyone turns this into another attack on President Obama, we should be aware of the history of this issue.

This is the first time in 8 years the Obama administration has allowed a resolution, opposed by Israel, to go forward. The George Bush administration allowed it to happen 6 times; the Clinton administration, 3 times; the first Bush administration, 6 times; and the Reagan administration, 10 times, including voting for one strongly condemning Israel for its ''premeditated and unprecedented attack of aggression'' when it wisely destroyed Iraq's nuclear weapons reactor in 1981.

But regardless of that history, it doesn't justify these latest abstentions. My mother used to say that two wrongs don't make a right. And she was right. It was wrong then, and it is wrong now.

I think allowing governments to bully Israel and the U.N. is a mistake, no matter who is in power. Instead, let's focus on what we should be doing when it comes to advancing the two-state solution.

This resolution calls for us to get back to the policy that many of us support: one, standing with Israel and the United Nations; two, stopping one-sided resolutions; and three, supporting direct negotiations as the only way to move toward a two-state solution.

This resolution says all that. Every one in this Congress should be voting for it because it is balanced. I am pleased to support this resolution, and I urge all Members to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to begin by thanking the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL). I thank him for working with me in a bipartisan manner not just on this resolution but on the one that we worked on late last year—a unanimous vote by this body directing the administration not to take the steps that the administration has taken.

I appreciate the leader and the Speaker as well working with us to ensure this resolution was brought quickly to the floor of this House.

Today, we put Congress on record objecting to the recent U.N. Security Council resolution that hurt our ally, that hurt Israel, and I believe that puts an enduring peace further out of reach.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, the United States has long recognized that a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can only come about through direct bilateral negotiations between these two parties, and that is why it is longstanding U.S. policy to veto the many one-sided, the many anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations Security Council that violate that principle.

But just the other week, the Obama administration broke with this longstanding U.S. policy by failing to veto U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. This dangerous resolution effectively states that the Jewish quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem and the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, are, in the words of the resolution, ''occupied territory.'' Why would we not veto that?

It also lends legitimacy to efforts by the Palestinian Authority to put pressure on Israel through the U.N. rather than to go through the process of engaging in direct negotiations, and it puts wind in the sails of the shameful boycott divestment and sanctions movement.

Unquestionably, this U.N. Security Council action damages the prospects for peace. The resolution and the bullying and harassment of Israel that it will spur only happened for one reason: the Obama administration let it happen—and that went against the distinct warnings from this body.

Mr. ENGEL and I engaged in letters, in conversations with senior administration officials seeking their assurance that the United States would veto one-sided, anti-Israel resolutions. In November, the House unanimously, all of us, passed a resolution which warned the administration against taking such last-minute action.

With that resolution, H. Con. Res. 165, the House unanimously stated that the United States Government should continue to oppose and veto United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to impose solutions to final-status issues or are one-sided and anti-Israel. Yet the administration rejected the call from Congress and chose a course that will bring harm for years to come by failing to veto U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

If the Palestinians want a lasting peace, they must accept that Israel, not the U.N., is their negotiating partner; and that means ending the incitement to violence against Israelis that goes on in so many of the mosques, that goes on in the schools, that goes on in the newspapers and on television there. It also means ending—and I think this is the most important fact, because leaving this out of the resolution at the U.N. is beyond me—their pay-to-slay scheme.

You talk about a lack of balance. Here we have a situation where, since 2003, it has been Palestinian law to reward Palestinian terrorists—terrorists—to go out, and they are given this incitement, this stipend for life. The more mayhem they create, the more horrific the number of civilians they attack and, therefore, the longer the sentence, the more they know: Well, I can serve my time, and then when I get out, I can get this stipend for the rest of my life—and it is larger and larger, depending upon the amount of mayhem—and if I don't make it, or if I am a suicide bomber, my family gets the stipend.

That, by law, is the way the Palestinian Authority has engineered this, costing the lives—and you can read

about it every month of those civilians attacked on the streets. It is not just Israelis, of course. Taylor Force, a U.S. Marine, was killed simply because he was in Israel, but it was by someone responding to the incitement.

So $300 million per year spent by the Palestinian Authority to do that. No mention of that, of course, by the United Nations. And that is why today's action is so important, to demonstrate our united opposition to U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334, call for its repeal, to head off any more moves the Obama administration might have in the next few days with respect to the Paris conference next week as well, and to provide the foundation for the next administration to move forcefully to counteract its dangerous impact.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, for yielding a portion of his time to opponents of this resolution. I also appreciate his willingness to work with me and other Members on our alternative resolution that is more accurate and less divisive, a resolution, unfortunately, the majority has denied a hearing for on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 11. The resolution before us today fails to credibly reaffirm our Nation's support for a two-state solution. It provides an inaccurate accounting of the United States' longstanding policy toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It includes reckless and divisive charges regarding the recent United Nations Security Council resolution, designed, it would appear, solely to embarrass the outgoing administration. It falsely claims, for example, that the Security Council resolution ''contradicts the Oslo Accords.'' It goes so far as to link the resolution to the boycott and divestiture movement.

Mr. Speaker, there is room for honest debate about the U.N. resolution and about the U.S. decision to abstain, but there is not room, there shouldn't be room, for this kind of disgraceful distortion. H. Res. 11 doesn't really engage the issues; it obscures and distorts them.

I would suggest that both those who support and oppose recent U.S. actions should oppose this irresponsible and divisive resolution. It does distort the record. In fact, during the Obama administration, fewer U.N. Security Council resolutions related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have passed than under any other modern Presidency. In fact, the December resolution is the only one that has passed under President Obama's leadership; and if you want a fair and comprehensive account of the thinking that went into that difficult decision, I commend to every Member Samantha Power's statement at the United Nations, one of the finest statements of its sort that I have ever read.

H. Res. 11 also doesn't take into account the fact that Republican and Democratic administrations alike have allowed Security Council resolutions addressing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to pass, many of which were opposed by Israel. The fact is H. Res. 11 runs a real risk of undermining the credibility of the United States Congress as a proactive force working toward a two-state solution.

In this period of great geopolitical turmoil and uncertainty, we must reaffirm those fundamental aspects of our foreign policy, including our strong and unwavering support for Israel, while also demonstrating to the world that we are committed to a diplomacy that defends human rights and promotes Israeli and Palestinian states that live side by side in peace and security, a formulation that has characterized our country's diplomacy for decades.

At best, Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 11 would muddy the waters of our diplomacy and foreign policy. At worst, it could undermine our decade-long efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians. I can't, in good faith, support the adoption of this resolution, and I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, in response briefly, we did have a substitute from Mr. PRICE, and we looked at that substitute, but it did not once mention the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334.

Mr. ENGEL and I have worked hard together, in good faith and in a bipartisan manner, to develop a measure that rejects and repudiates this dangerous U.N. resolution that was passed; and also, ours warns the White House against taking additional measures in the last few weeks of the current administration. I think it is important to remind the body that this is very concerning, given the backdrop of the Paris conference on the 15th of this month and the very real concern that the President could take further steps at the U.N.

Again, Mr. PRICE's amendment did not include this urgent warning. I want to say that I am happy to work with Mr. PRICE in a bipartisan manner once the Committee on Foreign Affairs organizes, but time is of the essence. We must act to reject United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334, not remain silent on it, and we have got to limit the damage that the administration has caused to prospects for a lasting peace.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our esteemed chairman for the time.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, will not undo the damage that has been done at the Security Council, but it sends an important message to the world that the United States Congress resoundingly and in a strong bipartisan manner disapproves of the vote taken on Resolution 2334, and it sends a warning to the nations that will gather in Paris next week to discuss the peace process that there will be repercussions if there is a move to introduce a parameters resolution before the 20th in an effort to further isolate Israel.

Our closest friend and ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel, has been under constant attack by the United Nations. Abu Mazen and the Palestinians have pushed a campaign to delegitimize the Jewish state, to undermine the peace process, to achieve unilateral statehood recognition. We have seen it this year at UNESCO, where that sham of an institution voted on several occasions to deny and distance Jewish and Christian historical and cultural ties to Jerusalem.

We have seen it at the Human Rights Council, where Israel is constantly demonized and falsely accused of human rights violations while the real abusers of human rights go unpunished because that body has utterly failed to uphold its mandate. This is a body that allows the worst abusers of human rights—like Cuba, Venezuela, and China—to actually sit in judgment of human rights worldwide. What a pathetic joke. Yet the only thing they can agree on is to attack Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East and the only place in the region where human rights are protected.

We have seen this scheme to delegitimize Israel at the General Assembly, where, in its closing legislative session, the General Assembly passed 20—20—anti-Israel resolutions and only 4, combined, for the entire world.

These institutions have no credibility, and now we have the unfortunate circumstance of the White House deciding to abstain from this anti-Israel, one-sided resolution at the Security Council. Our ally was abandoned, and credibility and momentum were given to the Palestinian schemes to delegitimize the Jewish state, to undermine the peace process.

While the damage has been done, Mr. Speaker, by this act of cowardice at the Security Council, we will have an opportunity to reverse that damage. In the coming weeks and months, this Congress and the incoming administration must show unyielding support for our ally Israel and undo the damage done.

This resolution by the chairman and the ranking member is an all-important first step that signals our intent. I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I look forward to working with Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL in further strengthening our U.S.-Israel bond.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), my good friend and senior member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

□ 1745

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, let's look at the historic timeline. The Reagan administration and other administrations have failed in the past to veto anti-Israel resolutions, and that failure has not been helpful to the cause of peace. Over the last two decades, Israel has frozen or removed settlements in an effort to negotiate peace, all to no avail.

On November 29 of last year, this House unanimously urged our U.N. Ambassador to veto any U.N. resolution that sought to impose peace settlement terms. But a month later, our U.N. Ambassador ignored the input of this House and allowed the U.N. to adopt a one-sided resolution that sought to impose peace terms on the parties.

Worse yet, that U.N. resolution equates the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, with outposts deep in the West Bank that are illegal under Israeli law.

Today we consider a House resolution that has over 30 Democratic cosponsors. It is not a pro-settlements resolution. It strongly and repeatedly reaffirms our support for a two-state solution, achieved through direct negotiations, and it objects to a U.N. resolution that set back the cause of peace. Vote ''yes.''

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the longtime chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding and for offering this important resolution, along with the ranking member, and I am proud to be a cosponsor.

President Obama's decision to abstain and not veto Security Council Resolution 2334 seriously undermines the peace process, abandons Israel at a critical hour in its life as a nation, and does serious injury to the historical record.

The egregiously flawed U.N. text says that all Israeli settlements after the 1949 armistice line including East Jerusalem and West Bank have no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law.

The pending House resolution repudiates 2334 and makes clear that a durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will only come through direct bilateral negotiations, not one-sided, anti-Israel U.N. resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. resolution could open Israeli leaders and even average Israeli settlers to criminal prosecution. Israel's enemies are likely to exploit 2334 by seeking prosecutions in venues like the International Criminal Court for construction activities, even though the vast majority of this activity takes place legally, pursuant to Israeli law.

A few hours ago, the European Jewish press reported that ''Leaders of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations called for France to cancel or, at least, postpone what they called an 'ill-conceived, poorly timed and damaging' event—the Paris Mideast conference—scheduled for January 15.''

I hope that we will also call upon our government not to go to this right before a transition of the White House and the Presidency and mischief that could be forthcoming from that.

They pointed out in their statement that ''Israel has long sought direct talks'' and ''it is time for the Palestinian leaders to stop evading their responsibility and seeking to use international fora to avoid the only true path to a lasting peace''—and that is a negotiated settlement.

Nathan Diament of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America pointed out that the U.N. has a long-established bias against Israel. As my good friend from Florida said a moment ago, 20 anti-Israel resolutions against just 4 in 2016—a bias and a discrimination against Israel.

President Obama's decision to abstain and not veto Security Council Resolution 2334 seriously undermines the peace process, abandons Israel at a critical hour in its life as a nation, and does serious injury to the historical record.

The egregiously flawed UN text says that all Israeli settlements after the 1949 armistice line including East Jerusalem and the West Bank have no legal validity and constitutes a flagrant violation under international law.

The pending House resolution repudiates 2334 and makes clear that a durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will only come through direct bilateral negotiations not one-sided anti-Israel UN resolutions.

With over three thousand years of Jewish history bound up in East Jerusalem and the West Bank, it is preposterous to assert that Israel has no legitimacy in defending its connections to this extraordinary heritage. Sadly, these kinds of prejudiced and revisionist claims are all too common in the United Nations where UNESCO voted just a couple months ago on measures that excise any mention of Judaism and Christianity's ancient ties to East Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, the UN Resolution could open Israeli leaders and even average Israeli settlers to criminal prosecution. Israel's enemies are likely to exploit 2334 by seeking prosecutions in venues like the International Criminal Court (ICC) for construction activities, even though the vast majority of this activity takes place legally, pursuant to Israeli law.

By calling on countries to distinguish between the State of Israel and Israeli settlements, 2334 enables the narrative of the anti-Semitic boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement, or BDS movement, that is aimed at delegitimizing Israel.

And in mere days, the error of 2334 could be further compounded.

A few hours ago the European Jewish Press reported that ''Leaders of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations called for France to cancel or, at least, postpone what they called an 'ill-conceived, poorly timed and damaging' event—the Paris Mideast conference—scheduled for January 15th.''

''The international community should not plunge forward with the ill-conceired and poorly timed Paris conference,'' CPMAJO Chairman Stephen M. Greenberg and Vice Chairman and CEO Malcolm Hoenlein said in a statement . . . According to the Conference of Presidents, there are a number of compelling reasons to postpone the Paris event, including the impending transition to the Trump administration, just five days later. ''It makes no sense that the next administration is precluded from participating in a discussion of an essential component of U.S. foreign policy with which it will be engaged,'' they explained.

''''Israel has long sought direct talks, it is time for the Palestinian leaders to stop evading their responsibility and seeking to use international fora to avoid the only true path to a lasting peace,' they added. Hoenlein cautioned it was possible the Obama administration could—following the recent passage of the anti-Israeli settlement Security Council resolution—take a 'further damaging step against the Jewish state before President-elect Donald Trump takes office.' ''

Nathan Diament, Executive Director of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, wrote me a letter today and said, ''On December 23, 2016, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 2334, a blatantly anti-Israel resolution condemning Israel's building of settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. It has long been U.S. policy that any progress toward an agreement in the region must be based on direct negotiations between Israeli and Palestinian leaders, not a vote of third-party nations at the UN.''

''Unfortunately the UN has a long and established bias against Israel. In 2016 alone, the UN General Assembly adopted 20 anti-Israel resolutions and just four against other countries: North Korea, Syria, Iran and Russia. The World Health Organization condemned Israel as the world's only violator of 'mental, physical and environmental health,' while the U.N. Women condemned Israel as the world's only violator of women's rights. The International Labor Organization condemned Israel as the world's only violator of labor rights. These same UN committees were silent on the issue of human rights violations in China, Libya, or the Congo.''

''Clearly, the UN has an agenda to undermine and delegitimize the state of Israel, and in that regard UN support for Resolution 2334 was not surprising. What was surprising—and deeply concerning—was the silence of the United States on this issue. Rather than exercising its veto power, the United States chose to abstain from voting, and thereby threatened the trust and support Israel has long placed in its most important ally. Over the course of his presidency, Mr. Obama has repeatedly assured American Jews and others concerned about Israel's security and welfare that his commitment to U.S. support for Israel's security was 'unshakeable.' By allowing the UN Security Council's resolution to pass in the final weeks of his Administration, President Obama undermined his legacy and threatened the longstanding alliance between the United States and Israel.''

''Whether the abstaining vote was a parting statement from the Obama Administration or the influence of anti-Israeli forces at the UN, the incoming Trump Administration and the

115th Congress must make the United States' support of Israel and our common goals of peace, democracy, and fighting terrorism—a pillar of its foreign policy. Today's resolution condemning UN Resolution 2334 will send an important message to the world that the United States stands with Israel and will continue to support our common goals.''

Mr. Speaker, before concluding, I would like to note that many of us in Congress have been warning about these kinds of reckless gambits for months. Three-hundred and eighty of us in the House signed a letter in April to President Obama specifically calling on him to veto any one-sided resolution like 2443 if it were raised in the Security Council. In late November, the House voted overwhelmingly for H. Con. Res. 165 further stressing the need for the United States to stand by Israel and veto biased Security Council measures.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 11 to denounce this dangerous Security Council action. I look forward to working with President-elect Trump to align U.S. policy with the overwhelming consensus in Congress: that we are and remain committed to Israel's sovereignty and security.

OU ADVOCACY CENTER,
Washington, DC, January 5, 2017.

Hon. CHRIS SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: On behalf of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (Orthodox Union)—the nation's largest Orthodox Jewish umbrella organization—please accept our gratitude for your support of today's resolution opposing UN Security Council Resolution 2334, and thank you for submitting this letter to the official record of the House of Representatives.

On December 23, 2016, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 2334, a blatantly anti-Israel resolution condemning Israel's building of settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. It has long been U.S. policy that any progress toward an agreement in the region must be based on direct negotiations between Israeli and Palestinian leaders, not a vote of third-party nations at the UN.

Unfortunately, the UN has a long and established bias against Israel. In 2016 alone, the UN General Assembly adopted 20 anti-Israel resolutions and just four against other countries: North Korea, Syria, Iran and Russia. The World Health Organization condemned Israel as the world's only violator of ''mental, physical and environmental health,'' while the U.N. Women condemned Israel as the world's only violator of women's rights. The International Labor Organization condemned Israel as the world's only violator of labor rights. These same UN committees were silent on the issue of human rights violations in China, Libya, or the Congo.

Clearly, the UN has an agenda to undermine and delegitimize the state of Israel, and in that regard UN support for Resolution 2334 was not surprising. What was surprising—and deeply concerning—was the silence of the United States on this issue. Rather than exercising its veto power, the United States chose to abstain from voting, and thereby threatened the trust and support Israel has long placed in its most important ally. Over the course of his presidency, Mr. Obama has repeatedly assured American Jews and others concerned about Israel's security and welfare that his commitment to U.S. support for Israel's security was ''unshakeable.'' By allowing the UN Security Council's resolution to pass in the final weeks of his Administration, President Obama undermined his legacy and threatened the longstanding alliance between the United States and Israel.

Whether the abstaining vote was a parting statement from the Obama Administration or the influence of anti-Israeli forces at the UN, the incoming Trump Administration and the 115th Congress must make the United States' support of Israel and our common goals of peace, democracy, and fighting terrorism—a pillar of its foreign policy. Today's resolution condemning UN Resolution 2334 will send an important message to the world that the United States stands with Israel and will continue to support our common goals.

Again, thank you for your support of Israel and today's resolution. I urge all members of the United States Congress to stand with Israel and vote in favor of the McCarthy-Royce resolution.

Best Regards,

NATHAN DIAMENT,
Executive Director.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here as a proud Jew and someone who, throughout my entire life, has been an advocate for the State of Israel, and I am standing here to oppose H. Res. 11.

As a Member of Congress, I have been committed to maintaining America's unwavering support for Israel, which has lasted from the very first moments of Israel's existence.

The U.S.-Israel bond is unbreakable, despite the fact that the United States' administrations have not always agreed with the particular policies of an Israeli Government. Contrary to the assertions of H. Res. 11, the U.S. has often expressed those differences in the context of the United Nations. Presidents, from Lyndon Johnson to George W. Bush, have each vetoed and sometimes voted for a U.N. resolution contrary to the wishes of Israel's Government at the time. Only the Obama administration, until 2 weeks ago, never, ever cast a vote against what Israel wanted.

But opposition to the building of settlements on land belonging to Palestinians before the 1967 war—with the exception of the land, of course, that is going to be swapped, agreed to by both parties—has been the official U.S. policy for many decades, contrary, again, to the assertions of H. Res. 11.

It has also been the policy of the United States to recognize that the only long-term solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict—the violence, the loss of life—is to create two states: one for the Palestinians and one for Israel. A two-state solution is the only way Israel can continue as both a democratic and a Jewish state, living in the peace and security that has eluded her from the very beginning. The building of settlements is an obstacle to achieving that goal.

And, of course, settlements aren't the only obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace. The U.S. resolution reiterates the Palestinian Authority security forces must continue to counter terrorism and condemn all of the provocations.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), who has served for years as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The recent stunt at the United Nations targeting Israel is the latest effort by this administration to cement a legacy of foreign policy that has failed, especially with our trusted ally Israel. It has been U.S. policy to veto any U.N. resolution dictating parameters on the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

The reason is simple. True peace can only be achieved at the negotiating table between the Palestinians and the Israelis, not at the United Nations. The one-sided, anti-Israeli resolution will only make peace harder.

The U.N. adopted 20 anti-Israeli resolutions last year, while passing just 4 for the rest of the world. The U.N. is not fair and unbiased. While pointing the finger solely at Israel, the recent resolution did nothing to point out the Palestinians' lack of progress towards peace.

The Palestinian Authority has failed to stop violence against Jews. It continues to—get this, Mr. Speaker—make payments to jailed Palestinian terrorists who have harmed or killed Jews.

Over the years, Israel has traded land for promised peace. They have no peace. And soon, if the United Nations gets its way, they will have no land.

Despite the administration's policy of abandoning our trusted ally Israel, the United States Congress must stand with our ally Israel.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), one of our new Members, who has made support for Israel part of her entire life and is giving her first speech on the House floor in support of this resolution and support of Israel.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle today in support of this resolution and to lend my name as a cosponsor. The United States alliance with Israel is absolutely critical, and this is not the time to sow uncertainty about the state of our relationship.

This resolution does a number of important things, but the most important is that it reaffirms Congress' longstanding support for a bilateral settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and objects to the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334. Paragraph 5 of that resolution is reminiscent of a recent U.N. Human Rights

Council resolution that established a database of companies in the settlements, facilitating a boycott.

The UNSC resolution does nothing to advance the cause of peace and is, in fact, an obstacle to it. Strongly ensuring the security of Israel is the only pathway to a lasting settlement.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ED ROYCE for yielding. I appreciate your leadership for peace.

I am in strong support of the House resolution, which is taking a firm stand and clear stand objecting to the United Nations Security Council resolution as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace.

The United States has stood with Israel against one-sided, biased resolutions at the United Nations and in other international forums. Additionally, the United States has been adamant that a peaceful resolution will only come from direct, bilateral negotiations, not addressed by an international forum. The distorted ideology of moral neutrality is suicidal for civilization, encouraging what the chairman correctly identified as ''pay for slay,'' as evidenced by the murder of American tourist Taylor Force just last year.

On December 23, my constituents were shocked as the Obama administration betrayed the people of Israel, undermining the peace process by failing to veto the U.N. Security Council resolution. President Obama and Secretary Kerry's actions revealed dangerous irresponsibility, putting Israeli and American families at risk of more terrorist attacks. Fortunately, Governor Nikki Haley, President-elect Donald Trump's appointee, will soon be making a positive difference as U.N. Ambassador of the United States, promoting peace through strength.

Today, I am grateful to stand strong with Israel by being an original cosponsor of H. Res. 11. I appreciate the leadership of Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, Chairman ED ROYCE, and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL for sponsoring this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ).

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, my commitment to the State of Israel is steadfast, but my first loyalty is to peace—peace that is protected by genuine self-determination.

I know in my heart that the only path to peace is to have two separate, sovereign states that peacefully coexist. The two-state solution is at the heart of American foreign policy, and every President and every Congress since I got here in 1993 put the two-state solution at the heart of what America wants for her friend Israel.

As I said on the House floor on December 6, if we are ever going to achieve the permanent peace that allows Israel to exist without fear and Palestine to exist without occupation, we must continue to fight for the two-state solution. But under the current strongman government in Israel, all pretenses and illusions are being stripped away. From settlements, to water, to restricting the Muslim call to prayer in Jerusalem, it seems that anything goes.

Today, as America embarks on its own experiment with strongman politics, this Congress is falling in line. This Congress that allowed our Chamber to be used for an Israeli campaign rally and TV commercials is bending to pressure from abroad and pressure here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt the commitment to peace of the American people, so I urge my colleagues to vote with their hearts and minds and defeat this House resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my remarks on the floor of December 6 in support of a two-state solution.

TWO STATE SOLUTION IS STILL THE PATH TO PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

[Luis V. Gutiérrez Floor Remarks, Dec. 6, 2016]

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about what is going on in Israel and I think it has implications both for U.S. foreign policy and for domestic policy and for our great ally, Israel.

As the right-wing government of Benjamin Netanyahu consolidates power and becomes in many ways the one-party rulers of Israel, a number of things are changing that should be of concern to all Americans.

Specifically, the increasing dominance of the Likud Party as the one-party in Israel jeopardizes the two state solution that I and many others in the United States and Israel feel is the only way to achieve long-term peace in the Middle East.

There is a retrenchment of hard line policies—aimed at solidifying alliances with smaller religious and hardline parties that keeps Likud in power—that will make it harder for Israelis and their allies in America—and anyone who seeks a lasting peace—to maintain progress towards a two state solution.

Right now, the Knesset is considering legislation to legalize all Israeli settlements in Palestinian territory on the West Bank, even those constructed on private Palestinian land.

Boom, 400,000 people in settlements across the West Bank, it's all legal because they say it is legal. But it's not.

And Israel is destroying Palestinian homes at a pace faster than we have seen before.

It is provocative, sweeping, and designed to make it harder to ever reach an agreement with the Palestinians.

The plan to restrict the Muslim call to prayer in Jerusalem has been revived, again to placate hardline religious constituents, by Prime Minister Netanyahu.

There is no clearer statement to people of the Islamic faith that they do not matter, they do not belong, and they will not be tolerated than to restrict the Muslim call to prayer in Jerusalem, a city that has heard the Muslim call to prayer for thousands of years.

I think what is going on in Israel with Prime Minister Netanyahu presents a cautionary tale about the consequences of following a political strongman. The strongman has to keep proving that he is a strongman over and over.

Like other strongmen who ride fear into leadership—when you base your political career on injecting fear and resentment into political affairs—when you use the backdrop of terrorism and the understandable fear of the Israeli people as a political tool for years and decades—this is the kind of policy that results.

There is an appetite for constant escalation of what you are doing to stand up to the enemy you have constructed—an enemy based on, but not the same as the enemies that fight against the state of Israel and tolerance and peace in real life.

Strongmen construct a foil—in this case based on the Palestinians, but sometimes exaggerated beyond recognition—and they need to feed the thirst for more and more action to attack the caricature that has been constructed.

But strongman politics in Israel have the impact of making a long-lasting solution that brings peace to the Middle East harder to achieve.

The fundamental rights of Palestinians to have their own state, a state alongside the Israeli state where they have the basic rights and dignity to govern themselves and raise their families in peace—that is what many Israelis, many Palestinians, and many around the world have been fighting for.

If we are ever going to achieve the permanent peace that allows Israel to exist without fear and Palestine to exist without occupation, we must continue to fight for the two state solution.

When I was just a freshman, almost 25 years ago, we celebrated the accomplishments of Rabin and Arafat and President Clinton to build towards a peace that recognizes the rights and dignity of Israelis and the rights and dignities of the Palestinian people.

For decades, the United States—under different leaders in different parties from Carter to Reagan to Bush and Obama—have recognized that peace will only come with mutual respect and tolerance.

That is what we have based our foreign policy on and should continue to base our foreign policy on.

Having talked with average people and with leaders on both sides of the Palestinian/Israeli conflict—I am convinced that it is the only path to peace.

America has been a catalyst—a constructive influence from outside—a nation based on religious freedom and democracy that has served as a model for both Palestinians and Israelis—and we have worked towards helping parties continue to move in the direction of two separate but mutually respectful countries, two nations that are not at war with each other or subservient to one another.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that Israel herself is moving away from the two state solution as a goal and that we as her closest ally must remind her—and ourselves—of what is at stake if we lose sight of this important goal.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the nation of Israel, one of our greatest allies in the Middle East.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 11, Objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 calls for a Palestinian state but not a Jewish state. It does nothing to condemn or stop the Palestinian Authority's pay to slay, as we have heard talked over and over again, that rewarded over $300 million to terrorists in Israeli jails last year for crimes committed against Israeli citizens and others. It legitimizes additional efforts to isolate and sanction Israel. It declares the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, where the City of David has been excavated, and the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, as occupied territories.

□ 1800

This is absurd. Furthermore, the Obama administration refused to veto it. This shameful move broke with years of bipartisan U.S. efforts to protect Israel from deeply flawed and biased U.S. resolutions.

H. Res. 11 reasserts the U.S. position that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can only be resolved through direct negotiations between the two parties. H. Res. 11 must pass to send a clear message to the outgoing Obama administration, to the U.N., and to the world that the United States stands with Israel.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of New York (Mr. SUOZZI), another new Member of Congress who is also making his maiden speech about the security of Israel and the U.S.-Israel partnership.

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of the bipartisan H. Res. 11.

In 2002, during the Second Intifada, after the massacre in Hebron, I had the great, good fortune of meeting in Jerusalem with Shimon Peres, of blessed memory. He explained why a two-state solution is the only path to peace, and I will never abandon his dream of a two-state solution.

U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334, however, pushes the hope of a two-state solution farther away for three reasons:

One, it discourages direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians.

Two, it fails to distinguish between ''long accepted'' and ''more controversial'' settlements. ''Long accepted'' settlements, such as the long established Jewish neighborhoods in East Jerusalem, in the Jewish Quarter, places like the Western Wall, and the ''consensus'' settlements versus ''more controversial'' hilltop settlements in the West Bank, such as Amona, settlements that even the Israeli Supreme Court has declared illegal.

Three, it fails to explicitly condemn the number one impediment to a two-state solution: anti-Israel terrorism.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I condemn U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

This is an outrageous attack against the State of Israel, the world's only Jewish state and the only democracy in the Middle East. I also condemn the Obama administration's failure to veto such a resolution, because it betrayed Israel and it harmed our national security interests. The Obama administration's actions, or lack of actions, were more than just a sin of omission in that they worked behind the scenes to move this resolution forward so that it could be voted on in the United Nations General Assembly. That is a sin of commission.

Now, we have to be honest about how the two sides have acted in this in putting pressure on Israel and not on the Palestinian Authority. Remember, when you talk about a two-state solution, the Palestinian Arabs rejected a state in 1948. They tried to wipe Israel off the map. They tried to beat them in 1967. It has been a constant state of war, and they have chosen to get rid of the Jewish state as something that is more important to them than the creation of their own state, and we have to be honest about that.

I will support this resolution. I view it as a good statement, but as just a first step. We need something in the coming days that has teeth to deal with the United Nations and its outrageous conduct. It has become a hotbed of anti-Israeli activity where all of these tin-pot countries get together and rail against the world's only Jewish state. They did 20 resolutions against Israel at the United Nations in 2016 and four against the rest of the world.

We need to take our power of the purse and defund the U.N. until U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 is revoked.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, for what may or may not be their good intentions, this resolution and its authors undermined the security of families here and in Israel. This ''go it alone'' approach with the current Israeli Government—defying a unanimous vote of 14 countries and ignoring the concerns of many of our allies—is not a path to peace. We will not protect ourselves or our allies in Israel if we pursue the path of isolation.

For decades, we have enjoyed a bipartisan commitment to two states living in peace and security next door to one another. It has been a difficult goal to achieve, but now is not the time to give up on it. There are, sadly, some in Israel and some among the Palestinians who wholly reject this commitment. They believe it is all theirs. They believe in a divine entitlement to every piece of land west of the Jordan River. Their idea of a reasonable negotiation is that the other side gets next to nothing.

Few people who have worked on this difficult issue and have tried to overcome such zealotry and achieve a just resolution have done as much as Secretary of State John Kerry. Despite the insults and the intransigence, he has made near Herculean efforts to achieve peace. To be honest, the roadblocks that have been thrown in his path have not come just from one side. In no way do we condone the many, many wrongs of the Palestinians and the Palestinian Authority by saying that some of those roadblocks were initiated by the current Israeli Government.

Then, to talk of one sided, what irony. Indeed, I think it is hypocrisy to talk about a one-sided resolution when this is a one-sided resolution. If there had been the slightest interest in bringing this body together—with all of us supporting Israel, with all of us supporting access to the Western Wall, with all of us supporting the security of our friend that was reflected in $38 billion, which is the most money in military assistance we have ever provided to a single ally by this administration—instead of attacking the goodwill and the good faith of this administration, we wouldn't be here today. There is no urgency for us to act today. There is an urgency—just as the new designee for the Ambassador to Israel has slandered some other people—for them to besmirch the efforts of this administration.

The truth is that ever-expanding Israeli settlements—many of them first constructed in total violation of Israeli law—are a significant obstacle, but they are certainly not the only one. The clearer goal of settlers is to have facts on the ground, to be irreversible in moving to split up any potential Palestinian Authority.

Protect our families and those of Israel by rejecting this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334—an anti-Israel, anti-Jewish attempt on behalf of pro-Palestinian nations to delegitimize Israel and ethnically cleanse East Jerusalem and Judea and Samaria of the Jewish people.

The Israelis have long been willing to compromise large swaths of land in this region in pursuit of a two-state solution. It has been the Palestinians who have, time and again, declined real offers on the table for their own state. Just think about this reality. If the Israelis agreed right now to make all of the concessions this U.N. Security Council resolution calls for, there would still not be peace. A viable two-state solution isn't just about Israel's recognizing the Palestinians' right to exist; it is also about the Palestinians' recognizing Israel's right to exist.

As for me, I stand for freedom, and America should stand strong—shoulder to shoulder—with Israel.

President Obama lit a menorah this year at the White House. He reflected on Hanukkah as a celebration of the

Maccabees' fight for freedom—the Maccabees, who lived, prayed, and fought on the land that this resolution now calls illegally occupied territory. It is an insult this resolution was passed just one day before the start of Hanukkah. Israel is one of America's greatest allies and is a beacon of freedom and liberty in a very dark region of the world. The Obama administration, by allowing this resolution to pass, is attempting a dangerous shift in American foreign policy that cannot be allowed to stand.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution, and I thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in great support of the Ross-Engel bill against this most deceitful and shameful U.N. resolution. That is what we are here for. This act was shameful and it was deceitful.

When the U.N. voted for this 2334 resolution, it was like cutting Israel's legs out from under it and then condemning Israel for being a cripple. Shameful and deceitful because they wanted to put all of the blame on Israel when it is the Palestinians who refuse to even meet to discuss or to even talk about a two-nation state. It is the Palestinians who say Israel doesn't even have a right to exist.

How in the hell are you going to meet with somebody to talk about a combined future when they will not give you decent recognition?

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I thank the gentleman because this part is very important.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is blessed. We have been blessed with divine intervention all through our history to be that shining light on the hill, to let all of our great work show for the world. We have an opportunity here tonight for this Congress to stand up and show that light for Israel.

Stand up for Israel and show our great works to this world. That is what I say, so let it be written and let it be done.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT).

Mr. TROTT. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 11, which offers a strong objection to U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

President Obama started his foreign policy 8 years ago with an apology tour in the Middle East, and now, not surprisingly, he ends it with a slap in the face to our ally and friend, Israel.

For over 40 years, the United States Government—Republicans and Democrats—stood shoulder to shoulder with our ally, vetoing countless resolutions at the United Nations. However, this past December, President Obama broke that tradition and chose to allow this resolution to come before the Security Council for a vote. As Prime Minister Netanyahu said: ''This was a disgraceful anti-Israel maneuver.'' Not only does this one-sided resolution blatantly target Israel, it seriously impedes the peace process.

Unfortunately, while I wholeheartedly reject what happened at the United Nations, I cannot say that I am surprised. The Obama administration has been more concerned with appeasing nefarious actors like Iran and Cuba, all the while ignoring friends like Israel. I look forward to a new era of foreign policy in which our enemies fear us and our allies respect us.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining for each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of a two-state solution, as a Jewish Member of Congress and as someone who has been to Israel and has seen the settlements firsthand, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution.

Settlements are an impediment to peace between Israelis and Palestinians. This resolution only provides ammunition to those who oppose a two-state solution—the approach that is our only hope for lasting peace. We all agree that the incitement of violence and terrorism must end, which U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334 discusses. But as Secretary Kerry so eloquently stated in his speech on December 28:

> Some seem to believe that the U.S.' friendship means the U.S. must accept any policy regardless of our own interests, our own positions, our own words, our own principles—even after urging again and again that the policy must change. Friends need to tell each other the hard truths, and friendships require mutual respect.

□ 1815

Well, my friends, Israel must end settlement expansion, close their outposts, and get to the negotiating table. Prime Minister Netanyahu has not treated the Obama administration with respect, and this resolution does not offer the American people the honest, true debate we should be having about this critically important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Obama administration, especially Secretary of State Kerry, for their dedication in trying to find a path forward for a two-state solution. It is my hope that the principles laid out in Secretary Kerry's December 28, 2016 speech will help guide serious negotiations in the days ahead. To ensure that his remarks are a part of this debate, I will now read his entire statement.

Secretary Kerry said: Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you very, very much. Thank you. (Coughs.) Excuse me. Thank you for your patience, all of you. For those of you who celebrated Christmas, I hope you had a wonderful Christmas. Happy Chanukah. And to everybody here, I know it's the middle of a holiday week. I understand. (Laughter.) But I wish you all a very, very productive and Happy New Year.

Today, I want to share candid thoughts about an issue which for decades has animated the foreign policy dialogue here and around the world—the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Throughout his Administration, President Obama has been deeply committed to Israel and its security, and that commitment has guided his pursuit of peace in the Middle East. This is an issue which, all of you know, I have worked on intensively during my time as Secretary of State for one simple reason: because the two-state solution is the only way to achieve a just and lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians. It is the only way to ensure Israel's future as a Jewish and democratic state, living in peace and security with its neighbors. It is the only way to ensure a future of freedom and dignity for the Palestinian people. And it is an important way of advancing United States interests in the region.

Now, I'd like to explain why that future is now in jeopardy, and provide some context for why we could not, in good conscience, stand in the way of a resolution at the United Nations that makes clear that both sides must act now to preserve the possibility of peace.

I'm also here to share my conviction that there is still a way forward if the responsible parties are willing to act. And I want to share practical suggestions for how to preserve and advance the prospects for the just and lasting peace that both sides deserve.

So it is vital that we have an honest, clear-eyed conversation about the uncomfortable truths and difficult choices, because the alternative that is fast becoming the reality on the ground is in nobody's interest—not the Israelis, not the Palestinians, not the region—and not the United States.

Now, I want to stress that there is an important point here: My job, above all, is to defend the United States of America—to stand up for and defend our values and our interests in the world. And if we were to stand idly by and know that in doing so we are allowing a dangerous dynamic to take hold which promises greater conflict and instability to a region in which we have vital interests, we would be derelict in our own responsibilities.

Regrettably, some seem to believe that the U.S. friendship means the U.S. must accept any policy, regardless of our own interests, our own positions, our own words, our own principles—even after urging again and again that the policy must change. Friends need to tell each other the hard truths, and friendships require mutual respect.

Israel's permanent representative to the United Nations, who does not support a two-state solution, said after the vote last week, quote, ''It was to be expected that Israel's greatest ally would act in accordance with the values that we share,'' and veto this resolution. I am compelled to respond today that the

United States did, in fact, vote in accordance with our values, just as previous U.S. administrations have done at the Security Council before us.

They fail to recognize that this friend, the United States of America, that has done more to support Israel than any other country, this friend that has blocked countless efforts to delegitimize Israel, cannot be true to our own values—or even the stated democratic values of Israel—and we cannot properly defend and protect Israel if we allow a viable two-state solution to be destroyed before our own eyes.

And that's the bottom line: the vote in the United Nations was about preserving the two-state solution. That's what we were standing up for: Israel's future as a Jewish and democratic state, living side by side in peace and security with its neighbors. That's what we are trying to preserve for our sake and for theirs.

In fact, this Administration has been Israel's greatest friend and supporter, with an absolutely unwavering commitment to advancing Israel's security and protecting its legitimacy.

On this point, I want to be very clear: No American administration has done more for Israel's security than Barack Obama's. The Israeli prime minister himself has noted our, quote, ''unprecedented'' military and intelligence cooperation. Our military exercises are more advanced than ever. Our assistance for Iron Dome has saved countless Israeli lives. We have consistently supported Israel's right to defend itself, by itself, including during actions in Gaza that sparked great controversy.

Time and again we have demonstrated that we have Israel's back. We have strongly opposed boycotts, divestment campaigns, and sanctions targeting Israel in international fora, whenever and wherever its legitimacy was attacked, and we have fought for its inclusion across the UN system. In the midst of our own financial crisis and budget deficits, we repeatedly increased funding to support Israel. In fact, more than one-half of our entire global Foreign Military Financing goes to Israel. And this fall, we concluded an historic $38 billion memorandum of understanding that exceeds any military assistance package the United States has provided to any country, at any time, and that will invest in cutting-edge missile defense and sustain Israel's qualitative military edge for years to come. That's the measure of our support.

This commitment to Israel's security is actually very personal for me. On my first trip to Israel as a young senator in 1986, I was captivated by a special country, one that I immediately admired and soon grew to love. Over the years, like so many others who are drawn to this extraordinary place, I have climbed Masada, swum in the Dead Sea, driven from one Biblical city to another. I've also seen the dark side of Hizballah's rocket storage facilities just across the border in Lebanon, walked through exhibits of the hell of the Holocaust at Yad Vashem, stood on the Golan Heights, and piloted an Israeli jet over the tiny airspace of Israel, which would make anyone understand the importance of security to Israelis. Out of those experiences came a steadfast commitment to Israel's security that has never wavered for a single minute in my 28 years in the Senate or my four years as Secretary.

I have also often visited West Bank communities, where I met Palestinians struggling for basic freedom and dignity amidst the occupation, passed by military checkpoints that can make even the most routine daily trips to work or school an ordeal, and heard from business leaders who could not get the permits that they needed to get their products to the market and families who have struggled to secure permission just to travel for needed medical care.

And I have witnessed firsthand the ravages of a conflict that has gone on for far too long. I've seen Israeli children in Sderot whose playgrounds had been hit by Katyusha rockets. I've visited shelters next to schools in Kiryat Shmona that kids had 15 seconds to get to after a warning siren went off. I've also seen the devastation of war in the Gaza Strip, where Palestinian girls in Izbet Abed Rabo played in the rubble of a bombed-out building.

No children—Israeli or Palestinian—should have to live like that.

So, despite the obvious difficulties that I understood when I became Secretary of State, I knew that I had to do everything in my power to help end this conflict. And I was grateful to be working for President Obama, who was prepared to take risks for peace and was deeply committed to that effort.

Like previous U.S. administrations, we have committed our influence and our resources to trying to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict because, yes, it would serve American interests to stabilize a volatile region and fulfill America's commitment to the survival, security and well-being of an Israel at peace with its Arab neighbors.

Despite our best efforts over the years, the two-state solution is now in serious jeopardy.

The truth is that trends on the ground—violence, terrorism, incitement, settlement expansion and the seemingly endless occupation—they are combining to destroy hopes for peace on both sides and increasingly cementing an irreversible one-state reality that most people do not actually want.

Today, there are a number—there are a similar number of Jews and Palestinians living between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea. They have a choice. They can choose to live together in one state, or they can separate into two states. But here is a fundamental reality: if the choice is one state, Israel can either be Jewish or democratic—it cannot be both—and it won't ever really be at peace. Moreover, the Palestinians will never fully realize their vast potential in a homeland of their own with a one-state solution.

Now, most on both sides understand this basic choice, and that is why it is important that polls of Israelis and Palestinians show that there is still strong support for the two-state solution—in theory. They just don't believe that it can happen.

After decades of conflict, many no longer see the other side as people, only as threats and enemies. Both sides continue to push a narrative that plays to people's fears and reinforces the worst stereotypes rather than working to change perceptions and build up belief in the possibility of peace.

And the truth is the extraordinary polarization in this conflict extends beyond Israelis and Palestinians. Allies of both sides are content to reinforce this with an us or—''you're with us or against us'' mentality where too often anyone who questions Palestinian actions is an apologist for the occupation and anyone who disagrees with Israel policy is cast as anti-Israel or even anti-Semitic.

That's one of the most striking realties about the current situation: This critical decision about the future—one state or two states—is effectively being made on the ground every single day, despite the expressed opinion of the majority of the people.

The status quo is leading towards one state and perpetual occupation, but most of the public either ignores it or has given up hope that anything can be done to change it. And with this passive resignation, the problem only gets worse, the risks get greater and the choices are narrowed.

This sense of hopelessness among Israelis is exacerbated by the continuing violence, terrorist attacks against civilians and incitement, which are destroying belief in the possibility of peace.

Let me say it again: There is absolutely no justification for terrorism, and there never will be.

And the most recent wave of Palestinian violence has included hundreds of terrorist attacks in the past year, including stabbings, shootings, vehicular attacks and bombings, many by individuals who have been radicalized by social media. Yet the murderers of innocents are still glorified on Fatah websites, including showing attackers next to Palestinian leaders following attacks. And despite statements by President Abbas and his party's leaders making clear their opposition to violence, too often they send a different message by failing to condemn specific terrorist attacks and naming public squares, streets and schools after terrorists.

President Obama and I have made it clear to the Palestinian leadership countless times, publicly and privately, that all incitement to violence must stop. We have consistently condemned violence and terrorism, and even condemned the Palestinian leadership for not condemning it.

Far too often, the Palestinians have pursued efforts to delegitimize Israel in international fora. We have strongly opposed these initiatives, including the recent wholly unbalanced and inflammatory UNESCO resolution regarding Jerusalem. And we have made clear our strong opposition to Palestinian efforts against Israel at the ICC, which only sets back the prospects for peace.

And we all understand that the Palestinian Authority has a lot more to do to strengthen its institutions and improve governance.

Most troubling of all, Hamas continues to pursue an extremist agenda: they refuse to accept Israel's very right to exist. They have a one-state vision of their own: all of the land is Palestine. Hamas and other radical factions are responsible for the most explicit forms of incitement to violence, and many of the images that they use are truly appalling. And they are willing to kill innocents in Israel and put the people of Gaza at risk in order to advance that agenda.

Compounding this, the humanitarian situation in Gaza, exacerbated by the closings of the crossings, is dire. Gaza is home to one of the world's densest concentrations of people enduring extreme hardships with few opportunities. 1.3 million people out of Gaza's population of 1.8 million are in need of daily assistance—food and shelter. Most have electricity less than half the time and only 5 percent of the water is safe to drink. And yet despite the urgency of these needs, Hamas and other militant groups continue to re-arm and divert reconstruction materials to build tunnels, threatening more attacks on Israeli civilians that no government can tolerate.

Now, at the same time, we have to be clear about what is happening in the West Bank. The Israeli prime minister publicly supports a two-state solution, but his current coalition is the most right wing in Israeli history, with an agenda driven by the most extreme elements. The result is that policies of this government, which the prime minister himself just described as ''more committed to settlements than any in Israel's history,'' are leading in the opposite direction. They're leading towards one state. In fact, Israel has increasingly consolidated control over much of the West Bank for its own purposes, effectively reversing the transitions to greater Palestinian civil authority that were called for by the Oslo Accords.

I don't think most people in Israel, and certainly in the world, have any idea how broad and systematic the process has become. But the facts speak for themselves. The number of settlers in the roughly 130 Israeli settlements east of the 1967 lines has steadily grown. The settler population in the West Bank alone, not including East Jerusalem, has increased by nearly 270,000 since Oslo, including 100,000 just since 2009, when President Obama's term began.

There's no point in pretending that these are just in large settlement blocks. Nearly 90,000 settlers are living east of the separation barrier that was created by Israel itself in the middle of what, by any reasonable definition, would be the future Palestinian state. And the population of these distant settlements has grown by 20,000 just since 2009. In fact, just recently the government approved a significant new settlement well east of the barrier, closer to Jordan than to Israel. What does that say to Palestinians in particular—but also to the United States and the world—about Israel's intentions?

Let me emphasize, this is not to say that the settlements are the whole or even the primary cause of this conflict. Of course they are not. Nor can you say that if the settlements were suddenly removed, you'd have peace. Without a broader agreement, you would not. And we understand that in a final status agreement, certain settlements would become part of Israel to account for the changes that have taken place over the last 49 years—we understand that—including the new democratic demographic realities that exist on the ground. They would have to be factored in. But if more and more settlers are moving into the middle of Palestinian areas, it's going to be just that much harder to separate, that much harder to imagine transferring sovereignty, and that is exactly the outcome that some are purposefully accelerating.

Let's be clear: Settlement expansion has nothing to do with Israel's security. Many settlements actually increase the security burden on the Israeli Defense Forces. And leaders of the settler movement are motivated by ideological imperatives that entirely ignore legitimate Palestinian aspirations.

Among the most troubling illustrations of this point has been the proliferation of settler outposts that are illegal under Israel's own laws. They're often located on private Palestinian land and strategically placed in locations that make two states impossible. There are over 100 of these outposts. And since 2011, nearly one-third of them have been or are being legalized, despite pledges by past Israeli governments to dismantle many of them.

Now leaders of the settler movement have advanced unprecedented new legislation that would legalize most of those outposts. For the first time, it would apply Israeli domestic law to the West Bank rather than military law, which is a major step towards the process of annexation. When the law passed the first reading in the Israeli parliament, in the Knesset, one of the chief proponents said proudly—and I quote—''Today, the Israeli Knesset moved from heading towards establishing a Palestinian state towards Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria.'' Even the Israeli attorney general has said that the draft law is unconstitutional and a violation of international law.

Now, you may hear from advocates that the settlements are not an obstacle to peace because the settlers who don't want to leave can just stay in Palestine, like the Arab Israelis who live in Israel. But that misses a critical point, my friends. The Arab Israelis are citizens of Israel, subject to Israel's law. Does anyone here really believe that the settlers will agree to submit to Palestinian law in Palestine?

Likewise, some supporters of the settlements argue that the settlers could just stay in their settlements and remain as Israeli citizens in their separate enclaves in the middle of Palestine, protected by the IDF. Well, there are over 80 settlements east of the separation barrier, many located in places that would make a continuous—a contiguous Palestinian state impossible. Does anyone seriously think that if they just stay where they are you could still have a viable Palestinian state?

Now, some have asked, ''Why can't we build in the blocs which everyone knows will eventually be part of Israel?'' Well, the reason building there or anywhere else in the West Bank now results in such pushback is that the decision of what constitutes a bloc is being made unilaterally by the Israeli Government, without consultation, without the consent of the Palestinians, and without granting the Palestinians a reciprocal right to build in what will be, by most accounts, part of Palestine. Bottom line—without agreement or mutuality, the unilateral choices become a major point of contention, and that is part of why we are here where we are.

You may hear that these remote settlements aren't a problem because they only take up a very small percentage of the land. Well, again and again we have made it clear, it's not just a question of the overall amount of land available in the West Bank. It's whether the land can be connected or it's broken up into small parcels, like a Swiss cheese, that could never constitute a real state. The more outposts that are built, the more the settlements expand, the less possible it is to create a contiguous state. So in the end, a settlement is not just the land that it's on, it's also what the location does to the movement of people, what it does to the ability of a road to connect people, one community to another, what it does to the sense of statehood that is chipped away with each new construction. No one thinking seriously about peace can ignore the reality of what the settlements pose to that peace.

But the problem, obviously, goes well beyond settlements. Trends indicate a comprehensive effort to take the West Bank land for Israel and prevent any Palestinian development there. Today, the 60 percent of the West Bank known as Area C—much of which was supposed to be transferred to Palestinian control long ago under the Oslo Accords—much of it is effectively off limits to Palestinian development. Most today has essentially been taken for exclusive use by Israel simply by unilaterally designating it as ''state land'' or including it within the jurisdiction of regional settlement councils. Israeli farms flourish in the Jordan River Valley, and Israeli resorts line the shores of the Dead Sea—a lot of people don't realize this—they line the shore of the Dead Sea, where Palestinian development is not allowed. In fact, almost no private Palestinian building is approved in Area C at all. Only one permit was issued by Israel in all of 2014 and 2015, while approvals for hundreds of settlement units were advanced during that same period.

Moreover, Palestinian structures in Area C that do not have a permit from the Israeli military are potentially subject to demolition. And they are currently being demolished at an historically high rate. Over 1,300 Palestinians, including over 600 children, have been displaced by demolitions in 2016 alone—more than any previous year.

So the settler agenda is defining the future of Israel. And their stated purpose is clear. They believe in one state: greater Israel. In fact, one prominent minister, who heads a pro-settler party, declared just after the U.S. election—and I quote—''the era of the two-state solution is over,'' end quote. And many other coalition ministers publicly reject a Palestinian state. And they are increasingly getting their way, with plans for hundreds of new units in East Jerusalem recently announced and talk of a major new settlement building effort in the West Bank to follow.

So why are we so concerned? Why does this matter? Well, ask yourself these questions: What happens if that agenda succeeds? Where does that lead?

There are currently about 2.75 million Palestinians living under military occupation in the West Bank, most of them in Areas A and B—40 percent of the West Bank—where they have limited autonomy. They are restricted in their daily movements by a web of checkpoints and unable to travel into or out of the West Bank without a permit from the Israelis.

So if there is only one state, you would have millions of Palestinians permanently living in segregated enclaves in the middle of the West Bank, with no real political rights, separate legal, education, and transportation systems, vast income disparities, under a permanent military occupation that deprives them of the most basic freedoms. Separate and unequal is what you would have. And nobody can explain how that works. Would an Israeli accept living that way? Would an American accept living that way? Will the world accept it?

If the occupation becomes permanent, over the time the Palestinian Authority could simply dissolve, turn over all the administrative and security responsibilities to the Israelis. What would happen then? Who would administer the schools and hospitals and on what basis? Does Israel want to pay for the billions of dollars of lost international assistance that the Palestinian Authority now receives? Would the Israel Defense Force police the streets of every single Palestinian city and town?

How would Israel respond to a growing civil rights movement from Palestinians, demanding a right to vote, or widespread protests and unrest across the West Bank? How does Israel reconcile a permanent occupation with

its democratic ideals? How does the U.S. continue to defend that and still live up to our own democratic ideals?

Nobody has ever provided good answers to those questions because there aren't any. And there would be an increasing risk of more intense violence between Palestinians and settlers, and complete despair among Palestinians that would create very fertile ground for extremists.

With all the external threats that Israel faces today, which we are very cognizant of and working with them to deal with, does it really want an intensifying conflict in the West Bank? How does that help Israel's security? How does that help the region?

The answer is it doesn't, which is precisely why so many senior Israeli military and intelligence leaders, past and present, believe the two-state solution is the only real answer for Israel's long term security.

Now, one thing we do know: if Israel goes down the one state path, it will never have true peace with the rest of the Arab world, and I can say that with certainty. The Arab countries have made clear that they will not make peace with Israel without resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. That's not where their loyalties lie. That's not where their politics are.

But there is something new here. Common interests in countering Iran's destabilizing activities, and fighting extremists, as well as diversifying their economies have created real possibilities for something different if Israel takes advantage of the opportunities for peace. I have spent a great deal of time with key Arab leaders exploring this, and there is no doubt that they are prepared to have a fundamentally different relationship with Israel. That was stated in the Arab Peace Initiative, years ago. And in all my recent conversations, Arab leaders have confirmed their readiness, in the context of Israeli-Palestinian peace, not just to normalize relations but to work openly on securing that peace with significant regional security cooperation. It's waiting. It's right there.

Many have shown a willingness to support serious Israeli-Palestinian negotiations and to take steps on the path to normalization to relations, including public meetings, providing there is a meaningful progress towards a two-state solution. My friends, that is a real opportunity that we should not allow to be missed.

And that raises one final question: Is ours the generation that gives up on the dream of a Jewish democratic state of Israel living in peace and security with its neighbors? Because that is really what is at stake.

Now, that is what informed our vote at the Security Council last week—the need to preserve the two-state solution—and both sides in this conflict must take responsibility to do that. We have repeatedly and emphatically stressed to the Palestinians that all incitement to violence must stop. We have consistently condemned all violence and terrorism, and we have strongly opposed unilateral efforts to delegitimize Israel in international fora.

We've made countless public and private exhortations to the Israelis to stop the march of settlements. In literally hundreds of conversations with Prime Minister Netanyahu, I have made clear that continued settlement activity would only increase pressure for an international response. We have all known for some time that the Palestinians were intent on moving forward in the UN with a settlements resolution, and I advised the prime minister repeatedly that further settlement activity only invited UN action.

Yet the settlement activity just increased, including advancing the unprecedented legislation to legalize settler outposts that the prime minister himself reportedly warned could expose Israel to action at the Security Council and even international prosecution before deciding to support it.

In the end, we could not in good conscience protect the most extreme elements of the settler movement as it tries to destroy the two-state solution. We could not in good conscience turn a blind eye to Palestinian actions that fan hatred and violence. It is not in U.S. interest to help anyone on either side create a unitary state. And we may not be able to stop them, but we cannot be expected to defend them. And it is certainly not the role of any country to vote against its own policies.

That is why we decided not to block the UN resolution that makes clear both sides have to take steps to save the two-state solution while there is still time. And we did not take this decision lightly. The Obama Administration has always defended Israel against any effort at the UN and any international fora or biased and one-sided resolutions that seek to undermine its legitimacy or security, and that has not changed. It didn't change with this vote.

But remember it's important to note that every United States administration, Republican and Democratic, has opposed settlements as contrary to the prospects for peace, and action at the UN Security Council is far from unprecedented. In fact, previous administrations of both political parties have allowed resolutions that were critical of Israel to pass, including on settlements. On dozens of occasions under George W. Bush alone, the council passed six resolutions that Israel opposed, including one that endorsed a plan calling for a complete freeze on settlements, including natural growth.

Let me read you the lead paragraph from a New York Times story dated December 23rd. I quote: "With the United States abstaining, the Security Council adopted a resolution today strongly deploring Israel's handling of the disturbances in the occupied territories, which the resolution defined as, including Jerusalem. All of the 14 other Security Council members voted in favor." My friends, that story was not written last week. It was written December 23rd, 1987, 26 years to the day that we voted last week, when Ronald Reagan was president.

Yet despite growing pressure, the Obama Administration held a strong line against UN action, any UN action, we were the only administration since 1967 that had not allowed any resolution to pass that Israel opposed. In fact, the only time in eight years the Obama Administration exercised its veto at the United Nations was against a one-sided settlements resolution in 2011. And that resolution did not mention incitement or violence.

Now let's look at what's happened since then. Since then, there have been over 30,000 settlement units advanced through some stage of the planning process. That's right—over 30,000 settlement units advanced notwithstanding the positions of the United States and other countries. And if we had vetoed this resolution just the other day, the United States would have been giving license to further unfettered settlement construction that we fundamentally oppose.

So we reject the criticism that this vote abandons Israel. On the contrary, it is not this resolution that is isolating Israel; it is the permanent policy of settlement construction that risks making peace impossible. And virtually every country in the world other than Israel opposes settlements. That includes many of the friends of Israel, including the United Kingdom, France, Russia—all of whom voted in favor of the settlements resolution in 2011 that we vetoed, and again this year along with every other member of the council.

In fact, this resolution simply reaffirms statements made by the Security Council on the legality of settlements over several decades. It does not break new ground. In 1978, the State Department Legal Adviser advised the Congress on his conclusion that Israel's government, the Israeli Government's program of establishing civilian settlements in the occupied territory is inconsistent with international law, and we see no change since then to affect that fundamental conclusion.

Now, you may have heard that some criticized this resolution for calling East Jerusalem occupied territory. But to be clear, there was absolutely nothing new in last week's resolution on that issue. It was one of a long line of Security Council resolutions that included East Jerusalem as part of the territories occupied by Israel in 1967, and that includes resolutions passed by the Security Council under President Reagan and President George H.W. Bush. And remember that every U.S. administration since 1967, along with the entire international community, has recognized East Jerusalem as among the territories that Israel occupied in the Six-Day War.

Now, I want to stress this point: We fully respect Israel's profound historic and religious ties to the city and to its holy sites. We've never questioned that. This resolution in no manner prejudges the outcome of permanent status negotiations on East Jerusalem, which must, of course, reflect those historic ties and the realities on the ground. That's our position. We still support it.

We also strongly reject the notion that somehow the United States was the driving force behind this resolution. The Egyptians and Palestinians had long made clear to all of us—to all of the international community—their intention to bring a resolution to a vote before the end of the year, and we communicated that to the Israelis and they knew it anyway. The United States did not draft or originate this resolution, nor did we put it forward. It was drafted by Egypt—it was drafted and I think introduced by Egypt, which is one of Israel's closest friends in the region, in coordination with the Palestinians and others.

And during the time of the process as it went out, we made clear to others, including those on the Security Council, that it was possible that if the resolution were to be balanced and it were to include references to incitement and to terrorism, that it was possible the United States would then not block it, that—if it was balanced and fair. That's a standard practice with resolutions at the Security Council. The Egyptians and the Palestinians and many others understood that if the text were more balanced, it was possible we wouldn't block it. But we also made crystal clear that the President of the United States would not make a final decision about our own position until we saw the final text.

In the end, we did not agree with every word in this resolution. There are important

issues that are not sufficiently addressed or even addressed at all. But we could not in good conscience veto a resolution that condemns violence and incitement and reiterates what has been for a long time the overwhelming consensus and international view on settlements and calls for the parties to start taking constructive steps to advance the two-state solution on the ground.

Ultimately, it will be up to the Israeli people to decide whether the unusually heated attacks that Israeli officials have directed towards this Administration best serve Israel's national interests and its relationship with an ally that has been steadfast in its support, as I described. Those attacks, alongside allegations of U.S.-led conspiracy and other manufactured claims, distract attention from what the substance of this vote was really all about.

And we all understand that Israel faces very serious threats in a very tough neighborhood. Israelis are rightfully concerned about making sure that there is not a new terrorist haven right next door to them, often referencing what's happened with Gaza, and we understand that and we believe there are ways to meet those needs of security. And Israelis are fully justified in decrying attempts to legitimize their state and question the right of a Jewish state to exist. But this vote was not about that. It was about actions that Israelis and Palestinians are taking that are increasingly rendering a two-state solution impossible. It was not about making peace with the Palestinians now—it was about making sure that peace with the Palestinians will be possible in the future.

Now, we all understand that Israel faces extraordinary, serious threats in a very tough neighborhood. And Israelis are very correct in making sure that there's not a terrorist haven right on their border.

But this vote—I can't emphasize enough—is not about the possibility of arriving at an agreement that's going to resolve that overnight or in one year or two years. This is about a longer process. This is about how we make peace with the Palestinians in the future but preserve the capacity to do so.

So how do we get there? How do we get there, to that peace?

Since the parties have not yet been able to resume talks, the U.S. and the Middle East Quartet have repeatedly called on both sides to independently demonstrate a genuine commitment to the two-state solution—not just with words, but with real actions and policies—to create the conditions for meaningful negotiations.

We've called for both sides to take significant steps on the ground to reverse current trends and send a different message—a clear message—that they are prepared to fundamentally change the equation without waiting for the other side to act.

We have pushed them to comply with their basic commitments under their own prior agreements in order to advance a two-state reality on the ground.

We have called for the Palestinians to do everything in their power to stop violence and incitement, including publicly and consistently condemning acts of terrorism and stopping the glorification of violence.

And we have called on them to continue efforts to strengthen their own institutions and to improve governance, transparency, and accountability.

And we have stressed that the Hamas arms buildup and militant activities in Gaza must stop.

Along with our Quartet partners, we have called on Israel to end the policy of settlement construction and expansion, of taking land for exclusive Israeli use and denying Palestinian development.

To reverse the current process, the U.S. and our partners have encouraged Israel to resume the transfer of greater civil authority to the Palestinians in Area C, consistent with the transition that was called for by Oslo. And we have made clear that significant progress across a range of sectors, including housing, agriculture, and natural resources, can be made without negatively impacting Israel's legitimate security needs. And we've called for significantly easing the movement and access restrictions to and from Gaza, with due consideration for Israel's need to protect its citizens from terrorist attacks.

So let me stress here again: None of the steps that I just talked about would negatively impact Israel's security.

Let me also emphasize this is not about offering limited economic measures that perpetuate the status quo. We're talking about significant steps that would signal real progress towards creating two states.

That's the bottom line: If we're serious about the two-state solution, it's time to start implementing it now. Advancing the process of separation now, in a serious way, could make a significant difference in saving the two-state solution and in building confidence in the citizens of both sides that peace is, indeed, possible. And much progress can be made in advance of negotiations that can lay the foundation for negotiations, as contemplated by the Oslo process. In fact, these steps will help create the conditions for successful talks.

Now, in the end, we all understand that a final status agreement can only be achieved through direct negotiations between the parties. We've said that again and again. We cannot impose the peace.

There are other countries in the UN who believe it is our job to dictate the terms of a solution in the Security Council. Others want us to simply recognize a Palestinian state, absent an agreement. But I want to make clear today, these are not the choices that we will make.

We choose instead to draw on the experiences of the last eight years, to provide a way forward when the parties are ready for serious negotiations. In a place where the narratives from the past powerfully inform and mold the present, it's important to understand the history. We mark this year and next a series of milestones that I believe both illustrate the two sides of the conflict and form the basis for its resolution. It's worth touching on them briefly.

A hundred and twenty years ago, the First Zionist Congress was convened in Basel by a group of Jewish visionaries, who decided that the only effective response to the waves of anti-Semitic horrors sweeping across Europe was to create a state in the historic home of the Jewish people, where their ties to the land went back centuries—a state that could defend its borders, protect its people, and live in peace with its neighbors. That was the vision. That was the modern beginning, and it remains the dream of Israel today.

Nearly 70 years ago, United Nations General Assembly Resolution 181 finally paved the way to making the State of Israel a reality. The concept was simple: to create two states for two peoples—one Jewish, one Arab—to realize the national aspirations of both Jews and Palestinians. And both Israel and the PLO referenced Resolution 181 in their respective declarations of independence.

The United States recognized Israel seven minutes after its creation. But the Palestinians and the Arab world did not, and from its birth, Israel had to fight for its life. Palestinians also suffered terribly in the 1948 war, including many who had lived for generations in a land that had long been their home too. And when Israel celebrates its 70th anniversary in 2018, the Palestinians will mark a very different anniversary: 70 years since what they call the Nakba, or catastrophe.

Next year will also mark 50 years since the end of the Six-Day War, when Israel again fought for its survival. And Palestinians will again mark just the opposite: 50 years of military occupation. Both sides have accepted UN Security Council Resolution 242, which called for the withdrawal of Israel from territory that it occupied in 1967 in return for peace and secure borders, as the basis for ending the conflict.

It has been more than 20 years since Israel and the PLO signed their first agreement—the Oslo Accords—and the PLO formally recognized Israel. Both sides committed to a plan to transition much of the West Bank and Gaza to Palestinian control during permanent status negotiations that would put an end to their conflict. Unfortunately, neither the transition nor the final agreement came about, and both sides bear responsibility for that.

Finally, some 15 years ago, King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia came out with the historic Arab Peace Initiative, which offered fully normalized relations with Israel when it made peace—an enormous opportunity then and now, which has never been fully been embraced.

That history was critical to our approach to trying to find a way to resolve the conflict. And based on my experience with both sides over the last four years, including the nine months of formal negotiations, the core issues can be resolved if there is leadership on both sides committed to finding a solution.

In the end, I believe the negotiations did not fail because the gaps were too wide, but because the level of trust was too low. Both sides were concerned that any concessions would not be reciprocated and would come at too great a political cost. And the deep public skepticism only made it more difficult for them to be able to take risks.

In the countless hours that we spent working on a detailed framework, we worked through numerous formulations and developed specific bridging proposals, and we came away with a clear understanding of the fundamental needs of both sides. In the past two and a half years, I have tested ideas with regional and international stakeholders, including our Quartet partners. And I believe what has emerged from all of that is a broad consensus on balanced principles that would satisfy the core needs of both sides.

President Clinton deserves great credit for laying out extensive parameters designed to bridge gaps in advanced final status negotiations 16 years ago. Today, with mistrust too high to even start talks, we're at the opposite end of the spectrum. Neither side is willing to even risk acknowledging the other's bottom

line, and more negotiations that do not produce progress will only reinforce the worst fears.

Now, everyone understands that negotiations would be complex and difficult, and nobody can be expected to agree on the final result in advance. But if the parties could at least demonstrate that they understand the other side's most basic needs—and are potentially willing to meet them if theirs are also met at the end of comprehensive negotiations—perhaps then enough trust could be established to enable a meaningful process to begin.

It is in that spirit that we offer the following principles—not to prejudge or impose an outcome, but to provide a possible basis for serious negotiations when the parties are ready. Now, individual countries may have more detailed policies on these issues—as we do, by the way—but I believe there is a broad consensus that a final status agreement that could meet the needs of both sides would do the following.

Principle number one: Provide for secure and recognized international borders between Israel and a viable and contiguous Palestine, negotiated based on the 1967 lines with mutually agreed equivalent swaps.

Resolution 242, which has been enshrined in international law for 50 years, provides for the withdrawal of Israel from territory it occupied in 1967 in return for peace with its neighbors and secure and recognized borders. It has long been accepted by both sides, and it remains the basis for an agreement today.

As Secretary, one of the first issues that I worked out with the Arab League was their agreement that the reference in the Arab Peace Initiative to the 1967 lines would from now on include the concept of land swaps, which the Palestinians have acknowledged. And this is necessary to reflect practical realities on the ground, and mutually agreed equivalent swaps that will ensure that the agreement is fair to both sides.

There is also broad recognition of Israel's need to ensure that the borders are secure and defensible, and that the territory of Palestine is viable and contiguous. Virtually everyone that I have spoken to has been clear on this principle as well: No changes by Israel to the 1967 lines will be recognized by the international community unless agreed to by both sides.

Principle two: Fulfill the vision of the UN General Assembly Resolution 181 of two states for two peoples, one Jewish and one Arab, with mutual recognition and full equal rights for all their respective citizens.

This has been the fundamental—the foundational principle of the two-state solution from the beginning: creating a state for the Jewish people and a state for the Palestinian people, where each can achieve their national aspirations. And Resolution 181 is incorporated into the foundational documents of both the Israelis and Palestinians. Recognition of Israel as a Jewish state has been the U.S. position for years, and based on my conversations in these last months, I am absolutely convinced that many others are now prepared to accept it as well—provided the need for a Palestinian state is also addressed.

We also know that there are some 1.7 million Arab citizens who call Israel their home and must now and always be able to live as equal citizens, which makes this a difficult issue for Palestinians and others in the Arab world. That's why it is so important that in recognizing each other's homeland—Israel for the Jewish people and Palestine for the Palestinian people—both sides reaffirm their commitment to upholding full equal rights for all of their respective citizens.

Principle number three: Provide for a just, agreed, fair, and realistic solution to the Palestinian refugee issue, with international assistance, that includes compensation, options and assistance in finding permanent homes, acknowledgment of suffering, and other measures necessary for a comprehensive resolution consistent with two states for two peoples.

The plight of many Palestinian refugees is heartbreaking, and all agree that their needs have to be addressed. As part of a comprehensive resolution, they must be provided with compensation, their suffering must be acknowledged, and there will be a need to have options and assistance in finding permanent homes. The international community can provide significant support and assistance. I know we are prepared to do that, including in raising money to help ensure the compensation and other needs of the refugees are met, and many have expressed a willingness to contribute to that effort, particularly if it brings peace. But there is a general recognition that the solution must be consistent with two states for two peoples, and cannot affect the fundamental character of Israel.

Principle four: Provide an agreed resolution for Jerusalem as the internationally recognized capital of the two states, and protect and assure freedom of access to the holy sites consistent with the established status quo.

Now, Jerusalem is the most sensitive issue for both sides, and the solution will have to meet the needs not only of the parties, but of all three monotheistic faiths. That is why the holy sites that are sacred to billions of people around the world must be protected and remain accessible and the established status quo maintained. Most acknowledge that Jerusalem should not be divided again like it was in 1967, and we believe that. At the same time, there is broad recognition that there will be no peace agreement without reconciling the basic aspirations of both sides to have capitals there.

Principle five: Satisfy Israel's security needs and bring a full end, ultimately, to the occupation, while ensuring that Israel can defend itself effectively and that Palestine can provide security for its people in a sovereign and nonmilitarized state.

Security is the fundamental issue for Israel together with a couple of others I've mentioned, but security is critical. Everyone understands that no Israeli Government can ever accept an agreement that does not satisfy its security needs or that risk creating an enduring security threat like Gaza transferred to the West Bank. And Israel must be able to defend itself effectively, including against terrorism and other regional threats. In fact, there is a real willingness by Egypt, Jordan, and others to work together with Israel on meeting key security challenges. And I believe that those collective efforts, including close coordination on border security, intelligence-sharing, joint cooperations—joint operation, can all play a critical role in securing the peace.

At the same time, fully ending the occupation is the fundamental issue for the Palestinians. They need to know that the military occupation itself will really end after an agreed transitional process. They need to know they can live in freedom and dignity in a sovereign state while providing security for their population even without a military of their own. This is widely accepted as well. And it is important to understand there are many different ways without occupation for Israel and Palestine and Jordan and Egypt and the United States and others to cooperate in providing that security.

Now, balancing those requirements was among the most important challenges that we faced in the negotiations, but it was one where the United States has the ability to provide the most assistance. And that is why a team that was led by General John Allen, who is here, for whom I am very grateful for his many hours of effort, along with—he is one of our foremost military minds, and dozens of experts from the Department of Defense and other agencies, all of them engaged extensively with the Israeli Defense Force on trying to find solutions that could help Israel address its legitimate security needs.

They developed innovative approaches to creating unprecedented, multi-layered border security; enhancing Palestinian capacity; enabling Israel to retain the ability to address threats by itself even when the occupation had ended. General Allen and his team were not suggesting one particular outcome or one particular timeline, nor were they suggesting that technology alone would resolve these problems. They were simply working on ways to support whatever the negotiators agreed to. And they did some very impressive work that gives me total confidence that Israel's security requirements can be met.

Principle six: End the conflict and all outstanding claims, enabling normalized relations and enhanced regional security for all as envisaged by the Arab Peace Initiative. It is essential for both sides that the final status agreement resolves all the outstanding issues and finally brings closure to this conflict, so that everyone can move ahead to a new era of peaceful coexistence and cooperation. For Israel, this must also bring broader peace with all of its Arab neighbors. That is the fundamental promise of the Arab Peace Initiative, which key Arab leaders have affirmed in these most recent days.

The Arab Peace Initiative also envisions enhanced security for all of the region. It envisages Israel being a partner in those efforts when peace is made. This is the area where Israel and the Arab world are looking at perhaps the greatest moment of potential transformation in the Middle East since Israel's creation in 1948. The Arab world faces its own set of security challenges. With Israeli-Palestinian peace, Israel, the United States, Jordan, Egypt—together with the GCC countries—would be ready and willing to define a new security partnership for the region that would be absolutely groundbreaking.

So ladies and gentlemen, that's why it is vital that we all work to keep open the possibility of peace, that we not lose hope in the two-state solution, no matter how difficult it may seem—because there really is no viable alternative.

Now, we all know that a speech alone won't produce peace. But based on over 30 years of experience and the lessons from the past 4 years, I have suggested, I believe, and President Obama has signed on to and believes in

a path that the parties could take: realistic steps on the ground now, consistent with the parties' own prior commitments, that will begin the process of separating into two states; a political horizon to work towards to create the conditions for a successful final status talk; and a basis for negotiations that the parties could accept to demonstrate that they are serious about making peace.

We can only encourage them to take this path; we cannot walk down it for them. But if they take these steps, peace would bring extraordinary benefits in enhancing the security and the stability and the prosperity of Israelis, Palestinians, all of the nations of the region. The Palestinian economy has amazing potential in the context of independence, with major private sector investment possibilities and a talented, hungry, eager-to-work young workforce. Israel's economy could enjoy unprecedented growth as it becomes a regional economic powerhouse, taking advantage of the unparalleled culture of innovation and trading opportunities with new Arab partners. Meanwhile, security challenges could be addressed by an entirely new security arrangement, in which Israel cooperates openly with key Arab states. That is the future that everybody should be working for.

President Obama and I know that the incoming administration has signaled that they may take a different path, and even suggested breaking from the longstanding U.S. policies on settlements, Jerusalem, and the possibility of a two-state solution. That is for them to decide. That's how we work. But we cannot—in good conscience—do nothing, and say nothing, when we see the hope of peace slipping away.

This is a time to stand up for what is right. We have long known what two states living side by side in peace and security looks like. We should not be afraid to say so.

Now, I really began to reflect on what we have learned—and the way ahead—when I recently joined President Obama in Jerusalem for the state funeral for Shimon Peres. Shimon was one of the founding fathers of Israel who became one of the world's great elder statesmen—a beautiful man. I was proud to call him my friend, and I know that President Obama was as well.

And I remembered the first time that I saw Shimon in person—standing on the White House lawn for the signing the historic Oslo Accords. And I thought about the last time, at an intimate one-on-one Shabbat dinner just a few months before he died, when we toasted together to the future of Israel and to the peace that he still so passionately believed in for his people.

He summed it up simply and eloquently, as only Shimon could, quote, "The original mandate gave the Palestinians 48 percent, now it's down to 22 percent. I think 78 percent is enough for us."

As we laid Shimon to rest that day, many of us couldn't help but wonder if peace between Israelis and Palestinians might also be buried along with one of its most eloquent champions. We cannot let that happen. There is simply too much at stake—for future generations of Israelis and Palestinians—to give in to pessimism, especially when peace is, in fact, still possible.

We must not lose hope in the possibility of peace. We must not give in to those who say what is now must always be, that there is no chance for a better future. It is up to Israelis and Palestinians to make the difficult choices for peace, but we can all help. And for the sake of future generations of Israelis and Palestinians, for all the people of the region, for the United States, for all those around the world who have prayed for and worked for peace for generations, let's hope that we are all prepared—and particularly Israelis and Palestinians—to make those choices now.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 11. Contrary to the U.N. resolution that we are condemning today, which condemns the settlements that are taking place in Israel, the new settlements that the Israelis find themselves permitting are not undermining the cause of peace. Let's get this straight. This is what we just hear over and over again that the settlements are undermining peace.

What undermines peace is when the Palestinian people continue with their policies of terrorism, both attacking with missiles and rockets, as well as stabbings, as well as the Palestinian people and their leaders unwilling to stand up and recognize that Israel exists. They don't have a right to flood into that country with a right of return. That is what undermines the peace.

The settlements wouldn't be taking place, except the Israelis and the United Nations and the supporters of the Palestinians have made a mockery of the deal that was made.

The Israelis withdrew from control of the territory. They withdrew, and they permitted the Palestinians to establish authority there with two promises: number one, they wouldn't use the territory to attack Israel; and number two, they would recognize Israel's right to exist, and this right of return permitting them to flood into Israel and eliminate it that way did not exist.

The Palestinians have given up nothing. The Israelis have given up territory and made themselves vulnerable to the type of attack that leaves Israelis dead every day from terrorist attacks.

No, the U.N. has it wrong. That resolution by the U.N. makes peace less likely.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reiterate the strong, bipartisan support for our ally, Israel, in the United States Congress.

Support for Israel has always been a bipartisan value, and it reflects the values of our country. Although we are entering a period of one-party government, bipartisan support for Israel remains a strategic asset, and those who support Israel need to be careful not to jeopardize that. I think none of my colleagues do that. I want to make it clear.

In supporting this House resolution, we are expressing our deep concern regarding the decision to abstain in the U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. Some may point out that the decision to abstain does not veer from the actions of past administrations. They would be right. It does not. That may be true, but it does not justify, in my view, this particular vote.

Allowing a one-sided resolution, which I perceived the U.N. resolution to be, to be adopted at this juncture sends the wrong signal and emboldens Israel's and America's enemies.

The United Nations is notorious for its disproportionate criticism of Israel. As Ambassador Samantha Power said before the U.N. Security Council vote on Resolution 2334: "As long as Israel has been a member of this institution, Israel has been treated differently from other nations at the United Nations."

She also noted that, in 2016 alone, the U.N. adopted more resolutions critical of Israel than it did nations that brazenly violate international law and violate human rights—more than Syria, more than Iran, more than North Korea, more than South Sudan, more than Russia, combined.

A one-sided resolution that assigns exclusive blame to Israel for the continuation of the conflict—without addressing Palestinian incitement to violence, Hamas control of Gaza, or their continued insistence on the so-called right of return and refusing to accept Israel as a Jewish state—undermines prospects for a two-state solution.

Also deeply concerning is this resolution's reference of Israeli presence in East Jerusalem, including the Jewish Quarter of the Old City and the Western Wall, as illegal.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. The only way to achieve a real and lasting peace that enables Israel to protect its security and remain both a Jewish state and a democratic one is a two-state solution, which I strongly support.

There are two parties to this conflict. Both have responsibilities. Both need to take steps toward peace. For Israel, this means not building in areas envisioned in the long term as part of a future Palestinian state; and for Palestinians, it means ending incitement, ending terrorism, and affirmatively accepting Israel's right to existence.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 11.

The U.N. resolution, on the other hand, is vastly disproportionate and includes language that seems designed to provoke Israel. Categorizing the Western Wall, Judaism's holiest site, as occupied territory is entirely inappropriate.

I believe that President Obama should have directed the United States to veto the U.N. resolution. Instead, our Ambassador sat silent. Abstaining on this vote handed a victory to the forces that wish to delegitimate Israel.

This resolution erects a greater barrier between the two sides, hindering critical negotiations. The peace process must be negotiated bilaterally by Israel and the Palestinians with support, not provocation, by outside actors.

In this new year and new Congress, we should act to reassert a position of strength on the world stage. We must stand by our allies, including our strongest ally in the Middle East, Israel. This country should have exercised its veto power as it has done before and thwarted this divisive anti-Israel effort.

Please vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, who are we kidding? I heard the ranking member say this isn't about Obama, and yet virtually every statement on the other side of the aisle is trashing President Obama.

If you want to simply condemn the U.N. resolution, let's do so. I will join you. But that isn't what this is about. It is subterfuge. This is about kicking a President on the way out one more time, enhancing a false narrative about his lack of support for our ally Israel. And it greases the skids to defund the United Nations while they are at it.

I say to my friends on my side of the aisle: Don't be fooled. Don't be enablers. That is what this agenda is about.

There was a viable alternative we could have had on the floor, and we were denied that right. We were even denied to have a motion to recommit for a reason: because they don't want to risk that. They want to control the platform that is negative and insidious and a resolution filled with insinuations and distortions of fact and history.

Vote ''no'' on H. Res. 11.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, just by way of the facts, what this resolution attempts to do is to reject the U.N. resolution that calls for a Palestinian state but not a Jewish state, a resolution that opens the door for those who want to impose boycott, divestment, or other sanctions measures against Israel or Israeli companies and, in essence, declares Judaism's holiest site as occupied territory. That is what is in this resolution. Those are the facts that we are debating here. Those are the facts that need to be rejected, my colleagues.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the U.N. resolution which hinders the path to peace and aims to undermine Israel, one of our country's top allies.

Our policy has long been that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict should be resolved by direct, bilateral talks between the two parties. This U.N. resolution contradicts our longstanding policy, first, by legitimatizing Palestinian Authority efforts to utilize international organizations to carry out its own solution; and second, by not providing for the Palestinian Authority to uphold their own responsibility as it relates to the peace negotiations.

The U.N. resolution disregards that Hamas, a terrorist organization, presently controls a portion of what would be the Palestinian state. That is an outrage, Mr. Speaker.

We must not sit on the sidelines or be silenced when anti-Israel resolutions are presented at international organizations. That is why I support H. Res. 11 today.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER). We are pleased that he is back.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, for 19 years, when Jordan occupied East Jerusalem and the West Bank, Jews could not visit the Western Wall or the Jewish Quarter of the Old City. They were denied access to places where, for 2,000 years, they have continuously made a personal connection to their faith and their history.

It is impossible to separate Jewish identity from the Western Wall or the Western Wall from its Jewish identity or Jerusalem from the Jewish State of Israel, yet this is exactly what has been happening in the United Nations for years and exactly what Security Council Resolution 2334 sought to do.

In addition, the resolution overwhelmingly assigns blame to Israel, while avoiding direct criticism of Palestinian incitement and violence. That is why, last month, I strongly urged President Obama to veto the resolution.

The U.S. has and must continue to seek a sustainable two-state solution with a democratic, Jewish State of Israel and a demilitarized democratic Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security. But the only path to two states is through direct negotiations by the two parties. Efforts to force a solution at the U.N. or internationalize the issues are misguided and risk moving peace further away.

As an original cosponsor, I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 11.

Mr. ROYCE of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

□ 1830

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in strong support of this resolution. We need to close ranks in the House of Representatives. We need to, as colleagues, support what for decades has been the cornerstone principle of American diplomacy towards Israel and Palestine, and that is direct negotiation between these two countries. That is the only way that peace can be achieved. The fact that our Ambassador to the United Nations went against decades of precedent by abstaining from this vote is appalling. It is another vote for tyrants and terrorists.

All of us need to close ranks to support a two-state solution between Israel and Palestine. I am proud to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle tonight, Mr. ENGEL and Mr. ROYCE, in opposing this mistake that has been made by our U.N. Ambassador and by the U.N. resolution itself. Both are wrong. Both our decision to abstain and the drafting have been destructive.

I am proud to have this resolution in the House to once again undo this harm and support our ally.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 11 to reject the anti-Israel U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334. Since 1972, the United States has vetoed 42 anti-Israel resolutions; but all of that changed in 2016.

The facts are, in the very final days of his administration, President Obama left our only ally in the Middle East to stand alone by blatantly and deliberately violating longstanding U.S. policy. For crying out loud, either we are with Israel or we are not.

I could go on and on about the severity of the President's refusal to veto an anti-Israel U.N. resolution and his decision to abstain from a vote on it. Instead, I will let Prime Minister Netanyahu's words speak for themselves:

''The Obama administration not only failed to protect Israel against this gang-up at the U.N., it colluded with it behind the scenes.''

Antagonizing our allies is not much of a foreign policy strategy. This is betrayal of the worst kind. Anti-Israel policies will not be tolerated. We are partners in this world and allies in democracy. I urge my colleagues to stand with Israel and support this legislation.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my great pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of today's bipartisan measure. There are no shortcuts to peace. Only the Israelis and the Palestinians can resolve their complicated differences through direct negotiation. That is why it has been longstanding policy to defend our ally Israel against one-sided U.N. Security Council resolutions seeking to impose solutions.

Last year, Congresswoman GRANGER and I led a letter to President Obama signed by 394 Members of this body

cautioning against one-sided U.N. initiatives that dangerously hinder the prospects for resuming direct negotiations. I believe the administration's abstention is a stain on our country's long and consistent record.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I thank our chair of the committee and our ranking member.

I am here to stand with Israel. The question of the best way to do that is one of legitimate debate. It is a debate that we are having here in the House. It is a debate that the folks in Israel are having there. There is no question that the resolution before us is not the one that everyone would have written, or the one that was before the U.N. was the one everyone would have written. There is no question that there is fault on the side of the Palestinians with respect to coming to the table for peace.

But here is the question that is starting to really make an impact on the possibility of achieving the two-state solution that both sides by and large believe is essential, and that is something that is within the control of the Israeli Government: Will it continue to intensify the support for settlements in the West Bank? If it does, as it has been, there are 600,000 settlers now between the West Bank and east Jerusalem. If it continues to do that, it makes as a practical matter it virtually impossible the land-for-peace swap that we know is essential to get to a two-state solution. That is the practical challenge that we have.

We are all friends of Israel. All of us here believe in a Jewish state and a democratic state.

The second issue of major concern that is discussed in Israel as well as here is the fact that demographics are going to catch up and cause a real crisis in Israel to maintain that Jewish identity and that democratic tradition. There are 4.5 million Arabs who live between the West Bank and in Israel proper. There are 6.5 million Jewish citizens. If there is not some resolution, at some point a decision has to be made to maintain the Jewish character at the expense of democratic ideals or compromise democratic ideals in order to maintain that Jewish identity.

The Israeli State has a proud, strong tradition of being democratic, of being reliable, of standing up for civil and human rights. Many there, and some of us here, believe settlements are an impediment to that tradition.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

A couple of weeks ago I stood in the Judea/Sumeria area in the West Bank speaking with numerous out of thousands of Palestinians working in factories, those who earn three times the salary that they would under the Palestinian Authority. They don't want their proudly made products boycotted. They don't want to lose their jobs. They don't want disruptive Palestinian Authority leaders to always speak for them—whose own area has 40 percent unemployment and no opportunity.

The Obama administration had 8 years to show their true colors. But when they didn't get their way, they insecurely, naively, and cowardly lashed out at our greatest and strongest ally in the Middle East.

Women, religious minorities, LGBT, and Jews would not have equal rights, democracy, or peace in a Palestinian country. In fact, the Palestinian Authority punishes Palestinians by death if they sell their land to the Jewish people lawfully.

The current administration has used the United Nations to both legitimize a profoundly flawed Iran deal and delegitimize Israel. To think that settlements are the only thing that stands in front of peace is dangerously naive.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the bipartisan Royce-Engel resolution. I urge my colleagues to stand with Israel and to stand with the Palestinians in the West Bank.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), my friend on the Foreign Affairs Committee and the ranking member of the Middle East Subcommittee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, in April of last year, 394 Members of this House sent a letter to the President urging him to oppose and veto if necessary any one-sided United Nations resolutions. Unfortunately, the resolution that passed the Security Council resolution without our veto was exactly that. It was one-sided.

The resolution contained no fewer than five provisions on Israeli settlement activity. It calls the Jewish neighborhoods of Jerusalem illegal, and it characterizes Jews praying at the Western Wall as being in flagrant violation of international law.

But even if you choose to accept every provision on settlement activity, the resolution included only one very general statement about violence. The U.N., which is historically biased against Israel, could not even condemn Palestinian terrorism against Israel as an obstacle to peace. It is, and the U.N. must acknowledge it. That is not balanced. It is one-sided.

Today's resolution clearly supports the goal of two states: a Jewish democratic State of Israel living next to a demilitarized Palestinian state as it stands against one-sided U.N. resolutions to take us further than this goal. Please support this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we are all friends of Israel, but that friendship requires more than demonizing the United Nations and the Obama administration. In fact, it requires the facing of hard truths, the destructive effect of incitement and violence on the Palestinian side, which the U.N. resolution explicitly acknowledges, and the threat to peace and to any conceivable two-state solution by relentless settlement expansion on the Israeli side, pushed by the right wing, unchallenged by H. Res. 11.

The majority, seeking to push this resolution through, has displayed little interest in what it would take actually to achieve peace, choosing instead to distort the history, to impugn the motives of those attempting to achieve peace. It is not worthy of this body. I urge its rejection.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

When an unfair, one-sided resolution moves forward in the U.N., as Israel's ally, we have an obligation to say it is wrong. That is what this resolution does. This resolution also calls for a two-state solution. So my colleagues who are somehow portraying this resolution as not being for a two-state resolution, they are absolutely wrong.

I urge my colleagues, especially my Democratic colleagues, to continue to support the U.S.-Israel alliance, and you continue to support it by voting for this resolution. This is a fair resolution.

Let's remember, when Israel left Gaza and uprooted settlements, what did it get in return? Not peace, but terrorism. Stand with the people of Israel. Vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in short, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 has harmed our ally Israel. It has harmed the prospects for peace. It is one-sided. It is an anti-Israel resolution, the kind of which it has been longstanding U.S. policy to veto within the U.N. Security Council, and it is not hard to see why because this resolution opens the door for those who want to impose boycott, divestment, or other sanctions measures against Israel or against Israeli companies. And, in essence, it declares Judaism's holiest site, the Western Wall, as occupied territory.

Mr. Speaker, this is reminiscent of another action by the United Nations, the infamous ''Zionism is racism'' resolution whose damage took decades to undo.

Fortunately, the bipartisan rejection of the President's U.N. decision provides an opportunity for the House to rally around a more constructive policy and renewed U.S. leadership in the region.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this resolution so that the bipartisan policy of rejecting this harmful U.N. Security

Council resolution and encouraging direct negotiation is endorsed loud and clear. It is far past time for the incitement to stop and the budgeting of $300 million by the Palestinian Authority to pay people to slay Israeli civilians be discontinued.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the bipartisan House Resolution 11 expressing opposition to UNSCR 2334.

In the summer of 1983 I visited the Western Wall in Jerusalem, Judaism's most holy site, for the first time. Merely 17 years earlier I could not have gone to the Wall, or for that matter anywhere in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem.

From 1949 to 1967, when Jordan occupied Jerusalem, Jews could not visit the one place where for nearly 2000 years, they had continuously made a personal connection to their faith and their history.

It is impossible to separate Jewish identity from the Western Wall, just as it is impossible to separate the Western Wall from its Jewish identity, or Jerusalem from the Jewish State of Israel.

Yet this is exactly what has been happening in the United Nations for years, and exactly what the one-sided UN Resolution sought to do.

In addition to seeking to declare the eastern part of Jerusalem a settlement, the resolution overwhelmingly assigns blame to Israel, while averting direct criticism of Palestinian incitement and violence.

That is why last month I strongly urged President Obama to veto the resolution.

The U.S. has, and must continue to seek a sustainable two-state solution with a democratic, Jewish state of Israel and a demilitarized, democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security.

But the only path to two states is through direct, bilateral negotiations between the two parties. Efforts to force a solution at the U.N. or to internationalize the issue are misguided, and risk moving peace further away, not closer.

Israel is our most important strategic ally in a most important and chaotic region of the world. The United States always has and always will ensure the security of Israel.

As an original co-sponsor, I call on my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 11.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 11.

I'd like to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for bringing this resolution to the Floor.

Your continued bipartisan support for our friend and ally, Israel, sets the right tone for any discussion this body has regarding this vital relationship.

Almost 70 years ago, on May 14, 1948, with the support of fiercely Democratic president, Harry Truman, the nation of Israel was born.

Created in the aftermath of World War II, the special relationship that our two countries now enjoy was founded. For 70 years, our government has supported Israeli interest because they represent American interest.

Throughout the decades, from Dwight Eisenhower to Barack Obama, from the great Texan, and Speaker Sam Rayburn to Speaker RYAN, our government has worked across party lines and across branches of government to ensure the one, true democracy in the Middle East is able to grow and prosper without hindrance.

Recently, we have reaffirmed our support for Israel by signing a new Memorandum of Understanding and resoundingly telling the world that we support our ally in the Middle East. UNSCR 2334 does not align with this affirmation.

It should be the policy of the United States to support a viable two-state solution, where Palestinians and Israelis live in prosperity and security. This does not mean negotiating out of fear or forced necessity.

I want to, again, express my gratitude and appreciation for this body and our friends on the Foreign Affairs Committee for leading by example.

U.S.-Israeli relations have always been bipartisan and should remain that way. It is my hope the new Administration will build on the foundation created by the Presidents and elected officials that came before us and support Israel in a bipartisan fashion.

I ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 11.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, any measure that seeks to promote a peaceful resolution to tensions between Israelis and Palestinians—whether coming from the United Nations or from this Chamber—should provide a balanced picture of the facts on the ground and the challenges confronting both sides. The recent UN Security Resolution on Israeli settlements failed that test by blaming Israel almost solely for impeding a two-states solution for peace and by using prejudicial language that places an unfair burden on Israel in depicting the basis for future negotiations. Calling any settlement activity by Israel since 1967 a major obstacle to peace, as the UN resolution does, ignores the reality that geographical adjustments will have to be made as part of any two-states solution reached by parties through direct negotiations.

However, the resolution before us today is also not balanced in that it too ignores conditions on the ground. Expressing the sense of Congress to repeal the UN Resolution does not focus on the increasingly fragile state of the two-states solution, and on conditions that make its potential achievement increasingly difficult to obtain. Prime Minister Netanyahu has called his government the most pro-settlement in history. President-elect Trump further diminishes chances for the two-states solution by choosing envoys who undercut the prospects for peace by expressing support for major settlement expansions, and whose opposition to a two-states solution reinforces opposition within the Israeli government. These positions threaten to continue to move momentum dangerously away from the possibility of a two-states solution.

I believe that the two-states approach, as challenging as it is to achieve, is the only way to ensure a Jewish and democratic state of Israel living in security with a non-militarized Palestinian state. It is important for peace in the Middle East and U.S. national interests.

This resolution is at present the only vehicle to express my concerns with the UN resolution, and I will therefore support it. However, I will continue to speak out on further actions that I believe will diminish the chance of a two-states solution and on other issues vital to peace in the Middle East.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 11, Objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace. On December 23, 2016, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 2334 which describes Israeli settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem as illegal, with the United States abstaining from the vote.

Now, U.S. Congress has chosen to disapprove of President Obama's leadership and longstanding U.S. foreign policy on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. UNSC Resolution 2334 merely reiterates the international community consensus and bipartisan U.S. policy that building settlements impedes the path to a lasting peaceful two-state solution. H. Res. 11 asserts that the UNSCR is ''anti-Israel'' and ''one-sided,'' but it does not break new ground or create any new policy. For example, in 1987, the Reagan administration abstained and allowed the passage of UNSCR 605, reaffirming the application of the Geneva Convention which included Jerusalem in the ''Palestinian and Arab Territories, occupied by Israel since 1967.''

Instead, I am urging support of an alternative resolution introduced and led by Congressman DAVID PRICE. Instead of disapproving of a resolution that reaffirms longstanding U.S. policy, Congress would work towards the progress of a two-state solution. H. Res. 11 would undermine our decades-long efforts towards a peaceful situation between Israelis and Palestinians and it is not the best way to show our support for Israel, our strong ally. Our goal must be to reaffirm U.S. policy in the Middle East and to find solutions with the international community.

We must be steadfast in our commitment to a two-state solution and to longstanding U.S. policy. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose H. Res. 11 and to support the alternative resolution introduced by Congressman PRICE.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for peace in the Middle East and between Israel and the Palestinians. That is why I am for a two-state solution and the end to new Israeli settlements.

However, the one-sided UN Security Council Resolution 2334 issued last month would declare the Western Wall and some Jewish holy sites, where many Jews live and pray, illegally occupied territory.

I am voting for H.Res. 11 today because the United States should veto any UN resolution that would require Israel to give away the Western Wall or the Jewish Quarters of Jerusalem. What the United States should encourage is an end to new settlements, a two-state solution and direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. That is the only framework that can lead to a just and lasting peace.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against H. Res. 11, the Object to UN Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 2334 as Obstacle

to Israeli-Palestinian Peace resolution. The resolution expresses the House's disapproval of UNSC Resolution 2334, which passed 14 to 0 with the United States abstaining from the vote.

H. Res. 11 mischaracterizes the UN resolution and falsely claims that the United States has never abstained from votes on similar resolutions. The UN resolution reaffirms that Israel's settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem are a ''major obstacle'' to peace, which has been long-standing US policy. H. Res. 11 states that the Obama Administration took an unprecedented step by abstaining from the vote when in fact the decision is not unique. The Reagan Administration took a similar step when it abstained from voting on UNSCR 605 that identified Jerusalem as part of the Palestinian and Arab Territories which is now occupied by Israel. Both Republican and Democratic presidents have continued similar U.S. policies.

Representatives PRICE, ENGEL and CONNOLLY offered a more balanced resolution as an amendment to H. Res. 11, but unfortunately House leadership refused to allow it a vote. The text of the amendment is now H. Res. 23, of which I am a cosponsor.

H. Res. 23 supports the longstanding policy that it is in the best interest of the international community that a two-state solution is reached only through direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. It reiterates United States support for Israel by opposing any outside efforts to impose a solution on the parties but rather to help facilitate peace negotiations. It includes continued opposition to the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaign which calls for boycotting certain products and companies, divesting from various organizations, and encouraging the use of sanctions against Israel.

I have always supported a two-state solution with Israel and a Palestinian state through direct negotiations between the two parties. As an ally of Israel, the United States has an interest to ensure a lasting peace is reached between Israel and Palestine. Let me be clear, while I support the United States' strong relationship and alliance with Israel, Israel's proliferation of settlements around the West Bank and East Jerusalem is directly at odds with establishing a two-state solution.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I remain committed to a two-state solution, where a Jewish state of Israel and a Palestinian state can coexist in peace. The best path to ultimately achieving this peace is through direct, bilateral negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians, not imposed solutions by international organizations. Instead of this Administration concluding its strong Israel record with the single largest pledge of military assistance in U.S. history, it chose to end on a perplexing note by choosing not to veto United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334.

The expansion of settlements in occupied territory has been long recognized on a bipartisan basis and in U.S. policy for decades as doing little to improve the confidence of Arabs that a final outcome can be freely and fairly negotiated. United Nations action does not help advance the cause of peace, nor does it bring about direct negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians so they might resolve their complicated differences and find a much needed, lasting two-state solution, which I have supported my entire career.

Any action, whether coming from the United Nations or the Congress, must provide a complete picture of the facts on the ground and full appreciation for the challenges confronting all sides. Like the one-sided resolution from the United Nations Security Council, H. Res. 11 too ignores the reality of the conditions on the ground. While I don't believe either resolution is balanced, I am voting in favor of H. Res. 11 to express my displeasure with the actions of the UN, which make direct negotiations all the more difficult to resume. I will continue to speak out in support of efforts that lay the foundation for peace in the Middle East and vigorously oppose those that undermine a lasting two state solution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 22, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 342, nays 80, answered ''present'' 4, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—342

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beutler
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Cárdenas
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Espaillat
Esty
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Levin
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price, Tom (GA)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—80

Amash
Bass
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Eshoo
Foster
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gohmert
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Heck
Huffman
Jayapal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kihuen
Kildee
Kuster (NH)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Lynch
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Nolan
O'Rourke
Payne
Pelosi
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Tsongas
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—4

Capuano
Evans
Lofgren
Shea-Porter

NOT VOTING—7

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Crist
Franks (AZ)
Gallego
Pompeo
Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1905

Mr. CASTRO of Texas changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. TIBERI and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Mr. COHEN changed his vote from ''present'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 11.

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO COMMEMORATE SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF SHOOTING IN TUCSON

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues from Arizona and around the country, to commemorate the sixth anniversary of the January 8, 2011, shooting in Tucson that killed six people and wounded 13 more.

Six years ago this week, Congresswoman Giffords was sworn into office, just like we were 3 days ago. Six years ago this week, she headed home to her district, just like we all will tomorrow. And 6 years ago, on Sunday, she was engaging in one of the most fundamental activities of representative government by meeting with her constituents to hear their thoughts, concerns, and ideas, just like we will all do in the days ahead.

As Representatives, we each carry out this critical discourse when home in our districts. Its exercise is vital to our free society, which is why this shooting wasn't just an attack on Tucson, but this body and our very democratic foundations.

The attack marked the first time in our country's history that an assassination attempt was made on a congressional Member while engaging with her constituents. It also is remembered as the first assassination of a congressional staffer, Gabe Zimmerman, in the line of duty.

As we remember those we lost, we also reflect on the renewed sense of compassion and civility that emerged from this tragedy. This weekend, in Tucson, we will commemorate how our community came together to support those grieving and provide an example of courage and unity that the entire country can follow.

It is in this spirit of unity that we stand here for a moment of silence to recognize the six lives that were cut tragically short that day:

Nine-year-old Christina Taylor Green;

Dorothy Morris;

Judge John Roll;

Phyllis Schneck;

Dorwan Stoddard; and

Congressional staffer Gabriel ''Gabe'' Zimmerman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will observe a moment of silence.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 22 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 26.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1910

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further 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, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 115–1 offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115–1 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. MESSER of Indiana.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CONYERS of Michigan.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. MCNERNEY of California.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 185, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

AYES—235

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
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 (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
Poe (TX)
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
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

NOES—185

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
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
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
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.
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)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Crowley
Denham
Gallego
Gutiérrez
Jenkins (KS)
Luján, Ben Ray
Mulvaney
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush
Suozzi

□ 1914

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 12.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 230, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

AYES—193

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
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
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
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
Katko
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
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—230

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
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 (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
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
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
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—10

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Gallego
Jenkins (KS)
Messer
Mulvaney
O'Rourke
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush

□ 1918

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 233, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

AYES—190

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
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
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
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—233

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
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
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 (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
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
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
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—10

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Denham
Gallego
Jenkins (KS)
Mulvaney
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush
Torres

□ 1921

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 232, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

AYES—186

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
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
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
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
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
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

NOES—232

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
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 (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
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
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
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
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—15

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Gallego
Gutiérrez
Jenkins (KS)
LaMalfa
Mulvaney
Palmer
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rokita
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Waters, Maxine

□ 1925

Mr. FERGUSON changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 231, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

AYES—192

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
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
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
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—231

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
DeSantis
DesJarlais
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 (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
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
Poe (TX)
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
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
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—10

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Diaz-Balart
Gallego
Jenkins (KS)
Mulvaney
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush
Sánchez

□ 1928

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 234, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

AYES—190

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
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
Gonzalez (TX)
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
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
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
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
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—234

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
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 (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
Poe (TX)
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
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—9

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Crawford
Gallego
Jenkins (KS)
Mulvaney
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush

□ 1932

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 231, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

AYES—194

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
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
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
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
LoBiondo
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)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—231

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Beutler
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
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
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
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 (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
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
Poe (TX)
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
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
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—8

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Gallego
Jenkins (KS)
Mulvaney
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush

□ 1936

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 235, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

AYES—190

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
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
Gonzalez (TX)
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
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
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
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
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—235

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 (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
Poe (TX)
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
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—8

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Gallego
Jenkins (KS)
Mulvaney
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush

□ 1940

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 232, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

AYES—193

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
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
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
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
McKinley
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)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—232

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
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
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
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
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
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—8

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Gallego
Jenkins (KS)
Mulvaney
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush

□ 1944

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 193, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

AYES—230

Abraham
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
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 (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)
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
Poe (TX)
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
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
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

NOES—193

Adams
Aderholt
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
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
Gonzalez (TX)
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
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
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
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra	Jenkins (KS)	Price, Tom (GA)
Collins (NY)	Mulvaney	Rush
Culberson	Pompeo	
Gallego	Price (NC)	

□ 1948

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, pursuant to House Resolution 22, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Murphy of Florida moves to recommit the bill H.R. 26 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. 7. EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN RULES THAT PROHIBIT DISCRIMINATION BY INSURANCE ISSUERS AGAINST DEPENDENTS UNDER THE AGE OF 26.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall apply in the case of any rule that pertains to prohibiting an insurance issuer from eliminating, weakening, or reducing health coverage benefits for dependents under the age of 26.

Mr. GOODLATTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion.

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

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.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If the amendment is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Like a number of my new colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I was not a Member of Congress in 2010 when Congress enacted the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. The law has now been in place for nearly 7 years, and it has become part of the fabric of our health care system, fundamentally changing the way that we provide and pay for health care in this country.

The Members of this Chamber, our counterparts in the Senate, and the incoming President will soon have a binary choice to make, and the stakes for patients, physicians, hospitals, and health insurance providers could not be higher.

The choice is this: Will we retain the many provisions in the Affordable Care Act that are functioning well and work together in a bipartisan manner to reform, refine, and rectify those provisions that need improvement; or, on the other hand, will we repeal the entire Affordable Care Act without a clear and comprehensive plan in place to replace the law with something as good or better, which is almost certain to cause chaos in our health care system and disrupt the lives and livelihoods of millions of our constituents?

The Affordable Care Act is not perfect; but I believe the responsible and moral course of action for this body is to strengthen the law, not repeal it. A look to historic precedent gives us guidance here. In the past, when Congress enacted important legislation, like Social Security or Medicare, designed to address serious national problems, it rarely gets it perfectly right the first time. Congress almost always needs to revisit the law down the line to observe how the law has operated in practice, to see who the law has helped or who it may have inadvertently harmed, to learn from that experience, and then, based on the evidence and the counsel of our constituents, to work across party lines to make any necessary improvements to the law. The perfect must never become the enemy of the good.

Just as in business, when your business plan runs into challenges, you don't scrap the whole plan; you make left and right adjustments along the way and keep moving forward toward your goals. Health care is too central to the lives of our constituents to be rebooted every few years in a partisan, haphazard manner.

My specific amendment is consistent with this broader philosophy. One of the most popular and well-functioning provisions of the Affordable Care Act is a provision requiring certain health insurance plans to allow young adults to stay on their parents' health insurance plans until the age of 26. This provision has been particularly beneficial for my district in central Florida, which has one of the lowest median ages of any congressional district in the Sunshine State and which is home to the University of Central Florida—the Nation's second largest university, with over 63,000 enrolled students.

Prior to the Affordable Care Act, too many young adults in central Florida and around the country were uninsured either because they were not employed or because they were employed at jobs that did not provide affordable coverage or any coverage at all. If these young men and women were to become sick or get injured, the resulting medical bills could bankrupt them or their families. The Affordable Care Act sought to mitigate this risk, and the evidence indicates that it has done so successfully; and the American people have said, overwhelmingly, that they want to keep this popular provision.

Accordingly, my amendment would establish an exception to the REINS Act. It would ensure that any Federal regulation that executes or enforces the Affordable Care Act provision enabling young adults up to age 26 to obtain health insurance coverage through their parents' plans will not be annulled by Congress. By voting for my amendment, you will send a signal that you support this provision, which has benefited millions of our constituents whether they live in red States, blue States, or purple States.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

On the floor of this House in 2011, the President of the United States promised the American people ''to reduce barriers to growth and investment . . . when we find rules that put an unnecessary burden on businesses, we will fix them.''

But, Mr. Speaker, those were just President Obama's words. His actions were starkly different. Throughout the entire 8 years of the Obama administration, a flood of new, major regulations has been burying America's job creators and households at record levels; and to make matters worse, when Congress declined to legislate the President's misguided policies for him, he increasingly resorted to unilateral regulatory actions to legislate by executive fiat.

It is time to say, ''Never again.'' The REINS Act, in one fell swoop, puts a stop to abuses like President Obama's and assures that Congress—the body to which the Constitution assigns the power to legislate—has the necessary tools to block the most overreaching

regulations and mandates on the American people.

This motion to recommit seeks only to distract from the urgent need to reform our regulatory system and reduce unnecessary burdens on the public. When health care reform regulations are adopted, they should be adopted with the approval of this body.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, reject this motion to recommit, and show America that Congress can act for the good of job creators and all Americans who desperately want and need jobs.

Mr. Speaker, 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 235, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

AYES—190

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
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
Gonzalez (TX)
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
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
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
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
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—235

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 (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
Poe (TX)
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
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—8

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Gallego
Jenkins (KS)
Mulvaney
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush

□ 2005

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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 237, noes 187, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

AYES—237

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
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 (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
Poe (TX)
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
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

NOES—187

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)
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
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)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
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
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Becerra
Collins (NY)
Gallego
Jenkins (KS)
Mulvaney
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush
Wilson (FL)

□ 2011

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on rollcall votes 12 through 23 on the evening of January 5, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall No. 12, "nay" on rollcall No. 13, "nay" on rollcall No. 14, "nay" on rollcall No. 15, "nay" on rollcall No. 16, "nay" on rollcall No. 17, "nay" on rollcall No. 18, "nay" on rollcall No. 19, "nay" on rollcall No. 20, "yea" on rollcall No. 21, "nay" on rollcall No. 22, "yea" on rollcall No. 23.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 6, 2017, TO MONDAY, JANUARY 9, 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, January 9, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 25

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ETHICS.—Ms. Sánchez.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2015

PERVERSE TORTURE PERPETRATED BY HEARTLESS YOUNG ADULTS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, four people were charged with a violent crime after a Facebook showed 30 minutes of horror. The criminal charges barely scratch the surface in describing the terror experienced by an 18-year-old boy who suffers from mental disabilities.

He was forced for 5 hours to cower in a corner scared, stunned, and powerless by people he thought were his friends. His mouth was duct taped shut. His hands and feet were tied. They cut his clothes, his hair, and scalp with a knife. He was burned, punched, and beaten. He was humiliated and berated. This was not just bullying, this was violent, perverse torture perpetrated by heartless young adults. His psychological trauma will haunt him for years.

He is not alone because children with disabilities are four times more likely to be assaulted than the general population.

We enacted major mental health reforms just a few weeks ago. Unfortunately, we cannot litigate compassion, mandate morality, nor legislate common decency for perpetrators who have no sense of shame. But today, as a Nation, we should all be ashamed and recommit to teach our children there is never any excuse to harm a disabled person. Never. I pray for the victim and his family.

IMPACT OF ACA REPEAL ON MOMS AND BABIES

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the Maternity Care Caucus, I rise on behalf of mothers and babies who will suffer if Republicans repeal the Affordable Care Act.

It is undisputable that, with prenatal care, babies are born healthier. Before the ACA, approximately 10 percent of childbearing women had no health insurance, and the plans of 60 percent of all insured women had no maternity coverage.

With ObamaCare's Medicaid expansion and insurance subsidies, more than half of these women who were uninsured became eligible for maternity care. In addition, the ACA also requires health plans to cover maternity care and preexisting conditions. All of this will be lost with ACA repeal.

Women will also lose coverage for lactation counseling and the cost of breast pumps, a known barrier to successful breastfeeding which is one of the most effective ways to protect the health of babies.

I urge my Republican colleagues to consider the negative impacts repealing ObamaCare will have on our Nation's mothers and babies. We must protect the future health of our children by ensuring all moms have access to maternity care and breastfeeding support.

RECOGNIZING ACHIEVEMENTS OF LEROY BALDWIN

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and achievements of Leroy Baldwin. A true American original, Leroy Baldwin was born and raised in Ocala, Florida, on December 15, 1932. Not coming from a family with a rich ag background, Mr. Baldwin bought his first calf when he was 6 years of age from the money he earned delivering newspapers.

Mr. Baldwin served honorably in the U.S. Army from 1952 to 1955 during the Korean war. After the war, he pursued his lifelong project, the Baldwin Angus Ranch. Starting with 40 acres, the ranch now spans 620 acres and has taken the Florida Angus breed all over the world.

Mr. Baldwin thanked God each and every day for the blessings his family and business enjoyed.

God, family, and country are the words he lived by, words vitally important to our Nation today. We have lost a true giant.

Mr. Baldwin, may God bless you, your family, and thank you for what you have done for Florida and our Nation's agriculture.

PATHWAY OF DESTRUCTION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today, in the Senate, the other body, unfortunately, joined the pathway of destruction for most Americans and voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. These are not my words, the pathway of destruction, but is evidence what will happen to millions and millions of Americans. By repealing without a replacement, which does not exist, insurance will be taken away from 32 million working families. Now, some 4 million uninsured children will have no insurance.

Let me be very clear that many of these individuals do not have college degrees. Many of them, the voters of those who now will take the rein of government. Healthcare premiums will increase by 50 percent for millions of Americans. Hundreds of billions of dollars will go to tax breaks for insurance companies while eliminating the tax credits and subsidies for millions of working families.

It will take healthcare coverage away from millions of low- and moderate-income Americans by cutting Medicaid, and it will close rural hospitals and public hospitals that provide the lifeline for many Americans. It will cut off Federal funds for health care for women through Planned Parenthood. And yes, it will eliminate and have cuts in Medicare and Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, this is a pathway of disaster. We should not repeal the Affordable Care Act.

STEMMING AVALANCHE OF REGULATIONS

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that, in my first week as a Representative of Michigan's 10th Congressional District, we have passed two important pieces of legislation to stem the avalanche of Federal regulations.

The top concern I hear from employers of all sizes across my district is that regulation from Washington is making it harder for them to do business. I spent my career in business, so I have firsthand knowledge of the damage caused by excessive Federal regulations.

The Midnight Rules Act and the REINS Act will provide much-needed regulatory relief to families and businesses alike. Both pieces of legislation will make unelected bureaucrats accountable to Congress.

The American Dream is achievable, and, as the son of a General Motors line worker, my life is proof of it. But that dream is only possible when we give Americans the freedom they need to be successful and unleash their capabilities in our economy.

TRAVEL TO CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BANKS of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about a bill that JIM MCGOVERN of Massachusetts and I have that we will be offering tomorrow. I think it is an important bill from the standpoint of advancing and perpetuating this American notion called freedom. It is a bill that had 130 sponsors in the last Congress. I am joined on the bill by TOM EMMER and Mr. POE and Mr. AMASH as original cosponsors as we drop the bill tomorrow. It is quite simply entitled the Freedom to Travel to Cuba bill. It does what the name suggests, to lift the current restrictions in encumbering Americans' ability to travel to Cuba.

Why is that important?

I think it is important for a number of different reasons, first of which is tied to the basic, fundamental notion of American liberty. American liberty is built of many different things. The Supreme Court has actually determined that as real as what you choose to wear, what you choose to eat, or what you choose to read is this basic, fundamental right to travel.

In the American system, we can travel as we see fit. I can go here, I can go there. I am going to visit my grandmother in Des Moines, my cousin in Chicago. We choose without government control and without government edict where we come and where we go. It is a far cry from what we saw in the former Soviet Union where you had to have your papers to determine where you could travel.

I have a map of the globe here. Did you know that you or I could travel to any country on this globe except one? You or I could travel to North Korea. You or I could travel to Syria. You or I could travel to Iran. You or I could travel to Iraq. It may not work out well for you, it may not be the best of trips, but you or I could travel without government prohibition to any spot on this globe except one, and that one is Cuba.

That may have made sense in 1960. For security reasons in the time of the cold war, it may have made sense to have that prohibition in place. But the question is: Does it make sense today? I don't think it does for a whole variety of reasons.

One, this is about the basic, fundamental American right of travel as we see fit, not as government sees fit.

Two, this is about the American liberty and this fragile notion of, if we don't protect it, government tends to grow. Jefferson talked about this theme a long time ago. He talked about the normal course of things for government to gain ground and for government to yield. So if we don't push back—and this is what the REINS Act was all about—if we don't push back about the government edict or laws that have outgrown their usefulness, what we are doing is we are allowing government to encroach on this fragile notion of liberty.

Fundamental to the notion of common sense is, if you tried something for 50 years and it has not worked, may we not try something different? I was here in the 1990s. I signed onto Helms-Burton. But it didn't work, and so we asked: Why not try something different?

What Ronald Reagan proposed at the time of the Iron Curtain was for Americans, kids with backpacks, to travel on the other side of that curtain. That personal diplomacy, that one-on-one diplomacy, would be key in bringing down that wall. That was the notion of engagement.

So I think this is about saying American policy has been the excuse that the Castros have used for 50 years. We have almost the longest-serving dictatorship in the history of globe there with the Castro brothers. What was oftentimes the case is they would blame the blockade, the embargo, Americans' inability to travel, whatever was going wrong with the country rather than simply addressing the real issue. The problem was communism and the way that it encumbers people and their hopes and their dreams. We gave them an excuse. So this is about pulling back the excuse and trying something different. It is about pushing back on a regulation that has not served its purpose.

Three, this is about engaging because that is part and parcel to American liberty. You know, I don't like some of the things that are going on in Russia. I don't like some of the things that are going on in China. I don't like some of the things that are going on in Vietnam. You can pick your country. But what we have chosen, as an American policy, is this notion of engagement, that we ultimately are going to be able to solve more by engaging with other countries. Again, that is why Ronald Reagan embraced it with countries of the former Soviet Union in helping to bring down that wall. So this is about

perpetuating the notion of engagement and government regulation.

We have just passed the REINS Act, which is all about saying if something isn't making sense, let's peel it back. Let's not have the fourth branch of government going out and perpetuating all kinds of regulations without them going through Congress. Yet, with regard to travel to Cuba, you have to sign an affidavit as to why you are going there. You have to keep receipts for up to 5 years proving where you did or didn't spend money. If you fill out a form wrong, you can be subject to a $250,000 fine. Is that kind of regulation consistent with free travel that we all should enjoy as Americans?

Finally, I think that this bill is about bringing about change to Cuba. My interest is not primarily about Cuba. My interest is about American liberty and the need to perpetuate American liberty.

But one of the offshoots, one of the benefits is about bringing change to Cuba. Even the worst detractor of the bill, we are all about the same thing, which is bringing more freedom to that country and the 11 million people that make up that country.

I think that allowing Americans to go there and to tell folks about what you are hearing from your state-run radio station or television station is not the truth, here is what is really going on. It is part and parcel to bringing about a change in Cuba. It is part and parcel to eliminating the excuses that have been used by the communist regime there. It is continuing the theme of engagement that we have employed for more than 100 years. And most all, it is part and parcel to maintain this fragile notion of American liberty which always needs to be protected.

□ 2030

If something has encroached upon American liberty, it is not about a tangible result in the here and the now. It needs to be pushed back. So, fundamentally, this bill is about those five different things. It is for that reason I would ask that viewers talk to their House or Senate Member and ask them to sign on to this bill.

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

ISRAEL AND THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, today we took up what was intended to be a very noble action on H. Res. 11 to rein in the out-of-control and outrageous actions of so many despots that occupy positions of authority in the United Nations. The United Nations, whether you go back to Libya being in charge of human rights, you have U.N. troops molesting so many females. There are all kinds of problems that have been wrought, and yet the U.N. has the gall to continually show how bigoted it is and how anti-Jewish and anti-Israeli that it is.

It is easy to find, if anyone bothers to check, that the United Nations never asked once for any other country to pony up land, much less demand that other countries like Jordan, who is a good friend of the United States, but the U.N. never said: Look, you are occupying this land that they call Palestine, so you have to give it up. They never did until it was controlled by the Israeli people, thus making clear this is really a bigoted move by the U.N. to constantly slander and slam the nation of Israel.

Also, if one wants to conduct another test to check to see how bigoted, if it is, the U.N. is, you could check on the condemnations by the U.N. for activities of Israel. Compare the facts of those activities and self-defense efforts by Israel and compare them to acts of other nations—the genocide, for example, that even Secretary Kerry, as tough as it was for him to finally admit that there was a genocide of Christians going on in the Middle East.

Is there any outrage by the U.N.? No. In fact, the U.N. head of the refugees who is now the U.N. General Secretary made clear about over a year and a half ago or so that the reason that they weren't helping Christians to the extent that they were helping Muslim refugees is because of the historic importance Christians have in staying where they were—that means where they are being murdered, where they are having their throats slashed, being crucified, tortured, raped, incinerated. The U.N. General Secretary, when he was in charge of the refugee program, thought it was very important to leave Christians in the Middle East so they can be murdered in some of the most heinous and egregious fashions imaginable.

So it was just and proper, to borrow from history, that we condemn the United Nations Resolution 2334 as being an obstacle to peace in Israel. Palestinians have made clear they don't want peace with Israel. They want it eliminated from the map. They name holidays, squares, and all kinds of things for people who go out and kill innocent Jewish children and others just for being Jewish. They reward the families of those who go and blow themselves up, killing, in atrocious fashions, innocent Israeli people. The United Nations turns a blind eye to it since the U.N. has become so racist, so bigoted, and so anti-Israel, the most antiterrorist country in all of the Middle East, including north Africa—although Egypt is of great help in that regard these days, and there are those in Libya who would like to. But after President Obama helped turn Libya into absolute anarchy and chaos, then Egypt is having their problems even coming from Libya.

What has the U.N. had to say about all that? Not really anything because if the Muslim Brotherhood supports it, so does, basically, the U.N., and far too often so has the Obama administration.

That is why, I guess, Israel got the lecture from Secretary John Kerry. Secretary Kerry, even in the days when he talked about the heinous acts of Genghis Khan, never bothered to mention the plight of the poor Palestinians before 1967 when they were under control of the most non-Israeli people you could imagine. There has been no discussion about that, only leveling really bigoted allegations at Israel.

So we have H. Res. 11 today, and I was thrilled because it meant that I was going to be able to come to the floor and vote to condemn the U.N. passage of U.N. Security Council Resolution 2334.

Unfortunately, as some of my friends here in Congress have pointed out, I am a bit anal at times. I actually want to read the things that we are going to vote on. So I got my copy of H. Res. 11, immediately noting that, in the very first whereas, it says the United States has long supported a two-state solution. It does say ''sustainable two-state solution.'' It says: ''Whereas since 1993, the United States has facilitated direct, bilateral negotiations between both parties toward achieving a two-state solution . . . .''

Well, it is the truth that President Clinton twisted the arm of the Israeli Prime Minister and convinced him to basically give Arafat almost everything he wanted. Now, if you believe what Scripture says about Moses going and pleading to Pharaoh to let the Jewish people, the children of Israel, go, we are told that God hardens Pharaoh's heart so that He could make a big demonstration of His power and glory down the road. Although there was suffering that came—great suffering—ultimately, incredible miracles were performed as a result of his hardened heart.

I think it is likely that when Arafat got everything he wanted—almost everything he wanted—in the offer from Israel, I thank God that Arafat turned him down. For anybody that has been in the military and goes to Israel, you can see readily, if Arafat had accepted what the Prime Minister of Israel had been willing, finally, to offer, it would have virtually made Israel indefensible unless they were using nuclear weapons or the threat of nuclear weapons.

Israel needs to be able to defend itself. King David was ruling from Hebron in the year around 1020 B.C. to around 1012 B.C. Then he moved, and he was ruling over Israel. What is now called the West Bank was actually called Israel—I mean, it was part of the nation of Israel. Solomon had control, but he did so from the City of David because that is where, up to Jerusalem, that David had moved the capital from Hebron, which is also where Abraham and Sarah are buried.

I have also visited the tomb of David's father, Jesse, that is there in Hebron. To be told: Oh, no, this needs to be Palestinian lands. The reason some of us think that Hebron, Judea, and Samaria should be Palestinian lands is because 1,600 years after David ruled from Hebron and then Jerusalem, Mohammed came along. Some say it was a vision, some say a dream. Some say he actually, during one night, was taken by a winged horse or donkey and flown to Jerusalem. Some say he actually got there and back to bed before morning. Whatever the case, 1,600 years before that did or didn't happen, David was ruling over that whole country.

There is no one alive today descended from any occupants of the Promised Land, the land of Israel, descended from people who lived in that land predating King David and King Saul before him, King Solomon after him—nobody. Nobody alive today has a prior claim. There is nobody, no country, from whom the United Nations has demanded a secession of land back to people that attacked that country and the land was taken back in a defensive mode in protection from the attack.

So at page 3 of our H. Res. 11, it points out that the U.N. resolution is a major obstacle to the achievement of the two-state solution. At the bottom of page 5, it says: ''A durable and sustainable peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians will come only through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties resulting in a Jewish, democratic state living side-by-side next to a demilitarized Palestinian state in peace and security.''

Mr. Speaker, there cannot be peace and security in the Middle East when a people are allowed to occupy an area, and those people continue, with the encouragement of the United Nations, with John Kerry and this President, to conduct intensive terrorism on the people of Israel and we continue to condemn the victims of that terrorism.

You can't have peace in a land where the most powerful nation—possibly the most powerful nation up to now. We were at one time. Our Navy is down, I think, to pre-World War I standards, and our troops are down below pre-World War II. But at one time, we were the most powerful nation. The most powerful or near most powerful nation is taking up for the victims and encouraging that the victims give away more of the land that they have already given so much of to those who are inflicting terror upon them. It is like my friends on the far left, constantly complaining about bullies, who never had been bullied like I was as a small child because I was very small in elementary school.

□ 2045

I got beat up a lot, and I defended myself, but it didn't matter. When people are coming after you that are a foot and a half taller than you are and they flunked two grades, you are not going to come out well.

My fifth grade teacher, after I got beat up trying to get back my football I got for Christmas, took me up in front of the class. My nose is still bleeding, dripping down my shirt. She said: I want everybody to see what happens when the little boys try to play with the big boys.

She always took up for the bullies. And that is what this administration has been doing and this is what this United Nations has been doing: taking up for the terrorist bullies.

I am amazed that the nation of Israel has held back all hell breaking loose on the Gaza Strip because of the continued assaults day after day, sending rockets into Israel, Israel spending millions of dollars to protect themselves against the constant attack from the Gaza Strip.

And what happens?

They try to protect themselves with a legitimate blockade to make sure nobody is taking rockets in, and the U.N. and world opinion goes nuts over that.

Page 6 of our resolution we voted on today goes on to say that the House of Representatives calls for United Nations Security Council 2334 to be repealed or fundamentally altered so that it is no longer one-sided and anti-Israel.

Here is my problem again. B, it allows all final status issues toward a two-state solution be resolved and have direct negotiations between the parties.

Nobody at the U.N., if we are a part of it, and nobody in the United States administration should even mention the little phrase ''two-state solution.'' This body should not even mention in a resolution that we are in any way endorsing a two-state solution.

I know there are a lot of Christians that aren't as familiar with the Bible, perhaps, as they will be one day, but my friend, Joel Rosenberg, pointed out numerous times in the book of Joel, chapter 3:

> For look. In those days and at that time I will return the exiles to Judah and Jerusalem. Then I will gather all the nations. I will bring them down to the Valley of Jehoshaphat. I will enter into judgment against them there concerning my people Israel, who are my inheritance, whom they scattered among the nations.

Then it lists the number one grievance that the God of the Bible, the God I believe in, had against those nations he is going to rain down only hell judgment on. The number one grievance is: they partitioned my land. They divided my land, the promised land.

When the United States Congress embraces, demands that Israel be divided into separate states instead of being able to live in, peacefully, the land that was occupied and promised over 3,000 years ago, I think we are making a big mistake. That is why I had to vote ''no'' on the resolution.

Now just as our leadership rushed this resolution to the floor, I am hopeful they will rush H. Res. 311 to the floor. I filed it today, this afternoon. H. Res. 311 is very basic. It says:

''To withhold United States assessed and voluntary contributions to the United Nations, and for other purposes.

''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 'Refusing to Assist Paying for United Nations Actions Against Israel Act' ''.

United States assessed involuntary contributions to the United Nations. That is section 2. And the operative wording says:

''No funds are authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for assessed or voluntary contributions of the United States to the United Nations or to any organ, specialized agency, commission, treaty or treaty body, or other affiliated body of the United Nations . . . ''

It goes on: '' . . . until such time as United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334, regarding Israel's Settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, is repealed in its entirety.''

Then, section 3 says: ''No funds are authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to pay interest on assessed or voluntary contributions that are withheld under this Act.''

So the purpose of that is I am hoping and praying that this body will not just pay lip service to a U.N. resolution, and actually embrace, as John Kerry, apparently, was saying that day, not much difference between AIPAC's position in supporting this resolution. He may not have mentioned they would support the resolution, but AIPAC's position and John Kerry's position. If you look at what is in the resolution, he may have something there.

This would actually put some teeth into it. This is something that would send a message to the United Nations and the nations around the world that if you are going to continue to be so anti-Israel, so bigoted, so racist, so anti-Jewish, then the United States is not going to continue to fund your outrageous, bigoted activities, your lush, lavish lifestyle.

I would think if we could pass this, the United Nations delayed in withdrawing that resolution or rescinding it, then that should ultimately lead to our denial of any visas to diplomats of the United Nations. Then, once that occurs, apparently under the deed to the United Nations, it was only for such time as the headquarters in New York—is the main headquarters of the United Nations. So if they can't get diplomats there, they will have to move the headquarters elsewhere and that land would be ceded back to the foundation.

Hopefully, if we will go ahead and do something that has teeth in it and not embrace language that will be fatal to this nation of Israel, we can make a difference. That can bring peace in the world. Terrorists only understand power, and sometimes power is conveyed in the way of money.

We should not be funding a United Nations that is so bigoted and so hateful to the nation of Israel.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 6, 2017, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the Egg Research and Promotion Rules and Regulations To Update Patents, Copyrights, Trademarks, and Information Provisions [Docket No.: AMS-LPS-15-0042] 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.

10. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of multiple violations of the Antideficiency Act, Air Force case number 12-01, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258; (96 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations.

11. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2016 annual Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program Report to Congress, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2249c(c); Public Law 108-136, Sec. 1221)a)(1); (117 Stat. 1651); to the Committee on Armed Services.

12. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Chambers and Harris Counties, TX, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8461] 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 Financial Services.

13. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP): Financial Assistance/Subsidy Arrangement [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0012] (RIN:1660-AA86) 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 Financial Services.

14. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modernizing HUD's Consolidated Planning Process To Narrow the Digital Divide and Increase Resilience to Natural Hazards [Docket No.: FR 5891-F-02] (RIN: 2506-AC41) 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 Financial Services.

15. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Narrowing the Digital Divide Through Installation of Broadband Infrastructure in HUD-Funded New Construction and Substantial Rehabilitation of Multifamily Rental Housing [Docket No.: FR 5890-F-02] (RIN: 2501-AD75) 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 Financial Services.

16. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's National Health Service Corps Report to Congress for the Year 2015, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 254i; July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 336A (as amended by Public Law 107-251, Sec. 307(b)); (116 Stat. 1649); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

17. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's Quarterly Report on the Transition of the Stewardship of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority Functions, covering the activities from June 1, 2016 to October 24, 2016, pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, Public Law 114-113; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

18. A letter from the Deputy Director, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — 340B Drug Pricing Program Ceiling Price and Manufacturer Civil Monetary Penalties Regulation (RIN: 0906-AA89) received January 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

19. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting the Board's report titled ''Report to the U.S. Congress and the Secretary of Energy; Board Activities for the Period January 1, 2013 — December 31, 2015'', pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987, Public Law 100-203; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

20. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

21. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting 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, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

22. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Russian Sanctions: Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List, and Clarification of License Review Policy [Docket No.: 161206999-6999-01] (RIN: 0694-AH25) 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 Foreign Affairs.

23. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Revision of U.S. Munitions List Category XV [Public Notice: 9688] (RIN: 1400-AD33) 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 Foreign Affairs.

24. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — International Traffic in Arms Regulations: International Trade Data System, Reporting [Public Notice: 9811] (RIN: 1400-AE07) 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 Foreign Affairs.

25. A letter from the Legal Counsel, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting notification of a federal vacancy, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

26. A letter from the Chairwoman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Federal Trade Commission's Inspector General Semiannual Report to Congress for the period April 1, 2016 through September 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

27. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress covering the period of April 1 through September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

28. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Alaska; Subsistence Collections [NPS-AKRO-22487; PPAKAKROZ5, PPMPRLE1Y.L00000] (RIN: 1024-AE28) 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 Natural Resources.

29. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Operating Plan for Colorado River System Reservoirs for 2017, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1552(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

30. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties (RIN: 1990-AA46) received December 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

31. A letter from the Director, Contract and Grant Policy Division, Office of Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contractor Financial Reporting of Property (2016-N024) (RIN: 2700-AE33) 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 Science, Space, and Technology.

32. A letter from the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Administration's certification that the level of screening services and protection provided at the Bozeman Yellowstone International Airport (BZN), Glacier Park International Airport (FCA), and Yellowstone Airport (WYS) in Montana will be equal to or greater than the level that would be provided at the airport by TSA Transportation Security Officers and that the screening company is owned and controlled by citizens of the

United States, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44920(d)(1); Public Law 107-71, Sec. 108(a); (115 Stat. 613); to the Committee on Homeland Security.

33. A letter from the Chair, Board of Directors, Office of Compliance, transmitting the Office's report titled ''Recommendations for Improvements to the Congressional Accountability Act'', pursuant to Sec. 102(b) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and House Administration.

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. OLSON (for himself, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. VELA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BABIN, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HURD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 294. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the ''Endy Ekpanya Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. KNIGHT, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 295. A bill to provide for a limitation on the number of civilian employees at the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 296. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude major professional sports leagues from qualifying as tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 297. A bill to require greater accountability in discretionary and direct spending programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Judiciary, 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. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 298. A bill to require additional entities to be subject to the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 299. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa (for himself, Mr. BACON, Mr. BLUM, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 300. A bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 301. A bill to require the National Institute of Standards and Technology to establish a premise plumbing research laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 302. A bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 303. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit additional retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or combat-related special compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on 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. HUDSON (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BEUTLER, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. EMMER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 304. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KIND, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 305. 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 Ways and Means, 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 Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 306. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information and computing technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 307. A bill to ensure that Members of Congress and Congressional staff receive health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs instead of under the Federal Health Benefits Program or health care exchanges; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on 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. DAVIDSON (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BRAT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BARR, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BLUM, and Mrs. LOVE):

H.R. 308. A bill to prevent proposed regulations relating to restrictions on liquidation of an interest with respect to estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer taxes from taking effect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 309. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with a complex metabolic or autoimmune disease, a disease resulting from insulin deficiency or insulin resistance, or complications caused by such a disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 310. A bill to withdraw certain land located in Curry County and Josephine County, Oregon, from all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws, location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and operation under the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 311. A bill to withhold United States assessed and voluntary contributions to the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. BEUTLER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CRIST, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. JAYAPAL):

H.R. 312. A bill to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. HENSARLING):

H.R. 313. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to establish a Social Security Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Social Security surplus, to provide for suspension of investment of amounts held in the Account until enactment of legislation providing for investment of the Trust Fund in investment vehicles other than obligations of the United States, and to establish a Social Security Investment Commission to make recommendations for alternative forms of investment of the Social Security surplus in the Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 314. A bill to repeal title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, 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. BURGESS (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 315. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to distribute maternity care health professionals to health professional shortage areas identified as in need of maternity care health services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 316. A bill to protect investors in futures contracts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 317. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to require that repurchase-to-maturity transactions be treated as secured borrowings; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 318. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to require any person subject to accounting principles or standards under the securities laws to show all transactions of such person on the balance sheet of such person; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 319. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reduce the limit on the amount of certain contributions which may be made to a candidate with respect to an election for Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 320. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to give members of the United States Capitol Police the option to delay mandatory retirement until age 60; 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 Mrs. COMSTOCK (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ESTY, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. HULTGREN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HILL, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BOST, Mr. EMMER, Ms. BEUTLER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 321. A bill to inspire women to enter the aerospace field, including science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, through mentorship and outreach; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 322. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the termination of certain retirement benefits for Members of Congress, except the right to continue participating in the Thrift Savings Plan, 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. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 323. A bill to amend the Black Lung Benefits Act to provide equity for certain eligible survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 324. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a higher Federal matching rate for increased expenditures under Medicaid for mental and behavioral health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 325. A bill to expand and enhance existing adult day programs for younger people with neurological diseases or conditions (such as multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, traumatic brain injury, or other similar diseases or conditions) to support and improve access to respite services for family caregivers who are taking care of such people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 326. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to create a National Neuromyelitis Optica Consortium to provide grants and coordinate research with respect to the causes of, and risk factors associated with, neuromyelitis optica, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 327. A bill to provide for United States participation in the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 328. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the work opportunity tax credit with respect to the hiring of veterans in the field of renewable energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 329. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for expenses for household and elder care services necessary for gainful employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 330. A bill to prohibit monetary payments by the Federal Government to employees, officers, and elected officials of foreign countries for purposes of bribery, coercion, or any activity that is illegal or undermines the rule of law or corrupts a public officer or the office such officer represents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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 Ms. LEE (for herself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 331. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act so as to exempt real property from civil forfeiture due to medical marijuana-related conduct that is authorized by State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 332. A bill to provide for the issuance of the Peace Corps Semipostal Stamp; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 333. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability rated less than 50 percent to receive concurrent payment of both retired pay and veterans' disability compensation, to extend eligibility for concurrent receipt to chapter 61 disability retirees with less than 20 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 334. A bill to direct the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance for individuals affected by exposure to Agent Orange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and 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. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 335. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide parity among States in the timing of the application of higher Federal Medicaid matching rates for the ACA-expansion population; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 336. A bill to provide transit benefits to Federal employees who use the services of digital transportation companies within the national capital region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 337. A bill to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on 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. RUSH (for himself and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 338. A bill to promote a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. SABLAN:

H.R. 339. A bill to amend Public Law 94-241 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. SERRANO:

H.R. 340. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified manufacturing facility construction costs and to allow a credit against tax for qualified manufacturing facility construction costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 341. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for start-up expenditures for business for 2017 and 2018; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. SANFORD):

H.R. 342. A bill to repeal the provision of law that provides automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress; 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. SIRES:

H.R. 343. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a program enabling communities to better leverage resources to address health, economic development, and conservation concerns through needed investments in parks, recreational areas, facilities, and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Natural Resources, 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 Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 344. A bill to amend the Forest Legacy Program of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 to authorize States to allow certain entities to acquire, hold, and manage conservation easements under the program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 345. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the President, the Vice President, Members of Congress, and other officers of the executive branch from lobbying on behalf of countries designated as countries of particular concern for religious freedom for 10 years after leaving office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 346. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a uniform 5-year post-employment ban on lobbying by former Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 347. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for requirements relating to documentation for major acquisition programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 348. A bill to more accurately identify and transfer subsurface gravel sources originally intended to be made available to the Ukpeagvik Inupiat Corporation in exchange for its relinquishment of related property rights; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.J. Res. 19. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.J. Res. 20. 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 Ms. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should provide, on an annual basis, an amount equal to at least one percent of United States gross domestic product for nonmilitary foreign assistance programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. HARRIS):

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution directing the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a statue commemorating the Hungarian Revolution of 1956 for placement in the United States Capitol, authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony for the presentation of the statue, and directing the Architect of the Capitol to place the statue in a suitable permanent location in the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. KILMER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SIRES, Mr. TONKO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. BASS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. COSTA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BERA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H. Res. 23. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives and reaffirming long-standing United States policy in support of a negotiated two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H. Res. 24. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should not bail out State and local government employee pension plans or other plans that provide post-employment benefits to State and local government retirees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 25. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H. Res. 26. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that restored the original black lung benefits eligibility requirements should not be reduced but should be preserved and protected; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H. Res. 27. A resolution rejecting the ''two-state solution'' as the United States' diplomatic policy objective and calls for the Administration to advocate for a new approach that prioritizes the State of Israel's sovereignty, security, and borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 28. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should take

all appropriate measures to ensure the continuation of door delivery for all business and residential customers; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. LIPINSKI introduced a bill (H.R. 349) for the relief of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, specifically Clauses 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) of such section.

OR

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 2; and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. YOUNG of Iowa:

H.R. 300.

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. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states 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 . . .

Article I; Section 8; Clause 18 of the Constitution states 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. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 302.

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 Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

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. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the United State Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia

By Mr. HUDSON:

H.R. 304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sections 4 and 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 307.

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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—

''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . .''

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 310.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, 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 . . .;'' and

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: ''No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.''

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight, Clause Three ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 3

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 3

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 3

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 4, CLAUSE 1

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1, SECTION 8, CLAUSE 17

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 6, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution: 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. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 8, Section—to provide for the general welfare and to regulate commerce among the states.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 325.

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 Ms. LEE:

H.R. 326.

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 Ms. LEE:

H.R. 327.

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 Ms. LEE:

H.R. 328.

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 Ms. LEE:

H.R. 329.

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 Ms. LEE:

H.R. 330.

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 Ms. LEE:

H.R. 331.

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 Ms. LEE:

H.R. 332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, which says that: ''The Congress shall have the power . . . to establish post offices . . . and 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. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 1: to provide for the common defense and general welfare.

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 12: to raise and support Armies.

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

Art. I, Sect. 8, Clause 16: To provide for organizing, arming, and discipling, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

Art. I, Sect. 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 Statesm or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, which says that: ''The Congress shall have the power . . . to declare war, grant letters of marque and repirsal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water . . . and 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. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 335.

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. MEADOWS:

H.R. 336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all neeful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement ins submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3 and 4 and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. I. Section. 6.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, sectoin 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 & Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

''The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''

''The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes''

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to ''establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.'' The Supreme Court has long found that this provision of the Constitution grants Congress plenary power over immigration policy. As the Court found in Galvan v. Press, 347 U.S. 522, 531 (1954), ''that the formulation of policies [pertaining to the entry of aliens and their right to remain here] is entrusted exclusively to Congress has become about as firmly imbedded in the legislative and judicial tissues of our body politic as any aspect of our government.'' And, as the Court found in Kleindienst v. Mandel, 408 U.S. 753, 766 (1972) (quoting Boutilier v. INS, 387 U.S. 118, 123 (1967)), ''[t]he Court without exception has sustained Congress' 'plenary power to make rules for the admission of aliens and to exclude those who possess those characteristics which Congress has forbidden.'''

By Mr. COHEN:

H.J. Res. 19.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.J. Res. 20.

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 the Year One thousand eight hundred 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.''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 26: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 38: Mrs. LOVE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. BEUTLER, Mr. BOST, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. CHENEY, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 66: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 74: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 79: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BARR, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 99: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 111: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 173: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 184: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota and Mr. CARDENAS.

H.R. 244: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 246: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HARRIS.

H. Res. 11: Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BUCK, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. BEUTLER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. BARR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. MAST, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MESSER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOVE, Ms. FOXX, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. CRIST.

H. Res. 14: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Borough of Metuchen, County of Middlesex, State of NJ, relative to Resolution 2016-261, confirming for the record its support of H.R. 814 and urging the United States House of Representatives and U.S. Senate to enact this important legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2. Also, a petition of Electors of the City of Manitowoc, WI, relative to a resolution, supporting the passage of an amendment to the United States Constitution seeking to reclaim democracy from the expansion of corporate personhood rights and the corrupting influence of unregulated political contributions and spending; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 5, 2017 No. 3

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. 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.

O Lord, as our lips are open in prayer, so may our hearts be open to receive Your Spirit. Help us to bow to Your will and live lives devoted to Your providential leading.

Lord, bless our Senators in their work. Let faith, hope, and love abound in their lives. Help them to seek to heal the hurt in our Nation and world and to be forces for harmony and goodness. Remind them that they will be judged by their fruits and that You require them to be productive and faithful. May they seek to serve rather than be served, following Your example of humility and sacrifice. Open their minds and give them a vision of the unlimited possibilities available to those who trust You as their guide.

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. ROUNDS). The majority leader is recognized.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, ObamaCare was sold to the American people with a lot of promises and a lot of fanfare—speech after speech, promise after promise, splashy PR campaigns, quirky YouTube videos.

But the American people never bought it, and the law never worked out the way it was promised. It opened up big problems and crashed computers on day one. Millions lost their health care plans and the doctors they were promised they could keep. Things only got worse from there. We have all gotten the calls and the letters. We have all seen the pain in our constituents' eyes. We all know how harmful this failed partisan experiment has been for those we represent.

We also understand our united mandate to do something about it.

The American people have hardly been subtle—hardly subtle—in their negative view of ObamaCare. That is borne out in the polling we have seen since the passage of this law 7 years ago. This past November, they again called out to Washington. Please help us, they said. Please get rid of this law that is hurting my family.

About eight in 10 favor changing ObamaCare significantly or replacing it altogether.

My message to the American people is this: We hear you. We hear you. We will act.

It is my sincere hope that Democrats will include themselves in that ''we.''

I hope they will help us bring relief to the American people today and better health care solutions going forward. We want their ideas. We want their input. We value their contributions in the construction of durable, lasting, and effective reforms.

While I am not the kind of guy who believes history takes sides, I know some of our Democratic friends are, and by now, they must surely have concluded that the ObamaCare-or-nothing crowd cannot be anywhere but on the wrong side of history. There is no future with that crowd.

These are the guys who say ObamaCare's innumerable, well documented, clearly apparent problems are just a case of bad PR. They tried to laugh them off, literally. They tried to blame Republicans, blame the media, blame the American people themselves. They have even taken to denying reality altogether.

They say that ObamaCare has been ''wonderful for America.'' They call its implementation ''fabulous.'' Just before the election, President Obama actually said this: ''The parade of horribles the Republicans have talked about haven't happened.'' He really said that. He went further: ''None of what they've said has happened.''

Really? So costs haven't gone up, then? Premiums just skyrocketed by double-digit increases—as high as 50 percent in some places. Deductibles have risen 10 times faster than inflation and nearly 6 times faster than paychecks.

So choice hasn't gone down then? Insurers are fleeing the exchanges, with more than half the country poised to soon have no more than one or two insurers to pick from. Americans are continuing to lose access to doctors and hospitals and health plans they like and were promised. Oh, they were promised they could keep those health care plans.

ObamaCare supporters may not like it, but these are simply the realities of this partisan law.

Now, you will notice they hardly talk about ObamaCare lowering costs or expanding choice anymore. They are down to just one or two talking points now, and even those are slipping away pretty fast. That is because, as Americans have unfortunately learned firsthand, having health insurance under ObamaCare is hardly the same thing as having health care. That is especially true for many who have been forced into Medicaid.

Let's just look at my home State as an example. Kentucky was once held up as a shining jewel of ObamaCare—well, no longer. ObamaCare predictably

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

has become a mess in Kentucky, just as it has across the Nation. That has proved a bit confounding to some of our friends over on the left.

The technical rate of the insured ticked up, they say. So why are so many Kentuckians upset? Why are they upset? Well, when you force Kentuckians into ObamaCare plans that many of their doctors won't accept, what did you think would happen? When you shoehorn folks with modest incomes into a plan with ever-growing premiums and deductibles so high they are afraid to get sick, what do you expect?

In fact, across the Nation, about 4 in 10 adults in ObamaCare aren't even sure they will be able to afford care if they really need it.

ObamaCare isn't truly solving problems or making our country healthier. It is a box-checking regime devoid of true compassion or empathy, a green-eyeshade exercise that misses something important—the lives of real people.

So ObamaCare is making things worse, and we now have a moral imperative to repeal and replace it—to bring relief to families now.

I hope every Member of this body will consider their role in that process because the pain Americans are experiencing is deeply personal. The betrayal middle-class families are feeling is clearly palpable, and, unless we do something soon, Americans will continue to lose their health plans. They will continue to get stuck with insurance that costs more and offers less. Costs will continue to rise unsustainably. Choices will continue to shrink uncontrollably. No amount of ObamaCare happy talk—no amount of it—or reality denial is going to change that.

Some will just never accept the facts, though. They will say we need only to tinker around the edges of ObamaCare. Everything will be fine. Others will try to claim that the failure of ObamaCare is a mandate for even more ObamaCare. They will claim that the solution is actually to move to the kind of fully government-run single-payer system that already collapsed in one of the most leftwing States in the Nation—the same system that 80 percent of voters just rejected in Colorado. Others will say we need only to install a massive new ObamaCare 2.0 system—ObamaCare 2.0—one that is mostly government-run.

We heard a lot of this so-called ''public option'' talk when Democrats thought they were on track to take the Senate and the White House. It was never a serious solution—just another admission of ObamaCare's failure. In the words of one of our Democratic colleagues, it was a distraction as well. Of course, you can't fix ObamaCare by piling on more ObamaCare.

Now, I am sure that won't stop some from trying to convince us otherwise, but even amid the din, traces of reality continue to break through.

Consider what the Clintons said during the election. Former President Clinton called ObamaCare ''the craziest thing in the world.'' That is Bill Clinton.

Secretary Clinton said ''lots of Americans'' have insurance ''too expensive for them to actually use.'' That was the Democratic candidate for President of the United States.

The Democratic Governor of Minnesota said that ''the Affordable Care Act is no longer affordable for increasing numbers of people.''

So reality is beginning to break through. Despite his ObamaCare pep rally yesterday, even the law's namesake hasn't been immune to sporadic admissions of the obvious. President Obama recently admitted that ObamaCare has ''real problems,'' he has bemoaned the human impact of his law as ''premium increases'' and ''lack of competition and choice,'' and admitted that, 7 years after ObamaCare's passage—this is President Barack Obama of ObamaCare—''too many Americans still strain to pay for their physician visits and prescriptions, cover their deductibles, or pay their monthly insurance bills; struggle to navigate a complex, sometimes bewildering system, and remain uninsured.''

That pretty well sums it up. It is an indictment as damning as anything any Republican has said. It is something to keep in mind when you hear the predictable attacks from the far left.

Now, look, we already know their central contention is that Republicans somehow want to go back to the way things were before ObamaCare, which everyone, of course, knows is not true. It is an argument that conveniently leaves out the fact that things are now worse for many than they were before ObamaCare. That is not all we can expect to hear either. We will hear that repeal will cause insurers to flee the exchanges, which, by the way, news flash, is already happening. We will hear that repeal will plunge ObamaCare into a death spiral, which, they might have missed, is here already and fast approaching terminal velocity—the death spiral—right now.

We long warned that ObamaCare would eventually collapse under its own weight. That is exactly what is happening. Democrats chose to rip apart our health care system 7 years ago and give us the chaos we are seeing, and things will only continue to get worse unless we act now.

It is time to finally bring relief. The status quo is simply unsustainable. The reality is, that by any measure, ObamaCare has failed. It didn't deliver on its core promises. It hurt more than it helped. Many are finding they can't even use the insurance they now have.

History will record ObamaCare as a failed partisan experiment, an attack on the American middle class, a lesson to future generations about how not to legislate. Let's be clear. ObamaCare's failure is the fault of ObamaCare and those who forced it on our country, not the American people, not the Republicans. We didn't cause this problem, but we are now determined to provide relief. We are determined to live up to our promise to the American people and repeal this failed law.

Starting today, we will begin repairing the damage by passing the legislative tools necessary to repeal ObamaCare and begin to transition to more sensible health care solutions. We just laid down the ObamaCare repeal budget resolution this week. We will take it up soon, but repeal is only the first step. It clears the path for a replacement that costs less and works better than what we have now. Once repeal is enacted, there will be a stable transition period to a patient-centered health care system that gives Americans access to quality, affordable care.

We plan to take on this challenge in manageable pieces, not with another 2,700-page bill. That was one of ObamaCare's initial mistakes and one we do not intend to repeat. Some of our friends across the aisle have mused publicly about their role in this process. I hope they will work with us. We hardly need another tired slogan from Democratic colleagues—after all, how does that move us ahead—but we do want their ideas, and we do want to work together to improve our health care system. That is the best way forward. That is certainly the way I prefer.

I hope our Democratic colleagues will join us in taking an important step forward soon by confirming TOM PRICE as HHS Secretary and Seema Verma as CMS Administrator. Some of you may remember the ''redtape tower'' we used to wheel around here. It represented the fact that while the ObamaCare bill may have run about 2,700 pages, its regulations run to tens of thousands of pages. That is what PRICE and Verma can get to work on once confirmed, stabilizing the health care market and bringing relief.

It isn't going to be easy. It is going to take time. There will be bumps along the way, but we are going to do everything we can to heal the wounds of ObamaCare and move forward toward real care. We are going to move step-by-step. We want the widest possible coalition working to achieve real solutions for the people who are hurting and calling for our help.

Let's give them that help. Let's give them some hope. Let's leave ObamaCare in the past and work together instead on reforms and outcomes we can all be proud of.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I appreciate the remarks of my colleague the Republican leader. I understand the Republican leader's discomfort. There is a cry from his side to repeal, but it has been 6 years and they have no plan to replace. Repeal without replace leaves 20 million Americans who have had health care in the lurch; leaves college students who are 21 to 26 and have been on their parents' plan in the lurch; leaves women who are now getting equal health care treatment to men in the lurch; and leaves those who have families who have preexisting conditions, and now can get insurance but without ObamaCare couldn't, in the lurch.

I understand the Republican leader's discomfort. Replace is not available because they can't come up with a plan. I appreciate his request to work with us. He has two choices. Our Republican colleagues have two choices: Either, once they repeal, come up with a replacement plan, and we will give it a look—they haven't been able to do it for 6 years; they are squirming right now because they don't have one; they are leaving so many Americans who need health care in the lurch—or don't repeal and come talk to us about how to make some improvements. We are willing to do that.

I will note that yesterday the vote to repeal without replace was totally partisan. My colleagues decried that the vote originally for ACA was partisan. This is equally partisan, and it is going to create huge trouble for our colleagues. Again, I will say to my Republican colleagues, your job is not to name call but to come up with a replacement plan that helps the people who need help—people who are now helped by the ACA but who will be left in the lurch once it is repealed.

CABINET NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have another subject I wish to talk about, and maybe this one will be a little more constructive right now in terms of my Republican leader's response because he and I yesterday had a constructive meeting on the matter of processing the President-elect's nominations to the Cabinet. We are still working out several details, but on this issue I want to express my appreciation for the majority leader's willingness to have a dialogue and work in good faith toward a process both sides of the aisle can live with.

Our caucus thinks it is absolutely essential that the Senate has a chance to appropriately vet the nominees, and the American people deserve to hear their views and qualifications in public hearings, especially for the most powerful Cabinet positions. We all know Cabinet officials have enormous power and influence over the lives of everyday Americans. They run massive government agencies that do the actual work of implementing our laws, keeping our Nation safe from terrorism, protecting the environment and civil rights, promoting clean energy and affordable housing—on and on. Every facet of public life is governed by a very powerful Cabinet official.

It is only right that we in the Senate—and by extension the American people—get to thoroughly vet their baseline acceptability for these jobs. That means getting their financial records to make sure they don't come into public office with standing conflicts of interest, and if potential conflicts of interest are found, making sure they have a plan to divest the assets in question, making sure the FBI has had the time to complete a full background check. It means making sure the independent ethics officers of each agency can sign off on them.

All of these benchmarks are standard protocol. All were done by about this time 8 years ago by the Obama administration. They are not onerous requirements. They are necessary requirements to prevent conflicts of interest.

I remind my colleagues again, every Obama Cabinet nominee had an ethics agreement in before their hearing. Every Obama Cabinet nominee underwent a full FBI background check before the Senate considered their nomination. For such positions of influence in our government, it is the responsibility of the Senate to guarantee that we have all the information we need on each nominee and in a timely fashion.

Truth be told, the slate of nominations selected by President-Elect Trump has made this process—standard for nominees of Presidents of both parties—immensely difficult. There are several nominees who have enormous wealth and own stock of enormous value. We have a CEO of one of the largest oil companies in the world, a billionaire financial services executive financier—oh, and another billionaire financial services executive.

Leaving aside for a moment what that says about the President-elect's priorities for his incoming administration, these nominees have potential conflict of interest challenges of epic proportions. At the very least—at the very least—they owe the American people the standard paperwork, and in fact we believe many of these nominees, given their financial holdings, should go one step further and provide their tax returns.

The minority only has ethics agreements in for four of the nominees so far. We only have financial disclosure forms from four of the nominees so far. We only have tax returns for four of the nominees so far. None of our committees has been notified that any nominees' FBI background check has been fully completed. Briefings have started, but they are far from complete.

As I said earlier, I hope the majority leader and I can work out an arrangement that works for both of our caucuses to process these nominees in a fair but thorough fashion. It certainly shouldn't be the case, as seems to be planned now, that six hearings—several on very important nominees—all occur on the same day and on the same day as a potential vote-arama. That is mostly unprecedented in the modern era of Cabinet considerations, happening only once in history. That is not the standard, but right now that is the case on January 11.

There are Members who sit on multiple committees. One of our Members chairs one of the committees, Judiciary, but has been very active on the Intelligence Committee—both nominees in a single day. That is unfair, not only to her, with her great knowledge, but to the American people. Each member deserves plenty of time to question each nominee, and if questions remain, they should be brought back for a second day of hearings.

After all, they are going to hold incredibly powerful positions for potentially the next 4 years. To spend an extra day or two on each nominee, if it takes a few weeks, several weeks, to get through them all in order to carefully consider their nominations, that is certainly worth it to the American people and, I would argue, to the new administration.

I have made these points to the majority leader, and I must say he has respectfully listened. I am hopeful we can find an agreement that alleviates the crunch and gives Senators and committees the opportunity to process these nominations with the proper care and oversight, with all of the proper paperwork in place, thoughtfully and thoroughly.

I yield the floor.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2017

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The bill 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 assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the pending business in the U.S. Senate is to set the stage procedurally so the Republican majority of 52 to 48 can repeal ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. That is what we are about. That is the business of the day, the week, and probably the weeks to come. So we are addressing that issue and others related to the budget.

I would like to start by sharing a story that was told to me by a family who I represent, Richard and Mary Laidman, who live in Naperville, Illinois. They told me a story, and I will recount it to you.

My 13-year-old son Sam was diagnosed with leukemia one day after the ''no pre-existing conditions exclusions for children''

protection went into effect [under the Affordable Care Act.] The good news is that the form of leukemia has, so far, been effectively controlled by a magic-bullet drug. My son is currently a very robust young man and in otherwise good health (while the drug keeps him alive). The bad news is that the drug, as I understand it, costs [Blue Cross Blue Shield] about $10,000 a MONTH! Without even going into the issue of ''Big Pharma'' pricing—

They wrote—

this means that it would take about $6 million to get my son into his 60's. Obviously we are feeling dependent on all the clauses of the [Affordable Care Act] right now—no preexisting conditions exclusions, no caps on benefits, allowing Sam to stay on our health insurance plan till [he reaches] age 26.

Mr. President, the bottom line according to the Laidman family of Naperville, IL, is that the Affordable Care Act is critical to their family's health and financial survival. That is what this debate is about. It is not about talking about promises made in campaigns or slogans one way or the other. It is about families like the Laidman family in Naperville who understand that were it not for the provisions in the Affordable Care Act, their son might not be here today or they may be penniless.

That is what it was like in the old days. If you had a son with leukemia and wanted to buy a family health insurance plan, good luck. If they would sell it to you, you probably couldn't afford it. And secondly, many policies had limits on how much they would pay. Listen to what she tells us: $10,000 a month just for this drug that keeps her son alive. There were policies that had $100,000 limits on the amount they pay each year. Oh, they were affordable and cheap enough. What would the Laidman family have done if that is all they had to turn to?

Sadly, we know thousands, perhaps millions, of families across America face that. That is why the Affordable Care Act made a difference. That is why it is inconceivable that the Republicans are coming to the floor, saying they want to repeal the Affordable Care Act without any replacement.

They have had 6 years to come up with a better idea, 6 years to come up with a list of improvements, and they have failed and failed miserably. Why? Because it is hard. It is difficult. We found that when we wrote this law.

Let me concede a point to the Republican leader who was on the floor this morning. I am ready to sit down. I think other Democrats are as well. If you want to change and improve the Affordable Care Act to make sure that American families like the Laidmans of Naperville have a chance for these protections in a better situation, I want to be part of it, and I have wanted to be part of it for 6 years. But the Republican approach has been very simple: All we will propose is repeal. We will not come up with an alternative.

It is catching up with them this week in Washington. Have you noticed? Senators on the Republican side of the aisle and even some House Republicans are saying publicly: You know, we really ought to have a replacement.

It is not fair for us to say to America: We're going to repeal the only protection you have. Trust us. Some day in the future we might come up with a better plan.

The atmospherics have changed—maybe even changed with the President-elect. Remember a few weeks ago when he said he thought that provision about the preexisting conditions was a good idea? Well, he is right, and so is the provision to make sure you don't have limits under the policy, the provision that allows the Laidmans to keep their son under their family health insurance plan until he reaches the age of 26.

Yesterday, Mrs. Kellyanne Conway, Senior Advisor to President-Elect Trump, was on a morning show, and she said: ''We don't want anyone who currently has insurance to not have insurance.'' That is a good statement. Then, when she was asked about whether the Republicans should come up with a replacement, she went on to say: ''That would be the ideal situation. Let's see what happens practically.''

Well, I don't know Mrs. Conway, but her observations square with what we feel on this side of the aisle, and more and more Republicans are starting to say publicly that it is irresponsible for us to repeal the Affordable Care Act without an alternative. It invites chaos. We know what is likely to occur. We know that if there is no replacement that is as good or better, people are going to lose their health insurance.

Illinois' uninsured rate has dropped by 49 percent since the Affordable Care Act was passed. A million residents in my State now have health insurance who didn't have it before the Affordable Care Act. Illinois seniors are saving on average $1,000 a piece on their prescription drugs because we closed the doughnut hole in the Affordable Care Act, which the Republicans now want to repeal. More than 90,000 young people in Illinois have been able to stay on their parents' health plan until age 26 under our current health care system, and 4.7 million Illinoisans, such as the Laidman family, no longer have annual or lifetime caps on benefits, and that protects them when there is a sick member of their family and they need it the most. Under our current health care system, 5.6 million Illinoisans with preexisting conditions no longer have to fear denial of coverage or high premiums.

I am going to close with this brief reference. Remember the first thing President-Elect Trump did when he went to visit the State where they were going to keep 800 jobs and not transfer them overseas? He took justifiable pride in the fact that he had jawboned the company into deciding to keep at least some of the jobs in the United States—800 jobs. That is good. America needs companies to make the decision to keep jobs here. We need all the good-paying jobs we can get, particularly in manufacturing. But do you know what the repeal of the Affordable Care Act means to jobs in Illinois? Well, the Illinois Health and Hospital Care Association knows. They told us that it would have a devastating impact on hospitals in Illinois. That includes many rural downstate hospitals, the major employers in their community. They estimate that we would lose between 84,000 and 95,000 jobs with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. We could have a press conference for saving 800 jobs at Carrier, but are they going to have a press conference and celebrate when they are killing 84,000 jobs in Illinois with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act? They shouldn't. They should do the responsible thing.

Let's work together. Let's make the Affordable Care Act better, more affordable. We can do it, but the notion of repealing it first and then promising to get around to a substitute later invites chaos. That is going to make America sick again.

Mr. President, I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first I want to thank Senator DURBIN for his comments about the policy of repealing the Affordable Care Act and not knowing what comes next, the impact it is going to have on people from Illinois. I am going to talk about people in Maryland. I have received similar letters showing that people are going to be adversely impacted.

I want to share with my colleagues the conversation I had with the secretary of health from Maryland. Maryland has Governor Hogan, a Republican Governor, and his secretary of health met with me several weeks ago to express his concerns about the impact on the people of my State of Maryland if the Affordable Care Act were repealed. What I heard from the secretary of health of Maryland was similar to what I heard from many of the health care stakeholders from the hospital association to physician groups, to health care advocates, to ordinary Marylanders who have contacted me about their concerns about what happens if we see a repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Let me just give you some examples of how the Affordable Care Act is working in my State and, as Senator DURBIN indicated, in his State. The uninsured rate in Maryland has dropped from 12.9 percent to 6.6 percent. That is about a 50-percent drop in the uninsured rate. That benefits all Marylanders—all Marylanders. Yes, 400,000 Marylanders now have health coverage who didn't have health coverage before, and for those 400,000, that is a big deal. That means they can see a doctor and get a physical examination. If they are ill, they can get treated and know there are doctors and hospitals that will want to take care of them because they have third-party reimbursement. They

no longer have to show up in emergency rooms because that is the only place they could get to. They can now go to a doctor and get a physical examination.

Mr. President, it benefits more than just those 400,000 Marylanders, who, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, have health coverage. It affects all Marylanders because we no longer have the amount of cost shifting of those who have health insurance paying for those who don't have health insurance because they use the system and don't pay for it. That dislocation has been dramatically changed in my State. So all Marylanders are benefiting from having 400,000 Marylanders who now have health coverage, but it goes beyond that. Many Marylanders who had health insurance didn't have adequate health insurance. They had restrictions on preexisting conditions. They had caps on their policies. It didn't cover preventive health care. They now have quality health coverage.

All of that is at risk. All of that is at risk because of what we are talking about doing, if I understand correctly. Quite frankly, I am still trying to figure out what the Republicans are doing to the Affordable Care Act, but if I understand it, they are going to repeal it, and they are not going to tell us right now how they are going to replace it. So everything that is included in the Affordable Care Act is at risk.

I will give you one more example of costs because I think this is an important point. Under the Affordable Care Act, if an insurance company wants to increase rates more than 10 percent, there are certain procedures they have to go through, certain public disclosures. We have a much more public process, but the number of claims of those who wanted to increase their policies by 10 percent have dropped from 75 percent before the Affordable Care Act to now 14 percent nationally. We have seen one of the lowest growth rates in health care costs in modern history. Yes, the Affordable Care Act has helped us do that. Why? Because individuals who had insurance now have coverage for preventive health care and are saving us money. Those who didn't have health care coverage now have health care coverage, and they are seeing doctors, and they are saving us money because if they have a disease, it is being caught at an earlier stage, being treated in a more aggressive way, and they are saving more intensive health care costs. All that is benefiting the people of Maryland and our country.

Senator DURBIN mentioned several people in his State—a person in his State—and letters. I want to talk about people in Maryland whom I have talked to over the last several years about the impact of the Affordable Care Act and why they are so concerned about the policy now of repealing the Affordable Care Act.

I want to go back to 2007. That is a date that Marylanders know very well. I want to go back to a 12-year-old, Deamonte Driver. Deamonte Driver was a 12-year-old who lived about 10 miles from here. His mom tried to get him to a dentist, but he had no insurance coverage, and she couldn't find a dentist. She couldn't find a dentist who would take care of him. Deamonte Driver needed about $80 of oral health care. He had an abscessed tooth that needed to be removed. It would have cost $80, and he couldn't find care in 2007 in the wealthiest country, in America. As a result, his tooth became abscessed and it went into his brain. He had thousands of dollars of health care costs, and he lost his life. As a result of that incident, I, along with other members of Congress, took up the cause of pediatric dental care to make sure every child in America has access to pediatric dental care. That is included in the Affordable Care Act as an essential health benefit.

Before the Affordable Care Act, very few health policies included pediatric dental; therefore, families were at risk as to whether they would actually use dental services because they did not have the money to pay for them. That was changed under the Affordable Care Act. That is at risk. That is at risk because, if I understand what is being suggested here, we are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act and the essential health benefits. We can't allow any more tragedies like Deamonte Driver in America, and yet we will be putting our children at risk if we repeal the Affordable Care Act.

There was another provision I worked very hard to get into the Affordable Care Act that I think is extremely important. We now have a National Institute of Minority Health and Health Disparities at the National Institutes of Health. We have agencies that deal with minority health and health disparities in all of our health care agencies thanks to the Affordable Care Act. That means we are now acknowledging that historically we have not done right for minority health in America. We looked at a lot of the research dollars; they were not spent in areas that minorities were impacted by. We see that access to care in certain communities is much more challenging because of minority status. We are looking at these issues and taking action.

The Institute sponsored a study in my home city of Baltimore. That study showed that depending on what ZIP Code you live in, your life expectancy could be as different as 30 years—a generation. Just your ZIP Code. We are taking steps to change that in Baltimore thanks to the National Institutes and the Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities. Are the Republicans telling us that is not needed anymore, that we are going to repeal our efforts to look at minority health and health disparities? That is unconscionable. Yet, if I understand correctly, that is the course we are going to follow.

Mental health parity is another area we have talked about at great length here. We know we still have not reached that goal to make sure mental health receives the same attention as any other health need, but in the Affordable Care Act, we did amazing things to expand access to coverage for mental health and drug addiction. By expanding the Medicaid population, we have 1.6 million Americans who now have expanded coverage for mental health and substance abuse.

We have had great discussions in this body. I am very proud of the Cures Act, where we expanded coverage for drug addiction. Now Republicans are talking about taking a major step backward by repealing Medicaid expansion that allows access to coverage for mental health and drug addiction. To me, that is something that is unthinkable. Yet we are moving on that path by the legislation that is before us.

Let me share a letter I received from Lillian from Baltimore. In 2008 she lost her job. She has a history of abnormal mammograms. She could not get coverage. She could not get an insurance company to cover her because of the preexisting concerns. She wrote: The Affordable Care Act has worked. I have coverage.

No preexisting conditions. No longer is being a woman considered a preexisting condition in America. Are we now going to turn our backs on the women of America and allow these discriminatory practices that existed before the Affordable Care Act to come back? I will tell you, I am going to fight to do everything I can to make sure that does not happen, and I would hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle feel the same. But you are marching down a path that puts women at risk, that puts Americans at risk.

We know about the caps that were in the law before the Affordable Care Act. What do I mean by caps? That is the maximum amount your health insurance policy will pay you. Some 2.25 million Marylanders had caps on their policies before the Affordable Care Act—not just the 400,000 new people who have come into the system, 2.25 million Marylanders will be impacted if we eliminate the protection against arbitrary caps.

The tragedy about caps is that when you really need coverage, that is when you are impacted. You get insurance to cover you. You discover you have cancer. It is extremely expensive to treat cancer in an aggressive way. All of a sudden, you are in the middle of treatment and you reach your cap. What do you do? What do you do? There are real, live examples from before we passed the Affordable Care Act. We are going to go back to those days in the United States of America? That is what repealing the Affordable Care Act means for 2.25 million Marylanders who are being put at risk.

Rebecca from Baltimore told me about her daughter Eva, who is 18 months of age and has severe congenital heart defects and has gone

through numerous operations. If caps are in place, she cannot get adequate care for her 18-month-old daughter. Those are real, live examples of people who are impacted by the Affordable Care Act. She also told me: Thank you for the 26-year-old provision where you can stay on your parent's policy. At least she knows Eva will be able to stay on her policy until she is 26.

I heard from Nichole, who is a 22-year-old student at Towson University. She could not get affordable health coverage and was able to stay on her parents' policy. That is an important provision which is being repealed by the Affordable Care Act.

I helped work on the provision in the Affordable Care Act that provides preventive care coverage—immunizations, cancer screening, contraception, no cost sharing. That saves money. Preventive health care saves money. It makes our health care system more cost-effective. That is why we decided to put a focus on preventive health care and expand it dramatically. Now, 2.95 million Marylanders benefit from the preventive health care requirements of the Affordable Care Act that is included in every health policy. That will be repealed, if I understand correctly what the Republicans are attempting to do on their repeal of the Affordable Care Act. We don't have a replacement. We don't know what it is going to look like. It is not easy to figure out how to put the pieces back together again.

There is a provision in the Affordable Act that deals with prevention and public health funds and that provides dollars to deal with some of the real challenges we have out there—obesity, tobacco abuse. My State is getting funds so that we can deal with healthy eating that will not only provide a better quality of life for those who have weight issues but also lead to a more cost-effective health care system. That will be gone with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Let me talk for a moment about health centers because I know we made that a priority in the Affordable Care Act. Qualified health centers are centers that are located in, in many cases, challenging communities where it is hard to get doctors and hospitals to locate. We provide access to care for people who have limited means. The Affordable Care Act did two things that are extremely important in regard to health centers. First, it provided some significant new direct resources for those programs. Secondly, because they are in challenging neighborhoods, they have a much higher number of people who have no health coverage who go into these centers; therefore, their third-party reimbursement is much lower than other health centers that are located in better neighborhoods or more affluent neighborhoods.

The Affordable Care Act has worked in expanding dramatically the capacities of these qualified health centers. We have 18 that are located in Maryland. I could talk about all of them, but I have been to the Greater Baden Medical Services center several times. It is located in Prince George's County. They also have a center in St. Mary's County. I have been to them many times. I have seen their new facilities thanks to the Affordable Care Act. I have seen the building in which they provide mental health services and pediatric dental care and actually adult dental care also. They provide those services to the community thanks to the Affordable Care Act. They told me that in the very first year alone of the Affordable Care Act, they were able to reduce their uninsured rates by 20 percent, meaning they get a lot more money coming in and they can provide many more services. All of that will be gone if the Affordable Care Act is repealed. I can't be silent about that. This center is providing incredible services. It is one thing to have third-party coverage; it is another thing to have access to care. We provided both in the Affordable Care Act. We are not going to go back.

I heard Senator DURBIN talk about Medicare. I just want to underscore this. This is not just about those under 65. It is about our seniors. It is about those on disability who are covered by Medicare.

We heard about the doughnut hole. We all understood. We were getting numerous letters from people who fell into that doughnut hole. Guess what. Those letters are tailing off dramatically. Why? Because the Affordable Care Act closes the doughnut hole for prescription drug coverage. In my own State of Maryland, 80,000 Marylanders benefited in 2014 from the Affordable Care Act and better coverage for prescription drugs, amounting to $82 million, averaging over $1,000 per beneficiary benefit. Those over 65 have better coverage for prescription drugs. You repeal the Affordable Care Act, and all of a sudden seniors figure out they have to pay another thousand dollars a year for prescription drugs. In my State, they don't have the money to do that. You are going to again hear about prescription drugs left on the counter at the pharmacy because of the repeal.

Guess what. It even does more than that. The Affordable Care Act provided greater solvency for the Medicare system. I have heard my Republican colleagues say: We are not going to do anything to hurt Medicare. Repealing the Affordable Care Act hurts Medicare. It hurts the coverage and it hurts the solvency. I don't want to be part of that. I would hope my colleagues don't want to be part of that. Yet repealing the Affordable Care Act does that.

Let me talk for a moment about affordability. It is one thing to have coverage; it is another thing whether you can afford that coverage. We heard all of these stories about the increased premiums, and we know, of course, that insurance premiums in America have gone up at a slower growth rate than they did before the Affordable Care Act. That is a fact. But we do hear about the individual market within the exchanges and how that has gone up by a significant amount, mainly because of the way it was originally rated. We have heard about that. But perhaps what many people don't know is that in my State and around the Nation, 75 percent of the people who qualify for private health insurance within the exchanges are eligible for credits. In other words, we are helping them with the affordability of their health care. In my State, that was $200 million a year to help Marylanders pay for health insurance. That will be gone with the repeal of this Affordable Care Act. That is wrong.

I received many letters from small business owners. One of the proud parts of the Affordable Care Act is that it helped our small business owners. Why? If you ran a small business, you wanted health insurance for your employees because you wanted to keep them well. You were discriminated against before the Affordable Care Act. You didn't have a big pool. God forbid one of your employees gets really sick during the year; your insurance premium goes through the roof. That is what was happening before the passage of the Affordable Care Act. Are we going to go back to the days where we tell small companies: You really can't get health insurance because if someone gets sick, you lose your policies basically. That is what we are talking about.

Annette of Bel Air, MD, wrote to me. She said she has saved significant money as a small business owner as a result of the Affordable Care Act. Tim from Laurel, MD, told me that in his small business, he saved $7,000 a year thanks to the Affordable Care Act. The reason is simple: You have broader pools, and you get the same type of rates larger companies get now. You will lose that with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Let me tell you about one of the tragedies of this that will happen immediately, affecting America's competitiveness and entrepreneur spirit. We know that a lot of people who work for big companies have great ideas, and they want to start out on their own. I have seen that over and over again in the biotech industries of Maryland. I go down the 270 corridor, the 95 corridor. I see small entrepreneurs who used to work for one of the giant defense contractors, and now they are pulling out and coming up with new ideas, doing things in a great way. That is what makes America a great nation. That is how we create jobs and how we deal with innovation.

Here is the situation. You are a 30-something-year-old, ready to leave that company and go out on your own. Your spouse has cancer. What do you do? You are not going to be able to get coverage. You are locked into that job. That will be a consequence of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. We are

dealing with real people and real people's lives. It is irresponsible to repeal the Affordable Care Act and not tell that young entrepreneur what he or she can expect. That is what is at stake.

There is one last point I want to talk about, and that is the Patients' Bill of Rights. I helped draft the Patients' Bill of Rights. It was not easy to pass the Patients' Bill of Rights. We were able to get it in the Affordable Care Act. We were able to get in the right that—you go to an emergency room. Under a prudent layperson standard, you did the right thing. You find out you didn't have that heart attack even though you had chest pains. Then you wake up the next morning and find out your insurance company is not paying the bill because you didn't have that heart attack. We changed that in the Affordable Care Act.

Are we going back, eliminating those protections, the right to appeal decisions or are we going to repeal that part of the Affordable Care Act? Are we going to go back to medical loss ratios, where insurance companies can make obscene profits and not rebate those excess profits to their policyholders when we have millions of people receiving rebates today? All of that is gone with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. President, I could go on and on, but I see my colleague Senator KAINE is here and others who want to speak on this issue.

Let me conclude with this. This is the wrong way to go about this. I heard the leader say that for 6 or 7 years—for 6 or 7 years—Democrats have been trying to work with Republicans to make the law even better.

We have never passed a major law that didn't need to be revisited. We understand that. We have been working to try to improve the law—not repeal it—improve it, build on it, make it better, and we have gotten no help from Republicans, not any help whatsoever.

Republicans have blocked efforts to improve this law. Instead, they are stuck on this repeal without knowing what the replacement is going to be. That is wrong. We should be working together to improve our health care system, but to pass a repeal, to put Americans at risk will lead to uncertainty, which will lead to insurance companies abandoning the market, giving consumers less choice rather than more choice. To hurt millions of Americans is wrong, and I urge my colleagues to reject this approach.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 8, which I send to the desk on behalf of Senator MURPHY, me, and other Senators as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. KAINE] proposes an amendment numbered 8.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit legislation that makes America sick again)

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. DON'T MAKE AMERICA SICK AGAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any legislation that makes America sick again, as described in subsection (b).

(b) LEGISLATION MAKING AMERICA SICK AGAIN.—For purposes of subsection (a), legislation that makes America sick again refers to any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that the Congressional Budget Office determines would—

(1) reduce the number of Americans enrolled in public or private health insurance coverage, as determined based on the March 2016 updated baseline budget projections by the Congressional Budget Office;

(2) increase health insurance premiums or total out-of-pocket health care costs for Americans with private health insurance; or

(3) reduce the scope and scale of benefits covered by private health insurance, as compared to the benefits Americans would have received pursuant to the requirements under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148; 124 Stat. 130) and the amendments made by that title.

(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.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to offer this amendment, amendment No. 8, with Senator MURPHY and other Senators, to the budget resolution we are currently considering, and the purpose of amendment No. 8 would be to create a point of order against considering any legislation that would either strip Americans of health insurance coverage, make health care more expensive, or reduce the quality of health coverage.

Our amendment creates a high hurdle to any legislation that would make America sick again, and basically that is what we are trying to do. If we are going to either strip coverage from people or make health insurance more expensive or reduce the quality of health coverage for Americans that they currently have, we shouldn't make that easy to do. We should have a high hurdle in place so we consider it before we do it.

The point of order is necessary because the entire purpose of this budget resolution is not to really address the budgetary matters facing the country. I say that as a member of the Budget Committee. In fact, the budget process was basically ignored in the last Congress.

This budget is only before us to set up a pathway to pass a fast-track repeal of the Nation's most consequential health care program in decades, a program that affects millions of people and a repeal being fast-tracked that would strip health care from millions of Americans.

I will come back to the health points in a second, but I want to address how we got to where we are on the budget question that was in the province of the Budget Committee.

I think it is a little strange that halfway into Fiscal Year 2017, which began in October 2016, we are going to be setting budget levels now. A budget resolution is a tool to set forth the guidelines for spending in Congress.

We know, in the history of this body, we are not always successful in passing a budget through both Houses of Congress and approving that budget through a conference process, but at least some progress is usually made; for example, both Houses doing their budget resolutions. As you know, that did not happen in 2016. Last year, our GOP counterparts in each House decided, for the first time in the modern budget era, not to hold a hearing on the President's submitted budget, not to have any activity on a budget in the Senate, either in the committee or on the floor.

To begin, I have to ask, if the budget wasn't important enough for us to consider last year, why is it now so important for us to be taking up a budget? The answer is obvious. We are debating a budget for the sole purpose—the sole purpose—of setting in motion a process to repeal health care coverage for tens of millions of Americans. This is really about an attack on people's health care.

I and many of my colleagues have said there is a significant need to make improvements to the Affordable Care Act and, more generally, to our health care system.

Mr. President, you were a chief executive of a State, just like I was. I learned something in my first year as Governor of Virginia, which was, when I looked at all the bills that were put on my desk for signature, amendment, or veto at the end of my State's legislative session, three-quarters of the bills were not new legislation or not repeals of legislation; three-quarters of the bills were improvements of existing law. That is the work of a legislative body. Overwhelmingly, it should be improvements to existing law. The Affordable Care Act needs significant improvement, just as other health care laws do, just as virtually everything we do needs improvement.

There is no reason, while we acknowledge the need for improvement, to repeal a law outright without having a sense of what the replacement will be because, by doing so, what we do is create chaos in the economy, chaos in the health insurance market, and especially chaos in the most intimate and important area of people's lives, their health.

Actually, on that subject, there was a wonderful letter that was sent on January 3 by the American Medical Association to the congressional leadership on

this very point, don't do a repeal that creates chaos for people. I am going to read some sections of the letter.

The AMA supported passage of the Affordable Care Act because it was a significant improvement on the status quo at that time.

We continue to embrace the primary goal of the law to make high-quality, affordable health care coverage accessible to all Americans. We also recognize that the ACA is imperfect, and there are a number of issues that need to be addressed.

Continuing the quote:

It is essential that gains in the number of Americans with health insurance coverage be maintained.

The letter concludes, from the American Medical Association, the largest organization representing American physicians:

Consistent with this core principle, we believe that before any action is taken, through reconciliation or other means, that would potentially alter coverage, policymakers should lay out for the American people, in reasonable detail, what will replace current policies. Patients and other stakeholders should be able to clearly compare current policy to new proposals so they can make informed decisions about whether it represents a step forward in the ongoing process of health reform.

The amendment Senator MURPHY and I propose is designed to accomplish exactly the goal, exactly the goal the AMA has specified in the letter of January 3.

We would create a 60-vote point of order against any legislation that would, first, reduce the number of Americans who are enrolled in public or private health insurance coverage, so there would be a 60-vote point of order against any proposal that would reduce coverage for Americans; second, the point of order would also lie against any plan that would increase health care premiums or total out-of-pocket health care costs for Americans with private health insurance; and, third, the point of order would lie against any proposed plan on the table that would reduce the scope and scale of benefits offered by private health insurance because the ACA was not only about affordable care and it was not only about coverage, it was also about the quality of care.

Could your coverage discriminate against you because you are a woman? Could your coverage expire once you get diagnosed with an illness and now have a preexisting condition?

These bill of rights protections for patients were an important and integral part of the Affordable Care Act, and the budget point of order that we would put on the table would establish a 60-vote threshold for considering any legislation if it triggered one of those three concerns: reduction in coverage, increase in cost, reduction in quality.

The point of order actually goes right to promises that the President-elect has made. In September of 2015, President-elect Trump said:

I am going to take care of everybody. I don't care if it costs me votes or not. Everybody is going to be taken care of much better than they are taken care of now.

He has made a promise to the American public that we will not rush into a new health care chapter that reduces coverage, that reduces quality, or that increases costs.

Just 2 days ago, the key spokesperson for the President-elect Kellyanne Conway said: We don't want anyone who currently has insurance to not have insurance.

She is not setting a threshold of 1 million people or 100,000 people or 10,000 people or 10 people. She is saying the threshold is this: We do not want anyone who has insurance to have that insurance jeopardized by actions of Congress.

This is what a repeal of the Affordable Care Act, without a replacement plan, will mean. It will have three significant consequences, and then I want to finish with some personal stories.

First, a repeal with no replacement will inflict a significant wound on the American economy. Health care is one-sixth of the American economy, one-sixth. You cannot inject uncertainty into one-sixth of the American economy without having significant negative effects on our Nation.

Congress should be in the business of increasing certainty, not increasing uncertainty, and if we go into the biggest sector of the American economy with a repeal, without any replacement strategy, it is the equivalent of, ''I am now going to jump off a cliff and I will figure out how to land once I am in midair.'' This will be economic malpractice to affect that many people.

Second, the effect of the repeal of the Affordable Care Act is sort of an under-the-table tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. Millionaires, if the Affordable Care Act is repealed—there are two taxes on high earners that are part of the financing of the Affordable Care Act, and these taxes on high-earning Americans would expire, and this is hundreds of billions of dollars over 10 years of a tax cut. Millionaires would get 53 percent of the tax cuts from a repeal, which is more than double the same group's share of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts that were done during the Bush administration.

Just to put that in some context, Americans in the top 0.1 percent economically would get an average tax cut of $197,000 if the Affordable Care Act is repealed. That is one way to sort of look at this repeal without a replacement. It is essentially a tax cut for the wealthiest, financed by reductions of health care on the people who are most in need.

Third, the impact that is the most significant is the impact on the health care of average Americans. The Urban Institute did a study in December and said: If there is a repeal with no replacement or a repeal with a delayed replacement to something that we know not what it will be, there will be 30 million Americans who will lose their health insurance. About 20 million will be people who got health insurance under the Affordable Care Act, and an additional 10 million will be people who will lose their insurance because of the chaos created in the insurance market.

I want to put that number, 30 million, into a context because numbers can just sound big and mysterious. Here is what 30 million people is. The number of people who would lose health insurance because of an ACA repeal is equal to the combined population of 19 States: Wyoming, Vermont, North Dakota, Alaska, South Dakota, Delaware, Montana, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Maine, Hawaii, Idaho, Nebraska, West Virginia, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, Kansas, and Arkansas. Nineteen States' combined populations, that is 30 million people, and that is who is going to lose health care coverage if we go forward with a repeal without a replacement.

Eighty-two percent of these 30 million who would become uninsured are working families, 38 percent will be between the ages of 18 and 34, and 56 percent are non-Hispanic Caucasians. Eighty percent of the adults becoming uninsured are people who do not have college degrees. There will be 12.9 million fewer people who have Medicaid or CHIP coverage in 2019 if the repeal goes through. These are some sobering statistics. These statistics show that, at a minimum, what we are doing here is very, very consequential and very, very important and should not be rushed into in a partisan 51-vote budget reconciliation process.

I want to conclude and tell a couple of stories from Virginians of people who are going to be impacted by this. When we essentially recessed in the Senate on December 9—between then and now—I went around the State and talked to people. I heard a story that I want to share, and then I will tell a couple of quick ones.

I met with Ashley Hawkins, a young mother in Richmond, a mother of two kids. We sat around a conference table in a federally chartered community health center in Richmond and talked to stakeholders. Ashley told her story. She had a preexisting health condition. Before the Affordable Care Act, health insurance was unaffordable. After the Affordable Care Act passed, she could suddenly get insurance.

Ashley owns a small business. She runs a nonprofit group that provides community arts education that serves others. Because of the ACA, she has been able to sign up on exchanges and get health insurance. Because of her income, she can receive subsidies to make that health insurance affordable. She makes $45,000 a year.

Without health insurance, the recent hospital bill for the birth of her youngest child would have been close to $16,000. With the Affordable Care Act, she receives a subsidy, and she is able to access high quality health insurance for her and her two kids for $280 a month. That is the difference between

not being able to afford to go to a hospital and deliver a child and to be able to afford, as a small business owner, a health insurance policy that covers her and her two kids for less than $300 a month.

This is what she said as we sat around the table and talked about what it means to have affordable insurance. She said: ''It has to do with self esteem and security and well-being.''

Having health insurance is about security, even when you are not sick. Obviously, when you are sick or when you are delivering a child, health insurance is needed. But when you are a mother of two children, even if you are at the peak of your health and even if your children are at the peak of their health, you would go to bed at night—and Ashley described this—wondering: What will happen tomorrow if my child gets sick? What will happen tomorrow if I am in an accident? Not having health insurance for a parent is a continuous agitating voice in your mind, an anxiety creator, about what is going to happen to my family if we get sick or get in an accident, which is something that happens to virtually every family. It has to do with self-esteem, with security, and with well-being. Without the protection for people with preexisting conditions, without the subsidies in the marketplace, people like Ashley will go back to not being able to afford coverage for their families.

After the Affordable Care Act passed, I happened to be in a position where I was trying to buy health insurance in the open market without an employer subsidy for the first time in my life. When I say I was doing this, what I mean is that my wife was doing all the work because she is the one who does all the work. She talked to two insurance companies who said: Hey, sorry, Anne, we can't afford your entire family because of preexisting conditions. One company would not cover me. One company would not cover one of my children. My wife said: Hold on a second. The Affordable Care Act just passed. You can't turn somebody down on a preexisting condition now.

In each case the insurance company said: I have to talk to my supervisor. They had to call back and say: You are right; we are wrong. We have to provide insurance for your entire family.

Can I tell you this? My family is the healthiest family in the United States. At the time my wife was making those phone calls, of the five of us, the only time any of us had ever been hospitalized was in the three occasions my wife went to the hospital to give birth to our kids. We are a healthy family, and we were turned down twice because of a preexisting condition by insurance companies that had to say: We are wrong, and because of the Affordable Care Act, now we can write a policy for your entire family.

I had a woman write me a letter—a Virginian from Williamsburg—a couple of years ago who said: My husband and I are self-employed, and we could never afford insurance. Because we couldn't afford insurance, we decided that we couldn't have children. We couldn't pay a hospital bill. This is what the Affordable Care Act has meant to them. We often talk about life and death issues in the sense of illnesses, sicknesses, cancer diagnoses, and preexisting medical conditions. They can be life or death issues, but they can also be life issues, in the sense of this couple who wrote and said that because they could now get insurance as self-employed individuals with subsidies to make it affordable, they are now going to start a family because of the Affordable Care Act. They could start a family.

Finally—and I will always remember this because this gives me great motivation—as I was getting outside of my native Virginia and exploring other States on an interesting 105-day summer vacation as part of a national ticket, I went to the Iowa State Fair. I told this story once before on the floor, but I am going to tell it again. A grandfather came up with a little boy in his arms. I said: What is that child's name? Jude. Jude, the patron saint of lost causes. There is St. Jude Children's Research Hospital in Memphis, a place where children have been able to go to get medical care.

I knew there must be a story. I said: Hey, Jude, tell me about Jude. Jude was a 3½-year-old who was diagnosed with a congenital heart defect and by age 3½—as his grandfather told me the story, now mom and dad were coming around me as well—Jude had to have multiple heart operations at the Children's Hospital in Omaha. The grandfather said to me that Jude would not have been able to have those operations and Jude would be uninsurable for the rest of his life if it were not for the Affordable Care Act.

Then Jude's father put his hand on my shoulders. He was a big guy. He said to me: You have to tell me that you will do everything you can to make sure that Jude isn't stripped away and consigned again into the outer reaches of preexisting conditions and uninsurable, with an uncertain future for my son. I made a pledge to him. I said: I am only one person. I don't know what, at the end of the day, I can do, but I can tell you this. I can stand up to make sure that your child and other children—such as Ashley's two kids and the family that wrote me about wanting to have children—will not be left high and dry and without the security of health insurance in the wealthiest and, to my way of thinking, still the most compassionate Nation on the face of this planet.

I encourage every Member of this body to ask their constituents for stories like Ashley's, like Jude's, like my family's, and like the family in Williamsburg about how an ACA repeal with no plan would impact them.

I will go back to the purpose of the amendment. The ACA is not perfect. We ought to be talking about reform. If Republicans want to call it replace and we want to call it reform or improvement, I don't care what we call it. We should have the AMA, hospitals, patients, and Members of Congress from both parties around the table to lay down what are our concern, what are our problems, and talk about how to fix them. There is so much we can do. There is so much we can improve. But by pushing an immediate repeal through a partisan budget process, we won't have the opportunity to work together to build on that common ground.

This is not a game. Sometimes we get into a budget vote-arama, and it has a little bit of a game aspect to it. I have been here until 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. when amendments are put on the table, there are 1-minute presentations of why it is good or bad, and we have a vote. It has a little bit of a feeling of a game. This is not a game. This is life and death.

Is there anything more important to someone than their health, because their health forms the foundation of their relationship with their spouse or their loved ones or their children? Health is what keeps a parent up at night worrying about the family. Health is what keeps a child worrying about an elderly parent. This is the most important thing to any person in this country, regardless of party, regardless of State, regardless of political persuasion. The worst thing we can do on a value of such importance is to rush and create chaos in the lives of millions of people.

So I conclude by saying that the amendment that Senator MURPHY, I, and others offer would seek to protect what we have—protect coverage, protect costs, protect quality—by making it harder to enact legislation that would strip these important items away from tens of millions of Americans.

We should be sitting down at the table to talk about reforms. So many of us want to do that. But we should not be rushing into a repeal that would jeopardize people's lives.

I urge my colleagues to please support amendment No. 8.

Thank you, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be considered time on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the periods of a quorum call, the time be equally divided between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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 legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. 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. MURPHY. Mr. President, what is happening on the floor right now is absolutely extraordinary. It is absolutely extraordinary that Republicans are using the budget process, the reconciliation process, in between the swearing in of the new Congress and the swearing in of a new President, to rip away from 20 million Americans health care insurance, to drive up rates for one-third of consumers in this country who have some form of preexisting condition—a sickness that without this law would make their rates go higher—and to throw the entire health care marketplace into chaos.

It is absolutely exceptional what is happening right now. No one in this body should normalize it. No one outside of this body should perceive this to be just politics as usual.

I was here when the Affordable Care Act passed. I was in the House of Representatives. Since then, I have heard my Republican friends say over and over and over again that they want to repeal the Affordable Care Act and replace it. I can't tell you the hundreds of times I have heard that phrase, ''repeal it and replace it.''

President-Elect Trump talked about that throughout the campaign, and then 2 days after he won the election, on Thursday night, he went on national television to double down on the promise that there would be an immediate replacement. He said: There will not be 2 hours between the Affordable Care Act being repealed and it being replaced with something better.

That is the second part of the argument the Republicans have made. The Affordable Care Act, in their minds, was deficient, despite the fact that there are 20 million people who have insurance today who wouldn't have it otherwise and despite the fact that there are hundreds of millions of Americans across the country who don't have to worry about them and their loved ones having their insurance rates jacked up because they are sick, and despite the fact that seniors are paying thousands of dollars less in prescription drugs than they were.

The Affordable Care Act isn't perfect—it never was—but the enthusiasm of Republicans to take away from Americans their health insurance and to drive rates up for millions more is really unthinkable.

We heard over and over again that the priority was to repeal it and replace it. Now we are repealing the Affordable Care Act with no plan for what comes next. We are driving forward with a repeal vote with no plan for how we keep the health care system together, how we prevent it from falling into chaos, how we continue to insure the millions of Americans who rely on it.

There is a cruelty to this enthusiasm for immediate repeal that is a little bit hard to understand—it is really hard to understand.

I think about somebody like Jonathan Miller. He lives in my State. He lives in Meriden, CT. He was born with cystic fibrosis. He is insured today through the Affordable Care Act. Here is what he said:

> For me, I was able to live a relatively normal life growing up, wonderful family and friends, but health has always been the most important thing in my life. I spend even in a good health year probably one or two hospitalizations each year that require IV antibiotics, I am on a whole suite of medications, each day I take about 15 to 20 medications, some of those are pills, some are breathing treatments, and then there are the shots. Healthcare is the number one priority in my life, it's more important than income, more important than anything else, being able to maintain my health.

He is insured by the Affordable Care Act today, but he also receives the benefit of the insurance protections because Jonathan, without the Affordable Care Act, even if he had insurance, would lose it—probably a couple of months into the year—because of a practice prior to the Affordable Care Act of capping the amount of money you would be covered for in a given year or in a lifetime. Jonathan would have blown through that in a heartbeat.

It is not hyperbole when he says: ''Without the Affordable Care Act, I'd probably be dead within months.''

That is the reality for millions of people across this country. Without health insurance, they cannot survive. They can't afford their medication.

So this isn't just about politics, this isn't just about the words on the page, these are people's lives. This is about life or death, and the casualness of throwing out a law without any concept of what comes next—I have read so many quotes in the paper over the last few days of Republicans admitting they don't know yet what they are going to do in its place, but they still feel the need right now, in the lame-duck session, to begin the process of repealing this law without any concept of what comes next.

Why do it now? Why not take one step back? Why not reach across the aisle to Democrats and say: Let's try to work to make this better. Let's try to answer the concerns the Republicans have, that President-Elect Trump has. Let's take some time to work through this, reform it in a bipartisan way. No. Instead, we are rushing forward with repeal, stealing health care for millions of Americans, plunging the health care system into chaos, with no guarantee that there is anything that is going to emerge in its place.

Senator KAINE and I have a very simple budget point of order. Senator KAINE has talked about it. It would prohibit the consideration of any legislation as part of budget reconciliation that would, No. 1, reduce the number of Americans who are enrolled in health insurance; No. 2, increase premiums or total out-of-pocket costs for those people with private insurance; or, No. 3, reduce the scope and scale of benefits that people have.

I have heard my Republican friends say: We are going to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and we are going to replace it with something better. We are not even committing you to replacing it with something better. We are just saying, if you are going to replace it, let's guarantee now that legislation is not going to take anybody's health care insurance away who has it now who wants it, it is not going to raise costs, and it is not going to reduce benefits.

I am going to be honest. The replacement isn't coming. It is not coming, and even if it comes, it can't meet those three tests. There is no way there is a replacement coming that is going to maintain the 20 million people who have insurance now, that is going to maintain cost controls and maintain benefits. It is not happening.

News flash to the American public: This law is being repealed under a budget reconciliation process that shuts out Democrats, and it is not going to be replaced by something that is equal in quality or better. At the very least, we can all put our names and our votes to a budget point of order that commits Republicans to the promise that they have made for 6 years, which is that if they repeal this, they will not put a piece of legislation before this Congress that doesn't guarantee that everybody keeps their health insurance, costs don't go up, and benefits don't come down.

I urge, when this comes up for a vote, a positive vote from my colleagues, and I urge my Republican friends to honor the promise they have made.

I thank Senator KAINE and others for joining me in offering it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would just say, I had the pleasure of sitting here listening to the Senator from Connecticut talk about his concerns about repealing ObamaCare, and I would say it strikes me that their posture is that we sold the American people a lemon, and we insist they keep it.

Our position is that ObamaCare has been a failure. It has been a grand—in terms of scale—experiment, a national experiment that has failed.

Yesterday I talked about the fact that my constituents are writing me and telling me that their premiums, in many instances, have doubled, and their deductible has gotten to the point that they are effectively self-insured so their insurance does them virtually no good.

We will vote to repeal ObamaCare, but obviously we are not going to leave people hanging out to dry. We are going to make sure they have coverage that they choose and that they can afford. I welcome the assistance of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to try to craft a bipartisan reform.

The biggest failure of ObamaCare was the fact that when our Democratic friends had 60 votes in the Senate and they had President Obama in the White House and a majority in the House, they jammed it down the throats of the American people. That is really why ObamaCare is unsustainable—because it was purely a partisan political exercise. We need to start over by repealing ObamaCare and then reforming our health care system so people can buy the coverage they want at a price they can afford. We are going to work very carefully to make sure the transition is thought out, methodical, and very carefully done.

NOMINATIONS

Soon, Mr. President, we will be considering and confirming men and women nominated by the President-elect to fill leadership roles throughout the administration. This is crucial to ensuring a smooth transition from one President to another, and it is important to make sure the next President has the people and resources he needs to help lead our country.

I have had some of the reporters in the hallway say: How in the world can you process so many nominees at the same time, so quickly?

I said: It is the tyranny of the calendar. We are going to have a new President on January 20, and wouldn't you want—for example, the President's CIA Director choice, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Defense, the head of the Department of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence—wouldn't you want all of those key national security positions filled as soon as possible in case some of our adversaries decide to take advantage of this transition to try to threaten the United States?

It makes sense to me that we would work in an orderly sort of way with our colleagues across the aisle to make this transition a smooth one from President Obama to President Trump. President Obama has said that is what he is working to do, and you would think it would make sense for us to be a part of the solution and not a part of the problem.

Holding up confirmations just for delay's sake is irresponsible and it is dangerous. As I speak, there is a hearing going on on the foreign cyber threats in the Senate Armed Services Committee. People are justifiably concerned about what our adversaries are doing in cyber space. But it is not related to just cyber space, it is related to nuclear threats from countries such as North Korea, obviously the ongoing humanitarian crisis and civil war going on in Syria and elsewhere, the threats from Russia not only in cyber space but also to our NATO allies in Europe, and I could go on and on talking about Iran and its nuclear aspirations, its ballistic missile capability.

This is a dangerous world we are living in, and why in the world would we want to make it even more dangerous just to let our colleagues delay for delay's sake President-Elect Trump getting to fill his Cabinet, particularly these important national security offices? The truth is, when it comes to wanting what is best for America, we are all on the same team. We should all want what is best for our country. It doesn't do our Democratic colleagues a bit of good to delay the inevitable because, thanks to former Democratic leader Harry Reid and the so-called nuclear option that changed the Senate confirmation rules, we know that President-Elect Trump's Cabinet members will be confirmed. It is going to happen because it takes 51 votes. Just delaying for delay's sake out of partisan pique really doesn't do anything to accomplish any goal but, rather, makes our country more dangerous and denies the President-elect the Cabinet he has chosen.

When President-Elect Obama was nominated to office, we acted very quickly. In fact, on the day he was inaugurated—January 20, 2009—seven of his Cabinet members were confirmed. We were not happy about the outcome of the election on this side of the aisle. We wished a different electoral outcome had occurred. But once the voters had spoken, we accepted their verdict, and we worked cooperatively to see a smooth transition from the Bush administration to the Obama administration. I believe it is our duty to do that. Nearly all of President Obama's Cabinet-level nominees were confirmed within the span of 2 weeks. We came together, understood that the people had spoken, and we went to work to cooperate in good faith, not necessarily because we were happy about the outcome but because it is our responsibility to do so.

Then there are some of the statements from some of our colleagues across the aisle that they now appear to be walking away from. In the spring of 2015, Senator STABENOW, the senior Senator from Michigan, said: ''When a President wins an election, they have the right to have their team.'' She said that on April 20, 2015. I hope that not only the Senator from Michigan but her other colleagues remember that position they took then and simply reciprocate in good faith during this transition.

Senator STABENOW is right, by the way. No matter which side you are on, we know that the voters have spoken. As President-elect, he has the authority to surround himself with those he sees fit to advise him and help him as he serves our country.

For some of our colleagues to suggest that keeping the President understaffed is somehow in the best interest of the American people is palpably false. It is ridiculous. I mentioned the national security nominations the President-elect has indicated. One of those first ones was Senator SESSIONS, our colleague here in the Senate, the junior Senator from Alabama, to serve as Attorney General of the United States. The Attorney General is not only the head of the Department of Justice and has an important law enforcement role, the Attorney General also has a very important anti-terrorism national security portfolio as well. So it is very important that people like Senator SESSIONS, the Attorney General nominee, be put in place on a timely basis for the safety of our community.

Talking about the nomination of Attorney General Loretta Lynch not even 2 years ago, the senior Senator from Vermont urged a quick confirmation, saying: ''Confirming the top law enforcement position should be an urgent priority of the Senate.'' And he is right.

As the minority party is now considering the political strategy of obstruction, delay, and stall tactics, what has changed except that your preferred candidate did not win and our preferred candidate did win? That is the only thing that has changed.

Another nominee the Senate will consider is the President-elect's choice to fill the Supreme Court vacancy left by the death of Justice Scalia. Last year, after the death of Justice Scalia, we promised the American people that the next President, whether it was a Republican or a Democrat, would nominate the successor to Justice Scalia. We didn't say we would only vote to confirm a Republican President's nominees; we said that the American people had a right to a voice in who would make that choice, recognizing that the next Justice on the Supreme Court could serve 25 or 30 years.

Here we are 15 days before the President-elect is sworn in to the White House and the minority leader is already threatening to deny the voices and the vote of the American people from last November by blocking any nominee indefinitely.

As shocking as it sounds, on Tuesday night, just hours after the 115th Congress was sworn in, Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, was asked in an interview on MSNBC if he would ''do his best to keep the seat open.'' He answered with one word: ''Absolutely.'' Despite months of calling for a full Supreme Court, all nine members, even using the hashtag ''We need nine,'' the Democratic leader is now threatening indefinite obstruction.

Republicans were clear with the American people: We would respect their voice in whom they wanted to pick the next Supreme Court Justice, whether it was a Democrat or Republican in the White House, and we would move forward with that nominee in the new Congress.

I hope our Democratic friends don't slow-walk President-Elect Trump's nominees. It is one thing to obstruct, but it becomes an even bigger problem when they intentionally try to keep President Trump from doing the job the voters have given him the responsibility to do.

The American people made clear in November that they are done with

business as usual here in Washington, DC. Frankly, I don't think it was a robust endorsement of either one of the political parties. We got an unconventional President-elect, and I think the American people expect him to shake this place up, and I think he will. We intend to work with him to make sure there is a positive outcome for the American people. I don't think they are interested in political stunts or delay for delay's sake, nor do they want us to return to the dysfunctional do-nothing Congress of the past. They want results, and they want a path forward toward a brighter future for themselves and their families.

Let's not keep from President Trump the men and women he has chosen to work alongside him. That would only make us less safe, our economy more fragile, and the government less efficient. After all, we are paying the bills as taxpayers. Why would we want a less efficient or less effective government? In short, it will not serve the interests of the American people well.

I know we are ready on this side of the aisle to roll up our sleeves and get to work. As I have learned through hard experience, the only time anything ever gets accomplished in the Senate is when we work together. I am not talking about people sacrificing their principles. We ought to fight like cats and dogs when it comes to our basic principles. There are a lot of things that are outside of the realm of principles where we can find common ground and work together and build consensus. I think we ought to take advantage of this historic opportunity to do just that, starting with confirming the President's Cabinet and letting them get to work to help his administration as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am going to talk about the resolution we are moving to that will allow us to repeal and begin the replacement for the President's health care plan.

A little over 3 years ago, President Obama hailed the start of the ObamaCare exchanges as a life-changing opportunity for Americans. For most Americans, it was life-changing, but it didn't turn out to be an opportunity. It was a life-changing experience because in many cases the insurance they had was no longer affordable, what they thought met their family's needs was no longer available, and the cost continues to go up.

When President Obama pushed the health care law through Congress without a single Republican vote, he repeatedly assured Americans that they would be able to keep the plans they had, that they would be able to keep the doctors they had, and that every family would have a significant reduction in their health care costs. He continued to make every one of those commitments until the plan actually was put in place and it was obvious those commitments were not going to be what happened. By the end of 2013, at least 4.7 million Americans had their plans canceled because they didn't meet the law's mandatory requirements. Remember, these were plans that 4.7 million people thought met their individual needs, and they could afford those plans. That is why they bought them. They might not have been perfect. They might have still been a stretch on their budget, but they decided: This is insurance I can afford, and it is insurance that meets the needs that I can afford to meet with the insurance I can buy.

The President's claims about everybody being able to keep their policies and keep their doctor were so far from reality that PolitiFact rated it as the lie of the year. I don't like to use that language as it relates to the President of the United States. I would say it must be really easy to become isolated in the Oval Office, and the President may get lots of information that sounds to him as if his plan is working, but the truth is that the President is not entitled to his own facts. He is entitled to his own opinion. He is entitled to his vision of what he thinks health care in America should look like, but he is not entitled to his own facts. If it is not happening the way he thinks it is happening, somebody needs to tell him. But, of course, in just a few days there will be a new President, and we have to deal with the chaos, frankly, that has been created under the old law.

President Obama said this law would mean more choice, more competition, and lower costs for millions of Americans. Nobody can find those Americans. A number of Americans got on Medicaid, another government program, who weren't on Medicaid before. But there aren't millions of Americans who have more choices, and there aren't millions of Americans who have more competition for their business, and there aren't millions of Americans who have lower costs. In fact, just the opposite would be the case in Missouri, where I live. A number of insurers pulled out of the exchange totally. Our neighboring States all have the same experience and, in some cases, even worse experience, but the competition, the choices, just aren't there because the system doesn't work.

We have 115 counties in our State, and in 97 of them, you have one choice; you have one insurer offering insurance. That one insurer may offer three different plans, but there is no competition for whatever level you are shopping for. There is only one place to get that level. This would be as if there is one shoe store in town and none of the shoes fit and they all cost too much, but if you didn't buy the shoes in that shoe store—and the chairman of the Budget Committee knows a lot about shoe stores—you would have to pay a penalty for not buying shoes that were available at that one location. Everybody would think: Well, that is unacceptable; you ought to at least be able to drive to another community and look for shoes. But that is not the case in 97 places, 97 counties. The vast majority of our State and a couple of States have no counties on the individual exchange that have competition. We went from several—every county a year ago in Missouri had at least two companies offering insurance, so there was at least a competitor. Some had more than two companies offering insurance. Now 97 have one company.

The promise was to bend the cost curve. The cost curve bent, but it bent the wrong way. The cost curve went up; it didn't go down. In our State, again, increased premiums have been as high as 40 percent.

In a number of States, they are in the 70-percent category. In one State, there is a 100-percent increase—not from when ObamaCare started but from last year—in places where the cost of insurance for individuals and families had too often already doubled, and now another add-on.

I was with somebody the other day, and I asked them about their insurance. He was a healthy guy in his mid-40s. His wife and two daughters were healthy. I said: What are you doing for insurance?

He said: I am self-employed. In 2009, there were four of us. We had insurance we thought met our needs. We were paying $300 a month. Now we are paying $1,190 a month, and we have a $7,500 deductible. If two of us are sick, we have to submit that deductible twice before we get any assistance from the insurance company—a $15,000 deductible if two people in the family are sick with a $1,190 monthly premium.

This is a family that had no health care problems. This is not a response to somebody who has a policy that they were using. This is a policy that wasn't being used and, of course, with a $7,500 deductible unlikely to be used unless that family really has a catastrophic situation occur. What I believe that family found out a few months after I visited with them was that their policy went up closer to $2,000 than $1,190.

The average deductible for a mid-level plan—there are the gold plan, silver plan, the bronze plan. For the silver plan, the average deductible in the exchange last year was $3,000. The average deductible in the bronze plan was $5,000, and it is higher than that for many people.

To make matters worse, if you aren't able to afford the few options available on the exchange, you pay a penalty. So you have no competition. You are required to buy the product, and if you don't buy the product, there is a penalty. It could have been as much this year as $2,045, but if your option is to pay $15,000 or $20,000 for insurance that has this high deductible, that is what many people have decided to do.

I have heard a lot of Missourians from the day this was initiated through today talking about the individual challenges they have seen. For

example, Dave, a small business owner in Columbia, said that the premiums for his employees have doubled. Why would that be the case? One, the standards necessary for a policy change and, two, if you're losing all this money in the individual marketplace, the insurance companies make that up somewhere. So his premiums have doubled. At the same time, they have continually had to raise deductibles and seriously reduce benefits. The cost goes up and the coverage goes down. I think that is what President Clinton said when he said this is a crazy system. It is costing more all the time and covering less. That is what Dave has found out in his business, and he was told late last year that he should expect a 40-percent increase this year. He said: If that happens another time, we are no longer in the employee-employer provided insurance marketplace.

Another location that serves our State and happens to be headquartered also in Columbia is the Older Americans Transportation System, a not-for-profit. They provide critical transportation services to older Missourians, and they have it other places in the country—older Missourians to low-income people, to underserved parts of our State that don't have other transportation options. The costs to insure their drivers have gone up by half a million dollars. The paperwork to comply with the law's requirements, as the executive director told me, is so complex and cumbersome, they had to spend additional money to hire a consultant to implement a software program to help them keep up with the new mandates. It suddenly got even harder to be a not-for-profit and break even.

Families and small businesses shouldn't be penalized because the law did not live up to its promise: If you like your health care, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Family costs will go down by $2,500 after this plan is put in place. Those things didn't happen.

We are in a chaotic situation now, and it is time to move in a new direction. We will have a bill before us very shortly that will allow us to begin that transition to do things that will prevent Washington from getting in between health care providers and their patients. We will do things that will break down barriers that artificially restrict choice and prevent Americans from picking insurance that meets their family's needs that they can still pay for. What a concept that would be.

This is basically the system we had before. It wasn't a perfect system, and I will say the biggest straw man put forward in that system was that nobody else had any ideas. There were plenty of other ideas, ideas that would better serve American families, American job creators, American job holders, people—plans that would have allowed small businesses to band together and become a bigger group to seek group insurance for a number of businesses instead of just one business's health savings account, better use of health savings accounts, buying across State lines, and things that I proposed specifically on letting your family stay on your insurance a little bit longer. Frankly, that was a 4-page bill that adds 3 million people to insurance every year so you can stay on your family policy until you are 26. There are four pages with a lot of white space. This does not have to be that complicated. There is no cost to taxpayers. Frankly, you are adding young, healthy people, not much cost to anybody but fundamentally no cost to taxpayers. It is just an additional way to look at things like buying insurance across State lines would be. There are solutions here, but we have been prevented from moving to those solutions.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution that will allow us to move forward. We will begin to eliminate the chaos of ObamaCare and restore the focus of health care to patients, people, the doctors they want to have, and the places they want to go to get their health care.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:45 p.m. today, the Senate vote in relation to amendment No. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I want to begin my remarks this morning by taking stock of how the 115th Congress, led by my Republican colleagues, seems to be coming out of the gate. Here is what is coming if the budget process that began this week plays out: 30 million Americans from Portland, OR, to Portland, ME, will be in danger of being kicked off their health care plans; sharply rising health care costs for everybody else, even those who get their insurance through their employer; broken campaign promises about a replacement coming on day one. With this resolution, Republicans in the Congress are building a Trojan horse of tax cuts for the most fortunate in America.

I want to discuss each of those issues this morning, but first let us recognize the bottom line. What is at stake in this debate is whether or not America is going to go back to the dark days when health care was reserved for the healthy and wealthy. For nearly 7 years and through 4 punishing campaigns, Americans have heard and felt the steady, partisan drumbeat of repeal and replace from the other side. Dozens and dozens of show votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act have been held in either Chamber. There have been countless press conferences, speeches, and hearings, even a government shutdown, and the message is always the same. The President-elect himself said that repeal and replace would happen—his words, not mine—simultaneously.

The replacement plan was coming. It would be fully written, ready to plug in—no gap, no harm relevant to anyone in our country. The same words, ''Coming Soon,'' have sat on that marquee for 7 years now. It seems to me it is time to admit that the show will not open. This is a broken promise, plain and simple. Americans are no longer looking at repeal and replace; now it is repeal and run. The consequences will be serious and immediate for tens of millions of Americans, both in access to health care and the bottom line for family budgets across the country. In short, it is a plan that will make America sick again. According to independent analysis, nearly 30 million Americans will lose their health insurance quickly after repeal. The first act of a new Congress: Kicking 30 million people off the insurance rolls—that is seven times the population of my home State.

The overwhelming majority of those 30 million Americans are not wealthy people. They are not in a position to be able to afford to go out and pick an expensive plan once the insurance companies get back in the driver's seat. Millions come from working families who will lose tax cuts for health insurance. Millions of others toil, often working multiple jobs, but still what they bring home is just barely enough to keep them out of poverty.

For many, signing up for Medicaid brought an end to the years when they had to choose between visiting a doctor and putting food on the table. If repeal goes forward, Americans all over the country are going to face that dilemma once again. I think it is important to remember that the danger of repeal does not end with Americans getting kicked off their insurance plans.

Repeal will send costs skyrocketing for everyone across the board, even those Americans who get their insurance through work, including a lot of folks who say the Affordable Care Act has not touched them at all. They are going to get a gut punch, a gut punch with higher premiums and higher out-of-pocket costs. When you kick tens of millions off the insurance rolls and send the markets into chaos, there is going to be a ripple effect. Everyone is going to feel those harmful effects, even those who have had the same plan from a particular employer for years or decades. Rising costs are going to eat into paychecks, crowding out the pay raises that our people need so desperately.

Colleagues, if you are watching this budget debate at home, I am sure you are going to say: Why in the world would any lawmaker go forward with this plan? I am going to go back to what I just said. In my view, this is a Trojan horse of tax cuts for the wealthy and the most fortunate.

When you look at both sides of the ledger, you see how exceptionally unfair this scheme actually is. On one

side, tens of millions of Americans lose insurance and suffer economic pain. That is the typical family. On the other side, there are substantial tax breaks for those at the top of the income scale.

One of the questions I am asked nearly every day in these halls, and I am asked this by many in the press and elsewhere, is whether Democrats are going to take part in this effort and what ideas Democrats would put forward. I want to take just a minute to describe why that question is so off the mark. First, you have to look at the nature of the reconciliation process itself. Budget reconciliation is inherently a partisan exercise. Inherently, it is not a process that brings people together. It is a process that drives people apart. It is inherently partisan.

A typical proposal that comes to the Senate floor is subject to unlimited debate and unlimited amendments. Usually it takes 60 Senators, Members from both parties to come together and pass legislation. It is very rare that a party builds that kind of supermajority on its own, so the two sides have to work together. That is the Senate at its best.

I see my friend, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator ENZI. He and I have served on the Finance Committee. At its best, that is what the Finance Committee has always been about—trying to find common ground, working together to get a proposal that can get 60 votes.

Reconciliation throws those unique characteristics of bringing Senators together; basically, reconciliation just trashes it, throws it out the window. In my view, when you use reconciliation the way it is being used here, you are telling the other party you neither need nor want their votes. It puts a one-sided proposal on the fast track to passage, tight limits on debate and amendments, a bare majority of votes required to actually pass it.

I am very concerned that what is at issue now is a serious misuse of the reconciliation process. This is not a simplified procedure to address a budget issue; this is an effort to ram through repeal and run. Second, this is not your run-of-the-mill congressional debate where you have both sides bringing their best ideas forward to tackle a policy issue.

For years, my Democratic colleagues and I have said that we are ready to work on a bipartisan basis to solve this country's health care challenges. I think I have spent about as much time as anybody in the Senate working to try to find bipartisan solutions to the country's big health challenges. Back in 2008, 2009, we had a bipartisan proposal: seven Democrats, seven Republicans. We had never had that before. I can tell you, we Democrats are ready to work on a bipartisan basis to solve the country's health care challenges.

For me, essentially what I have tried to make my top priority for public service—health care is one-sixth of the American economy. It has always been the issue that Americans care the most about because if you and your loved ones don't have health, nothing else much matters. So we ought to be working on a bipartisan basis to solve the country's health care challenges, finding ways to bring costs down for families, making prescription drugs more affordable, upholding the promise of Medicare, and strengthening its guaranteed benefits.

When I was director of the Gray Panthers at home, a senior citizens group, we always said that Medicare was a promise. It was a promise of guaranteed benefits. We ought to strengthen that promise, particularly updating it to incorporate changes in the program that reflect the needs of the Americans who face chronic health conditions, which is where the vast majority of Medicare dollars are going.

That is what we ought to be doing, upholding the promise of Medicare, working together in a bipartisan way. But that is not what is happening here. From the other side, what we have heard again and again is repeal and replace, dozens of partisan votes producing legislation that burned out in the Senate or met the veto pen.

Now, with a new administration, the Trump administration coming in, the Republicans kick off a procedural scheme that slashes taxes for the most fortunate, raises costs for typical Americans, and takes insurance coverage away from tens of millions of people. No Democrat is going to buy in to that proposition. The reason they won't is that the American people are not going to buy into that proposition.

This scheme is going to bring on a manufactured crisis that does harm to millions of Americans across the land, rocks our health care sector, our providers, our plans—all of those who make up this health care system. One side is pushing it, but the other side is saying: No, let's not create this catastrophe.

That is why, in my view, the questions about Democrats signing on to flawed, bad proposals miss the point. Everyone recognizes that the strict and immovable strategy adopted by the other side 8 years ago paid dividends in elections. But politics is different from governing. Politics is different from governing because there are serious life-and-death consequences to actions that deprive Americans of health insurance. Families are going to feel economic pain when premiums and deductibles jump.

I believe Americans are going to speak out. They are going to rally against an unfair, unbalanced bill that cuts taxes for the most fortunate, while putting insurance companies back again in the driver's seat. What is at stake here is pretty simple; it is whether or not America is going to turn back the clock and go back to those dark days when health care in our Nation was reserved for the healthy and the wealthy.

My colleagues and I say no way. We are going to fight that unfair, imbalanced approach in every way we can.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, time will be charged equally to both sides.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, today I have been listening to the diatribes against the repeal resolution we are working on, and I think some things need to be answered.

The Republicans are not trying to throw 30 million people off of their insurance. What we have seen over the time of ObamaCare is that there were 30 million people who were uninsured when we started that debate, and today there are 30 million people who are uninsured. Now it is a different 30 million people. The 30 million people who couldn't get insurance have insurance, and we want them to have insurance. And the 30 million people who are now off insurance used to have insurance, but they can no longer afford it. There has been a huge increase in the cost of health care. That is not how it was supposed to be. The prices were supposed to come down.

Yesterday we took the first step in fulfilling the promise of repealing ObamaCare, which will pave the way for real health care reforms to strengthen the doctor-patient relationships, expand choices, lower health care costs, and improve access to quality, affordable, innovative health care.

As I discussed yesterday, while Republicans will start by repealing ObamaCare immediately, we will ensure 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 to a new set of reforms, listening carefully to the advice of millions of Americans affected and making sure we proceed wisely, doing no harm.

There is a common misconception that some of my friends across the aisle have promoted. It is the idea that ObamaCare was a success and that repeal will be tearing down a functioning program. That is not true. ObamaCare has put our health insurance markets on the brink of collapse in many parts of the country. And what Republicans face now is an imperative to do something that the Democrats couldn't bring themselves to do when they had control, and that is to fix the problems they created.

ObamaCare became the epitome of a sacred cow for them, and any changes, as you can see, unless done by Executive action, were out of the question.

Interestingly, President Obama recently admitted in October 2016 at Miami Dade College that the law has real problems and that, in his words, ''There are going to be people who are hurt by premium increases or a lack of competition and choice.'' That is the President of the United States talking about ObamaCare. In that same speech, he went on to call these issues ''growing pains.'' I think that is a troubling

blind spot about this law that he and many of my Democratic colleagues share. Millions are facing impossibly high health insurance premiums for plans they may not even want to have. Costs are going up, and they can't afford it. Somehow these casualties of ObamaCare don't deserve relief, apparently; they are just written off as growing pains by the authors of the law.

My colleagues will recall ObamaCare architect Jonathan Gruber, who was paid in a number of different ways, who was famously exposed in 2014 for stating, amongst other things, that while crafting this bill, he believed that ''the lack of transparency is a huge political advantage'' and that it ''was written in a tortured way to make sure the CBO did not score the mandate as taxes.'' Mr. Gruber may have succeeded in masking the consequences of ObamaCare to obtain passage, but there is no way to hide the results.

A recent poll by the Gallup organization showed that more Americans continue to disapprove—53 percent—than approve—42 percent—of the law and that a majority of Americans want to see the law changed. Let me highlight that point again. A majority of Americans want to see ObamaCare either changed or replaced altogether. In fact, since passage of ObamaCare in 2010, there has never been a majority of Americans supporting the law. A quick glance around the Nation quickly explains why. For more and more Americans, there is only a single insurer from which they can select health plans, a monopoly. In fact, on Federal exchanges, one in five consumers will only be able to select plans from a single insurer. Many residents across the country only have one choice of health insurer. That is including my home State of Wyoming as well as the entire State of Alaska.

What does this lack of competition mean? Prices are surging for hardworking families who now have to choose between unreasonable insurance rates or an unreasonable fine. That doesn't even include the deductible problem we have. That doesn't even include the additional taxes and prices people are paying as a result of other things that are built into the law, which I will go into later—not in this speech.

The irony of a Democrat-led effort to help resulting in the creation of a lose-lose proposition for families ran true to voters in the most recent election when they voted for change. In Wyoming, some families would be forced to pay more than 30 percent of their total income on premiums to obtain health care coverage, which often includes deductibles of over $1,000. One family faced premiums of more than $1,600 per month. That is one family, $1,600 a month. As an alternative, their tax penalty for not carrying coverage was only $1,700 for the whole year. So guess what they did. They paid the fine because they couldn't afford the insurance premium. They could also see no way that they were going to be able to get a benefit from that.

For those lucky enough to be able to afford insurance, particularly in the individual market, under the new health law, premiums are expected to increase faster in 2017 than in previous years. Some States will see insurance premiums rise by as much as 53 percent. I think that makes it truly an emergency.

After discussing the why, it is important to talk about how we are going to do this. Passing the repeal resolution we are currently debating today will allow Republicans to use the budget reconciliation process to untangle the country from this unworkable, unpopular, and unaffordable law. This is the exact same procedure congressional Democrats and President Obama used to secure passage of portions of ObamaCare. Let me say that again. This is the exact same procedure congressional Democrats and President Obama used to secure passage of portions of ObamaCare.

After Congress passes this repeal resolution, it can then move forward on reconciliation legislation that will provide for the repeal of ObamaCare and pave the way for real health care reforms. I think Members are looking forward to an open and serious debate about the future of America's health and its health care system and the importance of restoring the trust of hardworking taxpayers. I think that is something both sides can agree on, and that is what will happen.

This resolution we are debating does two things. It recognizes the point in the budget we are at considering the points of order and things that happened up to this point in time. We are just recognizing that is where this budget is. It still keeps in place the points of order to maintain some control over our spending, but the significant part is the repeal part. That is where we institute the reconciliation, and all that is, is an instruction to two committees on the Senate side and two committees on the House side. The two on the Senate side were the Finance Committee—they are the ones who deal with all of the taxes and the finance and the Medicare and the Medicaid, and they need to save $1 billion over 10 years. That is peanuts around here. They will do much better than that, I am certain. And then the HELP Committee—Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions—also has an instruction to save $1 billion. That is it.

This isn't a debate over what the changes are going to be to ObamaCare; this is a debate about whether we are going to give two committees, which have jurisdiction over this situation, the ability to consider it and bring us something. It has to conform with the budget requirements, and that is going to save some money. That is why we have a very low threshold, each of them saving $1 billion. That is the time when we will have the debate on what is happening with health care. If somebody wants to raise the threshold of the $1 billion for each of the two committees, that would be perhaps acceptable—unnecessary but perhaps acceptable. If somebody wants to change the budget, we are going to have an actual chance to change the budget right after we finish this process because there is a budget for 2018. We are already a third of the way through 2017, and there are no spending bills approved. That is wrong, but that is what this budget reflects. That is where we are at this point in time on our spending. Hopefully, we will do well on the new budget and come up with a plan that is going to pull the United States out of the hole that we are in on our deficit spending, which results in huge debt.

I would like to make that distinction. Deficit is our overspending. Debt is the amount that we owe that we have to pay interest on—like pouring money down a hole—and that interest rate is going up. We get to make decisions on about $1 trillion each year, and the interest rate right now spends $200 billion right now by itself—that is at about 1 percent. If it goes to 5 percent, which is the norm for the United States, that would be $1 trillion dollars. That is the amount we get to make decisions on. What shape will our country would be in if we have to spend $1 trillion dollars on interest and that is all we have to make decisions on?

We have to do something. Health care is affecting more people in this country than anything else. So we will start immediately. We normally have a recess that would begin from the time we reorganize until the time the President is sworn in, but Republicans recognize that this is an emergency. This is something that needs to be taken care of. So we are going to stay around and get it solved.

We are going to do the processes we have to do. This is the first of the processes. There is another more important step, which has to be the actual savings part in order to do the reconciliation, and we are going to do that.

We will hear all kinds of stories of ways that people have been helped by health care, and we will hear stories about how people have been hurt by this health care. We need to fix it for both of them.

So I think Members are looking forward to an open and serious debate—I hope, a serious debate—about the future of America's health care system and the importance of restoring the trust of the hardworking taxpayers. I hope that is something we can both agree on.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, time will be charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, in 2010 the American people were promised a number of things, but among

those things was affordable, accessible, and quality health care. They were promised that if they liked their health care plans, if they liked their insurance, they could keep those insurance policies. They were promised a system that could get more folks covered at lower costs.

Instead, unfortunately, the Affordable Care Act has failed us and has failed to keep its promises. Canceled policies, elimination of certain plans, difficulties in identifying new plans, massive premium increases, sky-high deductibles, and limited options for doctors have really become a new standard for many American families.

At the end of last year, I completed another round of 105 townhall meetings in our State. There are 105 counties in Kansas. On occasion—it is pretty rare but on occasion someone will say: The Affordable Care Act was helpful to me and my family. My response to that is: I am glad, but surely we can come up with a proposal—a plan—that isn't so damaging to so many other people for the benefits that you claim you have acquired under the Affordable Care Act. Surely, we can come up with a plan that doesn't increase premiums, increase deductibles, increase copayments, eliminate plans, reduce the choice of the physician you see, and reduce your ability to keep the health care plan that you like. Because I am opposed to the Affordable Care Act does not mean I am opposed to trying to make sure Americans have better options and more affordable care.

I have also visited all 127 hospitals in our State. I have had conversations with the chief financial officer, the CEO, the trustees, the doctors, the nurses, and almost without exception the conversation is about how bad debt expenses increase, the ability for their patients—people who are admitted to the hospital—to pay their bills is less, not more, and that is because they can't afford the copayments and deductibles.

Unfortunately, ObamaCare—the Affordable Care Act—has taken away the freedom to make health care decisions from Americans, from us as individuals, and given way too much authority to the Federal Government. Kansans continue to ask me to help them get back to their former health care plans, to find a better way to do this, a plan that is more affordable with better coverage.

Over the last 6 years, I have advocated for a number of changes to our health care plan to help American families. Even before President Obama was President, we were talking about what we ought to do.

I had ideas of what we could do to improve the chances that people across Kansas and around the country would have a better opportunity to provide health care insurance for themselves and their family members. I am proud of some of the successes we have had in recent time.

I am a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and a supporter of funding for NIH, or the National Institutes of Health. This is research that is essential to saving and improving lives, growing our economy, and maintaining America's role as a global leader, but, most importantly, it saves lives and improves health care. In addition, it saves money—the cost of health care—if we can find the cure and treatment for cancer, for diabetes, for Alzheimer's. One of the ways we can help reduce the cost of health care and make it more affordable is to make certain that we make the necessary investments in finding those cures and treatments.

Last year, I supported, and this Senate and Congress passed, the 21st Century Cures Act. This takes us in additional directions in the way of finding those cures for life-altering diseases and, in the process, helps us to save our families' dollars. We have also worked hard to try to maintain the funding for Federal programs and agencies that work with universities and medical schools to train and recruit medical professionals who then go on to serve particularly in medically underserved areas. It is very typical of your State and mine, Madam President, in which we are experiencing the constant shortage of the necessary professionals to provide the necessary health care.

While this is progress, with a new Congress, a new year, and a new administration, we now have a tremendous opportunity to provide real substantive reform to our health care system. I mentioned the conversations I have had in townhall meetings. In addition to the health care side of the Affordable Care Act and the problems it has created for affordable and accessible health care, we have also had the challenges on the economic side—the job creation side—that the Affordable Care Act has unfortunately caused—the conversation about whether or not to expand a business, whether or not to exceed the 50-employee threshold. Those aspects of the Affordable Care Act are very damaging and need to be addressed and cured as well.

As we as a Senate, we as a Congress, and we as a country look for a replacement strategy, for something different—significantly different than the Affordable Care Act—we ought to focus on the practical reforms that embrace increased flexibility and allow American men and women to decide what is right for them and their individual family health care needs.

As we take this matter up in Congress, I wish to again put forth some specific ideas I have offered over the years as a blueprint for reform that we should try to put in place.

First, we should maintain preexisting condition protections for those with continuous coverage. Individuals with debilitating diseases and chronic conditions who have purchased health care should be reassured that their coverage will not be stripped in any future health care changes to our system.

Second, we can increase coverage by enabling Americans to shop for plans from coast to coast, no matter what State they live in. This will lower the premiums by spurring greater competition in the insurance market.

Third, we should extend tax savings to those who purchase health care coverage, regardless of their employment. To assist low-income Americans, we can offer tax credits to help them obtain the private insurance of their choice. We also can expand access to care by supporting community health centers and other primary care access points.

Fourth, instead of limiting the choice of plans, let's give small businesses and organizations the ability to pool together in order to offer health insurance at lower premiums, similar to corporations and labor unions. We also need to make it possible for health insurance to travel with workers when they move from one job to another job throughout their careers.

Fifth, we ought to increase the incentives available to individuals to save now for their future and for long-term care needs by empowering them to utilize health savings accounts and other incentive plans. Doing so enables individuals to take ownership in their health, and that is important as well.

Sixth, we need not accept the idea that costs for currently available medical treatments will inevitably rise. Instead, let's continue to support those things that bring down the cost of health care by finding cures and treatments, as I mentioned, with the National Institutes of Health. Advancing lifesaving medical research and spurring innovation can help us accomplish health care savings, reducing the financial burden for those with diseases and their family members who care for them.

Seventh, we need to address shortages in our medical workforce by promoting education and programs at our universities and our medical schools that train physicians, nurses, and other health care officials and encourage them to practice in underserved areas through scholarship and loan repayment programs. Kansas is an example, as is your State, Madam President, where those rural areas and, additionally, those core centers of our cities lack so often the necessary health care providers.

Eighth, in order to curb the preventable costs that often occur through unnecessary emergency room visits and untreated symptoms of disease, we should provide coverage to low-income Americans, despite their limited financial means, in a financially sustainable way that ends up saving money in the long run. For all of us, the best reduction in health care costs is wellness, fitness, diet, and nutrition. That also means early preventive care. It means early diagnosis, and we make certain that Americans have access to that diagnosis and that early treatment. Ensuring access to quality care with a focus on preventive health is an effective way to limit high-cost health visits that place burdens on hospitals,

physicians, our economy, and our health care system as a whole.

Lastly, we can reform our medical liability system and reduce frivolous lawsuits that result in inflated premiums and the practice of defensive medicine, where doctors order every possible test out of fear of potential lawsuit. Doing so can save tens of billions of dollars each year and make health care more affordable for more people.

The bureaucracy that goes with the providing of health care needs to be simplified. I have often looked behind the desk when I go see my family physician and wonder what all the people who are working there are doing. So much of it is not about patient care but navigating the system by which your health care bill, at least in part, gets paid. There is all the variety of insurance forms. I know this in my life—the ability to understand that insurance document that arrives in the mail and sits on our kitchen table waiting for my wife or me to figure out what this means. I have seen this with my own parents when they were living—the amount of documents, paperwork, and forms and checks for $13.19 that arrived in my dad's mailbox and trying to figure out with my parents: What does that mean? Why am I getting this?

So much cost savings and so much anxiety and angst could be eliminated if we had a system that was much more uniform in its presentation, simplifying the way in which our health care bill gets paid by our insurance provider, by Medicare, by Medicaid, or out of our own pocket. I would defy most Americans to be able, unfortunately, to understand what is the stuff that comes in the mail and what it means to them.

As we move forward with trying to replace and improve access of Americans to health care—to affordable health care—I believe there are reforms that will provide us with a good blueprint for how to start helping Kansans and all Americans across the country who have suffered under the deficiencies and the costs and the damage that comes from ObamaCare.

I look forward to working with my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats—to find solutions to take advantage of this opportunity that we have. The American people—many American people, most American people—are hurting under this law, and they have spoken clearly numerous times. It is time for us to bring to them the changes that improve their lives by improving their health care, by improving their health, and by making sure that no American is worried about whether or not the necessary health care that they need or their family member needs is outside of their reach.

Mr. CARPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield.

Mr. CARPER. It is great to see my friend from Kansas on the floor and looking forward to serving the next 6 years.

One of the things I focused on as a member of the Finance Committee on the Affordable Care Act was the idea that we have doctors, hospitals, and nurses who in some cases provide entirely too many tests and procedures and so forth that are needed to treat somebody just in order to cover—as Naval aviation used to say—our 6 o'clock. You didn't want to have somebody come up from behind you to shoot you down. So we talked about covering our 6 o'clock. Doctors, hospitals, and nurses spend a lot of time covering the 6 o'clock, as my friend knows.

I am an Ohio State boy. I am going to say something nice about Michigan, which is really out of character here. In Michigan, the University of Michigan Medical School and hospital came up with a policy called Sorry Works. If a doctor, hospital, or nurse made a mistake that adversely affected a patient, they apologized. The idea was to apologize, make up for it, make them whole, help them get well, cover their financial costs and so forth. It is called Sorry Works. It is a good idea.

I met a guy who is a doctor and a lawyer—a Republican—from Illinois who took the idea of Sorry Works and he put it on steroids and they called it Seven Pillars. It has been a great example of what actually works to reduce the incidents of medical mistakes in hospitals and nursing homes and also to get better health care outcomes. You reduce medical malpractice costs, and you also get more satisfaction from the patient side.

We have taken that idea in Delaware—Seven Pillars—at Christiana Care, which is the big health care delivery system in our State. We have taken that and have begun to incorporate it in the way they work. If I am your doctor and you are my patient and I perform a procedure on you, if you are harmed or hurt—not your fault, my fault—the idea is I apologize. I meet with you privately—no lawyers—and apologize for what has happened and try to make you whole. If you lost wages, if you have pain and suffering, they pay your health care costs and make you whole. Don't hide it. Don't put it under the rug but take full acceptance, responsibility. That is one of the approaches being used to try to deal with medical malpractice costs. I think it is a good one. It is not the only good one, but it is one.

I happened to be walking through the Chamber and heard my friend speaking, and I thought I would share that with you, with everyone.

When I was Governor of Delaware, we used to meet with my Cabinet. We would be talking about a particular problem or challenge we faced in Delaware. I would say to my Cabinet: Some other State or some other Governor has actually addressed this issue. They figured out how to deal with this this. Our challenge is to find out what works and do more of that and to see if it can be transferred to Delaware.

Sorry Works is a Michigan idea. It morphed into Seven Pillars in Illinois, and now it is being incorporated in my own little State in our big health care delivery system. It is something that works. I am not sorry that it works. I am glad that it works, and I am happy to share it with my friend from Kansas and whoever else might be interested.

I yield.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the Senator from Delaware, and I appreciate his comments. He did walk in just as I was talking about that particular issue of a series of things that I believe would improve the cost and affordability of health care. I thank the Senator for sharing his experience in Delaware and elsewhere and use that as an opportunity to indicate that the cost savings that comes from that kind of reform is a positive, but we also want to make sure those who, through no fault of their own, are actually harmed are made whole to the best of our ability that this can be accomplished.

Finally, I would use this as an opportunity to point out that this Senate ought to work in a way in which the ideas of all 100 Members are considered in a respectful way as we try to find solutions to the access and affordability of health care.

Again, I thank you for the time on the floor.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, if I could speak through the Chair.

I failed to mention one thing about Sorry Works, Seven Pillars, and what we are doing in Delaware. If we have that meeting between the patient who had been harmed, the physician and provider, and they have the need where there is an apology and an offer to try to make the patient whole—no attorneys involved—if the patient says no, I am not interested in doing that, nothing that is said in that conversation between the two of them can be used in a court of law, which I think is an interesting approach. We are anxious to see how it works over the next couple of years.

Ironically, I was probably the only Democrat—maybe the only member of the Finance Committee—who was trying to get included in the Affordable Care Act provisions dealing with medical malpractice. I had this idea—not to let a thousand flowers bloom or ideas like that—to figure out five or six good ideas and put them on steroids to see if they actually work on a larger scale. I could not get a cosponsor on the other side of the aisle, which blew my mind. It still does. I could never understand that. In the meantime, the ideas are starting to crop up and flourish, and, hopefully, we can find out what works and do more of that.

Thank you.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I would welcome a membership on the Finance Committee, but I don't have one at this stage or with my time in the Senate. Under either circumstance—membership on the Finance Committee or here in the entire Senate—I look forward to working with my friend and colleague, the diligent Senator from Delaware.

I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I hear my Democratic colleagues praising ObamaCare. I had to smile yesterday. I heard a colleague talking about how ObamaCare was addressing high pharmaceutical costs. I had to start laughing—and kind of a bitter laugh. Tell that to a senior who is paying $6,000 for her medicine, which before ObamaCare passed was a fraction of that.

We hear how great it is that ObamaCare has given so many people coverage. Say how great that coverage is to someone who has a $6,000 deductible—a $6,000 deductible—who does not have $400 in her checking account. There is a friend of mine—people don't believe it so I put it on my Facebook page. He got his quote for him and his wife. They are 60 and 61 years of age. Their premium for 1 year was $39,000, each of them with $6,000 deductibles. Again, it is on my Facebook page because otherwise no one would have believed me.

So when people speak about the affordable health care act, I have to laugh. If this is affordable, what would be unaffordable? We can clearly do better than this.

I begin this speech by calling into question my Democratic colleague's defense of ObamaCare, but we can have common ground. I applauded and still applaud the goals of those who support the Affordable Care Act. They wish to have coverage for all. Now, that is important. For over 30 years, I have worked as a physician in a hospital for the uninsured. My medical practice has been geared toward bringing coverage, to bringing care to those who otherwise would not have it.

As I look at this issue, I have to thank them for their motivation but have to recognize that the Affordable Care Act has not achieved that in a way which most Americans find affordable. The other thing about ObamaCare is that it coerces Americans. It takes power from patients and States and gives it to Washington, DC, coercing the individual with mandates and penalties, taking away her right to choose. That is not where the American people wish to be.

I would like to believe Republicans and Democrats can find common ground. I have introduced a replacement plan that would give States the power. I am willing to concede, the minority leader believes that ObamaCare is working just fine in his State of New York. In my plan, we repeal ObamaCare on a Federal level, but if a State like California or New York thinks ObamaCare is working for them, God bless them.

Under my plan, a State legislature would have the right to stay on ObamaCare. So here Congress would pass the legislation giving States the choice, and the State would either have the option we advance, which I think is superior—but when Republicans say that you can keep your health insurance if you wish, and we mean it, we mean it. If a State decided they wished to stay on ObamaCare, they could or if a State truly decides they want to have nothing at all to do with any of this, they can totally opt away from the Medicaid expansion, from any help for others in their State to purchase insurance, period.

I think this recognizes that if the minority leader wants to claim it is working in New York, they can keep it, but clearly ObamaCare is not working in some other States. We can talk about Arizona, where briefly a county did not have a single insurance company providing insurance and where premiums increased by as much as 100 percent. We can look at Louisiana, my State, where that quote I gave earlier—a fellow and his wife, $39,000 for 1 year's premium.

Clearly, ObamaCare markets are failing there. So let's repeal ObamaCare, give the States the power, allowing them to choose the system that will work for them. Now, health care cost is important. Under our bill, we make health care more affordable by giving the patient the choice, the power, if you will, of price transparency. Under ObamaCare, we have seen prices rise out of control. A lack of price transparency keeps providers from having to compete which takes away the consumer's power of choice.

You can see this power of choice price transparency. Fifteen years ago, LASIK surgery cost $1,000 an eye or $875 an eye, with more for astigmatism. Now you can drive down the street and you see a billboard—a billboard—that says: LASIK surgery $275 an eye. So over a period of time, when everything has increased, LASIK surgery has come down—the power of price transparency.

Another example I like to use is of a woman, a physician, went for her mammogram. She wanted to pay cash. They talked her out of it. No. No. No. We don't even know what to charge you.

OK. I won't pay cash.

They billed her insurance company. She later found that if she had paid cash for her mammogram, it would have cost her $90. As it turns out, they billed the insurance company $500. Her deductible was $100. She was actually out $10 because they billed her insurance company. She should have known that price going into it.

One more example. If a doctor orders a CT scan, the cash price, according to an LA Times article a few years ago in the Los Angeles Basin, varied from $250 to $2,500. Unless you are an investigative reporter for the LA Times, able to call up and get that cash price, you otherwise would not know. I guess maybe it sometimes helps to have another example. Would anyone buy a car if they did not know the price of the car beforehand? Yet that is routinely done with health care.

Under the legislation I and Senator COLLINS have introduced in the Senate, and I and PETE SESSIONS have introduced in the House of Representatives, people will know what the cash price is. I have found, working in a hospital for the uninsured, that when you the give the patient the information and power they need to know to make the better decisions, you get better outcomes.

By the way, we have been told that Republicans don't have a plan. The plans I am speaking of now are drafted in legislative language—legislative language, again, that would repeal ObamaCare, put in price transparency, and return decisionmaking power to the patient. We should repeal the individual mandate, repeal the employer mandate, prevent the Federal Government, the long arm of the Federal Government from reaching into someone's household, forcing them to do something they don't wish to do.

There should be an alternative. Under both the World's Greatest Health Care Plan—the bill I introduced with PETE SESSIONS—or the Patient Freedom Act that I have SUSAN COLLINS as a cosponsor, we take all of the money a State would receive had they done the Medicaid expansion and those eligible to be signed up for the ObamaCare exchanges, and we give that money to the State to allow them to give tax credits to those who are eligible.

These tax credits could only be used for health insurance. If the patient did nothing, she would have a health savings account, catastrophic policy with a pharmacy benefit. She could use the health savings account as first-dollar coverage.

Now, under ObamaCare, $6,000 deductible. Under our plan, the patient has first-dollar coverage, so if her daughter has an earache and she takes her daughter to the urgent care center, she can cover that visit with a health savings account that would be funded with this credit. They also have catastrophic major medical coverage, so if they get in that car wreck, take them to the emergency room, sky-high pricing, they are protected from medical bankruptcy.

Under our replacement plan, we also give States the option to say that if someone in our State is eligible, they are automatically enrolled. I smile when I say that covers two populations, the person who may live under a park bench and does not have his life together to otherwise do it, and the other population would be my 22-year-old son and those like him, those young folks who never think they are going to get ill so they never sign up for insurance. Without them being in the pool, we end up with a sicker pool. That is what has happened with ObamaCare.

By the way, it would be easy to imagine you could end up with 95 percent enrollment of those eligible should the State decide to go this way. The timeframe for our replacement would be simple. In year one, say 2017 Congress

passes the enabling legislation, which in year 2018 allows the State to choose between these three options; in 2019, the State would implement the option it chooses; and by the end of 2019, we have made the transition from repeal to replace, to implementation.

Folks ask: Would I lose my coverage? I am a physician. I am going to give my perspective: a patient I might see who has breast cancer. She does not like ObamaCare. She voted for Donald Trump, but she is on the bubble financially. She is not sure she can afford coverage, but she has breast cancer. As bad as ObamaCare is, at least she is getting some care.

Now she is having to put out all this money first, but still she is getting some care. If we keep her in the prism through which we look at this problem so that in the transition from ObamaCare to better coverage she continues to have her therapy, so at the end of this, not only does she have better coverage, but she has health and recovery from breast cancer, we have done our job. That is our Republican goal, to keep our prism as that woman who is vulnerable from a sickness she has now. In our transition, she does not lose coverage; she merely moves to better coverage.

I introduced the Patient Freedom Act with 12 Senate cosponsors in 2015 and then again teamed up with Representative PETE SESSIONS in 2016 to introduce the World's Greatest Health Care Plan. That is truly its name. TOM PRICE, our soon-to-be HHS Secretary, first introduced his Empowering Patients First Act to the House of Representatives in 2014. Speaker PAUL RYAN, Representative FRED UPTON, Senators RICHARD BURR, and ORRIN HATCH have also outlined plans for comprehensive health care reform.

All of these plans create a new system that returns power of choice to patients and to States. Simple provisions as I have described such as health savings accounts, instituting free market values, if we put them into a replacement plan now, we will quickly have an effect upon millions. Republicans have worked hard to lay the groundwork to repeal and replace ObamaCare.

President-elect Trump has said he wants repeal and replace to happen at the same time. He promised both. We should fulfill both promises. Our majority leader has said we can do a better job as Republicans covering more people. We have the principles, the ideas, and the plans ready to go so let's put them to use. We owe it to the American people to carry out that replacement now with a smooth transition so the insured population can grow without anyone losing coverage in the process.

Republicans are committed to creating and passing effective health care legislation to replace ObamaCare and to bring real coverage to all Americans. Now is the time to do so.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today in support of S. Con. Res. 3 and the ongoing effort to repeal the most harmful elements of the so-called Affordable Care Act.

While our friends on the other side of the aisle have been trying to convince the American people that there is nothing to see here and that this poorly named law is working according to plan, the vast majority of our citizens know the truth: ObamaCare just doesn't work.

According to the results of a recent Gallup poll, 80 percent of Americans want Congress to either change the Affordable Care Act significantly or repeal and replace it altogether. Let me repeat that. Eight out of every 10 people in this country agree that the status quo is unacceptable and that we need a major change in what is going on around here.

We need a major course correction in our health care system. It is not hard to see why this is the case. After all, under ObamaCare, the cost of health insurance has increased dramatically and will continue to do so well into the future. Under ObamaCare, individuals and families are being left with fewer and fewer choices when it comes to buying health insurance. Under ObamaCare, patients have fewer options and reduced access to health care providers. Under ObamaCare, the American people have been hit with steep taxes, burdensome mandates, and a health care system that simply does not meet their needs.

This year alone, premiums in the benchmark plan for the ObamaCare exchanges have gone up by an average of 25 percent, and in some parts of the country, the increases have been significantly larger than that. In addition, over the past 2 years, insurance plans have been dropping out of markets all over the country. As a result, it is estimated that more than half of the counties in the United States will have two or fewer available health insurance plans on the exchanges—and that is this year—and about a third of them have only one available option.

I am quite certain that every single Member of this Chamber has heard from a number of their constituents about these problems, about the problems they have faced as the Affordable Care Act has been implemented. I know I have. A number of Utahns have written to me to express their concerns about the increases in their insurance premiums. For example, last month, Austin from Provo, UT, told me that due to the growing cost of his insurance plan, ''I'm going to have to drop the insurance and face the penalty next year. I'm worried because, as a young husband and father, I'm barely making ends meet, and I'm not sure I can afford to pay the penalty for not having insurance.'' Similarly, Eryn from Spanish Fork, UT, noted that because her family's previous insurer dropped out of the Utah marketplace, the remaining plan that best met her family's needs was ''a plan with a small list of in-network providers and no coverage for out-of-network providers.'' She continued, saying that under this new plan, ''We will have a higher deductible ($13,000 for the family), we will have to pay the full cost of any visit to the doctor . . . and we will not be able to save as much money in our Health Savings Account each month because of the high premiums, which add up to $11,000 a year. . . . The premium is basically another mortgage payment for us, only we have no property to show for it. This is too much.''

No family should have to choose between paying their mortgage and paying for their health insurance. Yet, with all of ObamaCare's failures and broken promises, families throughout the country are currently having to make those kinds of choices.

Unfortunately, it does not get any better from here, not without a major change to the status quo. In fact, I think it is safe to say that if we fail to act, the worst is yet to come. Therefore, it is only fitting that we begin this new Congress by repealing ObamaCare and setting the stage for workable reforms that will actually bring down costs, provide more options, and let the American people—and not Washington bureaucrats—make their own health care choices. The budget resolution before us is the first step in this effort.

As we all know, the resolution contains reconciliation instructions to the relevant committees, including the Senate Finance Committee, which I chair, to draft legislation to repeal ObamaCare. So after approving this resolution, the next step will be for the Finance Committee, the HELP Committee, as well as the Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce Committees over in the House, to get to work on putting together a repeal package. This process will be more difficult than it sounds. We don't want to be reckless, and we don't want to inflict more harm on the American people or our health care system; therefore, in addition to repealing ObamaCare, the legislation we draft pursuant to this budget resolution will have to include a stable transition period to give us the time and space we need to provide more sensible reforms.

Under the budget resolution, the legislation to repeal ObamaCare and provide that transition period will need to be reported to the Budget Committee by January 27. Then both the House and Senate will debate the legislation, hopefully passing it by simple majority votes and sending it to the desk of the incoming President. Once we pass this repeal legislation, we will come to the most important step in the process: replacing ObamaCare with a health care system worthy of the American people.

This will not be a simple endeavor. It is going to take a great deal of work, and it will almost certainly require the efforts of people from both parties. The Finance Committee is going to have a

major role to play throughout this process of repealing ObamaCare, providing for a secure transition, and replacing the law with more effective reforms. Our committee has jurisdiction over all the major Federal health programs, including Medicare and Medicaid. In addition, we will have jurisdiction over the tax provisions, which include all of ObamaCare's harmful taxes as well as the premium tax credits provided to purchase plans in the ObamaCare exchanges.

I have spoken at length to my Republican colleagues on the Finance Committee about these issues, and all of them are ready and willing to do whatever is necessary to put our Nation's health care system on a more responsible path. We are going to get it done. In that I have no doubts.

To be sure, the first few steps in this effort are going to happen quickly. Once again, the plan is to produce repeal legislation before the end of this month. This, of course, is how it has to be. The American people don't have the time for us to wait around on these issues, and we don't have the luxury of sitting back and watching the problems get worse over time. The problems facing our health care system are growing by the day. We need to take the swiftest possible action.

We intend to act quickly and methodically to begin providing relief for the millions of Americans who are currently suffering as a result of ObamaCare and the unworkable system it has created. As I noted, if that effort is going to be successful, it should be bipartisan. Both Congress and the incoming administration will need to work together.

CABINET NOMINATIONS

On that point, Madam President, I do want to note that my friends on the other side of the aisle have as recently as this morning made a number of statements and issued several demands with regard to the process for considering and confirming the President-elect's Cabinet nominees. According to my colleagues' statements, they want multiple rounds of hearings on every nominee, which, by the way, is unprecedented. This morning, they even went further, issuing demands that certain preconditions be met before hearings could even be held on a particular nomination. These tactics are, to put it bluntly, preposterous. My colleagues are certainly free to oppose any nominee and to try to convince others to do the same. It is unfortunate that they have decided to go further by politicizing the process by which we consider nominations.

Speaking for the Senate Finance Committee, I have to say that we have an established set of vetting procedures for all executive branch nominees. Republicans and Democrats alike have those particular procedures. That process has been in place for decades and has traditionally been bipartisan.

By all accounts, the Finance Committee's longstanding vetting process is exceptionally thorough and fair, and it is deeply regrettable that some of our colleagues would try to undermine that process and not provide the incoming Trump administration's nominees the same respect and regard our committee has provided for nominees in the Obama administration and prior administrations as well. As chairman, I take this process very seriously. I have made no efforts to abbreviate or short-circuit our procedures for any nominee and have no intention of doing so in the future. I am certain all of our chairmen here in the Senate can say the same thing.

My hope is that my colleagues will stop politicizing this process at every step and allow the Senate to function as it has under both Republican and Democratic administrations. My friends on the other side may not like the results of the recent election, but their disappointment of the outcome is no justification for reinventing the way we do business here in the Senate.

I hope we will all take this into consideration and we will start cooperating with each other and get this government moving again and that we will support and sustain these people who are qualified and good people who are being chosen by the Trump-elect administration. I think it is important that we do these things and do them carefully and that we treat each other with the respect that is well deserved in this body. I hope that the petty, cheap politics will be discontinued.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I enjoyed listening to the comments of my colleague from Utah about the Affordable Care Act, and I wanted to expand on that a little if I could. I know we are having a discussion right now about whether to repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act, and we are focused a lot on what the timeframe might be and what the replacement might be, which is appropriate, but we also have to remind ourselves as to how we got here.

We got here because the Affordable Care Act has not met its promises and has let down the people of Ohio and people around the country. Millions of these families have already had a tough time experiencing really a middle-class squeeze of flat wages, even declining wages, on average, over the last decade or so, and now higher costs. That squeeze is accelerated by the cost of health care which has gone up dramatically.

In my own State of Ohio, the Ohio Department of Insurance has reported a 91-percent increase in the individual market in Ohio in the last 6 years, an 80-percent increase for small businesses that are purchasing Affordable Care Act-compliant plans. This is since the Affordable Care Act went into effect. Think about that. There has been almost a doubling of health care premium costs. Who can afford that? People certainly can't afford that as their wages are flat or even declining.

According to the Kaiser Family Health Foundation, average family premiums since the Affordable Care Act was put into place have increased by more than $4,700. Recall that one of the promises of the Affordable Care Act was that costs would go down, on average, $2,500 per family. Exactly the opposite has happened. In fact, there has been an almost doubling, with a $4,700 increase. I don't think families got that kind of pay increase to be able to afford that. They certainly haven't in Ohio.

So this is a huge problem. To make matters worse, we think these cost increases are continuing to escalate in our State and around the country. In Ohio, premiums grew this year in 2017—on average, 13 percent higher than in 2016. So there have been double-digit increases in 1 year. With two plans in particular, premiums went up by 39 percent in Ohio. So for some families it was much worse than that. We have had good leadership in Ohio with Governor Kasich and Lt. Gov. Mary Taylor, who is also the insurance commissioner in our State, and because of that we have done a better job of trying to control these costs, but in many parts of the country, the situation is getting even worse.

Nationally, premiums are increasing by 25 percent just this year. In Arizona, they are doubling. In Tennessee, they are rising 63 percent. In Pennsylvania, right next door to Ohio, they are rising 32 percent. I can go on and on. I am sure North Dakota has had similar problems, as the Presiding Officer can tell us about. Some people might be able to afford these higher premiums, but I think we just can't afford it.

I heard Senator HATCH talk about having to make a choice between paying your rent or being able to pay your premium. That is what I hear in Ohio as I talk to people who are struggling and are now being hit with these huge expenses. Unless we take action, there is no light at the end of the tunnel.

The Congressional Budget Office, which is a nonpartisan group in Congress, and also the Joint Committee on Taxation projected that unless we do something to change the status quo, premiums will continue to skyrocket. They say they will grow by at least 5 percent per year over the next decade. By the way, that is far faster than they assume wages are going to grow so the squeeze will continue.

The law was advertised as something that would ''bend the cost curve,'' meaning we would begin to see a reduction in the costs of health care, but health care costs have gone up, not down, and on top of that, American people had to pay hundreds of billions of dollars every year in taxes for this new law. There are 19 tax increases in the Affordable Care Act. Some of these, like the Cadillac tax, are very unpopular, even among Democrats and Republicans. So we are hoping we can deal

with that with any kind of repeal effort immediately.

Another goal of this law, we were supposed to be increasing access to health care. Let's talk about that for a second. We heard different things on the floor about that. About 6 million people lost health insurance they liked as a direct result of this law going into effect. About 6 million Americans were told their coverage is no longer adequate because it didn't meet the mandates so they will lose their coverage. President Obama told the American people, I am told, 37 different times that if they liked their doctor, they could keep their doctor. Of course, that turned out not to be true. When you lose your health care plan and lose your doctor, you don't feel like those promises have been kept.

The outside fact checker called PolitiFact rated that as the Lie of the Year for 2013. That is the outside group that looks at what we elected officials say is going to happen and then compares it to what actually happens. By the way, it still is not true. One in five ObamaCare customers were forced to find a new insurance company for this year.

So the Congressional Budget Office that I mentioned and the Joint Committee on Taxation, these nonpartisan groups, now project that 27 million Americans are still uninsured today. Under the status quo, if we don't take action, they say that will be the case for the next decade. So this notion that everybody is going to get covered just hasn't happened. By the way, that is about 1 in 10 people in our workforce, even after hundreds of billions of dollars of taxpayer dollars have been spent on the Affordable Care Act, including these 19 new tax increases.

A lot of people have told me: ROB, I have health insurance, but I really don't because my deductible is so high. So, forgetting the premiums for a second, to pay for health care, just the annual deductible has gone out of sight. There are some plans where a deductible for a family might be $8, $9, $10,000 a year. That is not really health care because you end up paying all that money out of pocket. The average deductible for a midlevel plan for ObamaCare, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation, went up to $2,500 the year before last, 2015, to more than $3,000 last year, an increase of about 25 percent in just 1 year. You see that in increases in deductibles and copays, not just in the premiums.

National insurers have lost billions of dollars on the Affordable Care Act exchanges, and a lot of them pulled their plans from the States. This is a real problem because if you don't have competition or choice out there, you will not get the costs down. I see in my own State of Ohio we lost one-third of the companies on the exchanges just this year. We have gone from 17 companies offering insurance on the exchanges in 2016, last year, to this year having just 11—so 17 companies going down to 11 companies. We now have 20 of our counties—there are 88 counties in Ohio—20 of our counties have only 1 insurer. This is also true nationally. About one-third of the counties around the United States only have one insurer. Again, this leads to higher costs, less choice, less competition. Quality also goes down because you don't have competition for the beneficiaries. It also affects the issue of premiums going up, deductibles going up, copays going up, and the middle-class squeezed.

So the President's health care law certainly failed at its own goals that were laid out in the promises that were made. It was supposed to create jobs, too, which is a different issue. What is the economic effect of this? Having more people covered is a good thing. We all want that. But what is the economic impact on the way the Affordable Care Act was put into place? We are looking at the weakest recovery in the history of our country from a recession still. Unfortunately, we haven't seen the strong economic growth we hoped for and had anticipated after a deep recession. Some of the reason for that, in my view, is health care. Health care costs went up dramatically. People are paying a lot more for health care, not being able to get ahead, small businesses having higher and higher costs.

If you look at the latest jobs report, it is interesting. The Bureau of Labor Statistics tells us that 5.7 million Americans now are stuck in part-time work who want full-time work. These are people who are looking for a full-time job but only have a part-time job. Why is that? The economy is not working as it should. It is not generating enough growth to create job opportunities full-time, but it is also because of these mandates under the Affordable Care Act. I can tell you, economists may differ on the impact of this, but go talk to people about it.

I was in Chillicothe, OH, and someone came up to me and asked: Can you help me; because my employer is saying I can only work 28 hours a week. I figured out what it was about. She was a fast-food employee. I asked her: What did they say? And she said it was because of health care. What does that mean? It means that under ObamaCare, if you work under 30 hours a week, you are not covered by the mandates and the new costs, so some employers are going to say we are keeping you under 30 hours a week. That has led to more part-time work.

In this particular case, the woman said: I have to find another part-time job and I have kids at home and this is tough. And I said: Well, the answer to this, in part, is to change the health care law; that is, to take out some of the mandates and requirements and make it more pro-growth and pro-job rather than the current situation.

There are tens of thousands of new pages of regulations in this new law. It forces small businesses—and I am a small business person. I can tell you that I have burned a lot of time and effort to try to figure it out. You can go to consultants and pay them a bunch of money, and they will tell you they are not sure what it means either. This is one of the big issues that doesn't get talked about much with the Affordable Care Act; that it is really hard for businesses to figure out what they are supposed to do, particularly small businesses that don't have that kind of expertise inhouse. Those costs could go toward having more employees, they could go into reinvesting in business, plants and equipment, but they are going into trying to figure this thing out.

I don't doubt the good intentions of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who support this legislation. We all want to see more coverage and see health care costs go down, but that is not what is happening.

Before the Affordable Care Act went into effect, the CBO estimated that 26 million Americans would be enrolled in a plan in 2016. That is what they estimated. The Congressional Budget Office said 26 million would be enrolled in a plan in 2016. The actual number was 12.7 million, less than half. So, again, it hasn't met its own promises and projections.

The co-ops are another failure. There was a debate on the floor just before I got elected about should there be a public option so everybody would have an option to get into an exchange. We said let's put together these co-ops. They will be nonprofit. They will work great. We will set up co-ops around the country. There were 23 co-ops set up, including 1 in Ohio. We now see that 15 of the 23 co-ops have gone insolvent.

I will tell you that last spring, when 22,000 Ohioans lost their health care because the co-op went belly up, it was tough because they had to scramble and find a new health care plan quickly. More than 860,000 Americans—people who were encouraged by this law to sign up for these co-op plans—had to scramble to find new coverage because of a failed co-op. It is tough on these families.

It is also tough on the taxpayer. We did an investigation of this under the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and we looked at what was happening to these families and we also looked at what was happening to the taxpayer. At that time, when only about half of the co-ops had gone under, rather than two-thirds, $1.2 billion of taxpayer money had already been spent on these co-ops. That money isn't coming back to the Treasury, meaning this is money that will probably never be repaid. Again, part of the problem with our deficit is that ObamaCare and the Affordable Care Act is so expensive, and the co-ops in particular just wasted money. Among the surviving co-ops, 3 have not yet enrolled 25,000 members. In other words, they are not enrolling enough members even if they are surviving. So the nonpartisan Government Accountability

Office, GAO, issued a report in March which confirmed the results of our investigation, and it indicates that this money, the $1.2 billion, has now increased substantially because more of the co-ops have gone under.

Many of those 22,000 Ohio families who were in the co-op had already paid deductibles in the plans they thought they could count on. Think about it. They paid hundreds of thousands of dollars in health care costs to get up to their deductible, and then all of a sudden they found out that they had to go to a new plan and they had to start all over again. So it is adding insult to injury. They lost their plan and they had to scramble to find one and then they found out they have all these out-of-pocket expenses again because although they met their deductible under the old plan, they have to start again in the new plan. This is not the way it ought to be. It is just not fair. These families did nothing wrong. All they did was what they were told to do, to sign up for these co-ops.

I think these are just symptoms of the problem. The diagnosis is clear. The Affordable Care Act is a bad law, bad economics, and bad health care policy. It hasn't worked. I think it is difficult to make the other argument. The President's health care law hasn't worked, not because it didn't have good intentions but because it tried to achieve those good intentions by forcing millions of people to buy a product they didn't want after losing a product they did want, including a $2 billion taxpayer-funded Web site that didn't work. If you recall, they had problems with the Affordable Care Act Web site and unfortunately potentially exposed a lot of personal information of many of these individuals to hackers.

As I talked about, even those who have insurance often have limited access to providers because the deductible is so high that they can't afford their health care.

With higher costs and fewer choices, the American people, by and large, are dissatisfied with the plan, the Affordable Care Act, just as they were when it was enacted. A CBS poll last month has shown that more people disapprove of the law then approve of it. A Gallup poll in November found that 8 in 10 Americans want the law repealed or significantly changed—8 in 10 Americans. Why? Because they have seen it.

By the way, most Americans were not in the exchanges, but they still felt it. Think about this. When a company is involved in the exchanges and losing money, and many of these companies are losing hundreds of billions of dollars a year, what they are doing is they are cost-shifting onto private plans, onto employer-based plans, and raising the costs for other Americans. This is part of the reason health care costs have gone up generally, not just in the exchanges but overall.

I have certainly seen this firsthand in Ohio. Constituents have been contacting me for the last 6 years to tell me how this health care law has affected them. There is a father of five who wrote to me after the cost of the family's insurance doubled. Another man saw his $100 deductible soar to $4,000 while his premiums hit $1,000 a month.

I still remember the letter I received from Dean from Sandusky. He lost his job in 2009 as so many other Americans did during the recession. Because he lost his job, he had to go on the individual market to buy health insurance. He picked out a plan that worked for him and his family. He liked it and he bought it. Once the President's health care law went into effect, that plan was discontinued because it didn't meet the mandates and requirements of the new law. He found himself high and dry. He, too, had to buy another plan that was twice as expensive, and it cost him more than half of his pension—because that is his income. It is his pension. So not only did he lose his job, but then he was saddled with a plan he couldn't afford and a much more expensive cost of living. He didn't do anything wrong, but because of a failed, mistaken approach that Congress took to health care reform, he has now had to struggle to make ends meet.

Susan from Batavia also wrote to me. She is a single mom. She lost the plan she liked because of the President's health care plan. She wrote and said: I stay in shape. I watch my diet. I exercise regularly. I do all the right things. I had a high-deductible, low-cost plan, but under the President's new health care law, I had to change my plan.

Her coverage, by the way, was for double the price of the premium. A single mom; tough to afford it.

Another, Susan from Columbus, OH, wrote to me and told me that she works for a small business of 12 employees. When the health care law went into effect, their rates went up nearly 30 percent in 1 year. Small businesses and new businesses cannot afford that. I cannot tell you how many small businesses I have been to where I asked them: What have your premiums done over the last several years, and they tell me: Double digit, ROB. Double digit. If we get an increase in the low double digit, that is a good thing. Again, there is no place for that to come from except for wages and benefits and cutting back on employees—in some cases, again, not expanding a plan that they otherwise would have because of this health care law.

It doesn't have to be this way. We can enact real health care reform that uses the market forces that help to increase competition, that requires insurance companies to compete for our business, that allows people to get the plan they want, looking all around the country for what works best for them. This burdensome health care law is standing in the way of real reforms right now. It is hurting families in Ohio and across the country.

The health care market was far from perfect before this law so I am not arguing that the status quo is acceptable. I think we have to do things not just to repeal ObamaCare but to replace the Affordable Care Act with reforms that make better sense. We had issues before, but it has gone to worse, not better. It accelerated the problems.

I hope that over the next couple of months, as we talk about this, we will be able to come up with a replacement plan that makes sense. Republicans and Democrats alike need to come to the table on this because, again, I have listed today all the reasons the current law is not working. The status quo is not acceptable. I think it is very hard to argue that it is. That means all of us have a responsibility to say: OK. How do we fix this? How do we come together, Republicans and Democrats alike—not on a partisan basis as was done last time—to figure out a way to do it together? We need to come together to make sure the people we represent have the chance to get the health care they want for them and their families, that fits them, where they can have costs that are affordable, where they can have quality health care that is good for them and their families, where it can be patient-centered, and we can give people the affordable care they deserve.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:45 p.m. there be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided in the usual form, prior to the vote in relation to Kaine amendment No. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 8

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 8, offered by the Senator from Virginia, Mr. KAINE.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I have spoken about this previously. The budget that is on the floor really isn't a budget; it is more of a focused attack on health care for millions of Americans. Amendment No. 8, which I have offered with Senator MURPHY and others, is an attempt to stop the majority from passing a health care repeal through a fast-track process. The amendment does one thing: It creates a budget point of order against any legislation that would either reduce the number of Americans enrolled in public or private health insurance, increase health insurance premiums, or reduce the scope and quality of benefits provided.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, this amendment is corrosive to the privilege of the budget resolution, meaning that it is outside the scope of what is appropriate for a budget resolution. Any inappropriate amendment could be fatal to the privilege of this resolution, which would destroy our efforts to repeal ObamaCare. In other words, a vote in favor of this amendment is a vote against repealing ObamaCare.

In addition, this amendment is not germane to this budget resolution. This budget resolution is much more focused than a typical budget resolution. The Congressional Budget Act requires that the amendment to a budget resolution be germane. Since this amendment does not meet the standard required by budget law, a point of order would lie. As such, I raise a point of order under section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive section 305(b) of that act for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 2 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Harris	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Heitkamp	Sanders
Cantwell	Hirono	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Udall
Donnelly	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—52

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Paul	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 52.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

Who yields time?

If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTION ON ISRAEL

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, in the final days of the Obama administration's second term, with all eyes focused on the President-elect, the temptation to try to take a dramatic action to seal a cherished policy legacy must have been almost irresistible. So it proved for President Obama on December 23, 2016, when he betrayed decades of robust bipartisan American support for Israel at the United Nations by abstaining from a completely biased resolution that condemns our close friend and ally Israel and condemns all the so-called settlement activity, defined as any construction in any territory won by Israel in the Six-Day War.

U.S. policy for decades has been to stand up for Israel at the United Nations, a hot bed of anti-Semitism that discriminately condemns Israel more than any country in the world, particularly when resolutions are being offered up that are outrageously biased, that attempt to predetermine the outcome of negotiations, that prejudge the basis for negotiations, or that try to dictate terms to Israel.

We have seen this pattern of appealing to the United Nations from the Obama administration over and over with disastrous deals—the nuclear deal with the Islamic Republic of Iran, as well as the U.N. Convention on Climate Change, two international agreements that significantly threaten the security and prosperity of the United States. Both of them should have been submitted to this body, the Senate, as treaties.

But the President chose instead to try to impose them through the United Nations because he knew that they would never be ratified by the Senate, even when this Senate had a Democratic majority. So the Obama administration's strategy, instead, has been to curb American power by subjugating our national interests to the globalist agenda of the U.N., a policy that he is now attempting to extend to Israel.

Here are some of the main problems with UNSC Resolution 2334. First, it is an attack on Israeli sovereignty, as it falsely defines as illegal under international law building activity within Israel's own borders, which should be an internal Israeli issue. The historical connection of the Jewish people to the land of Israel did not begin in 1967.

Let us not forget that the Six-Day War was a defensive war fought almost 50 years ago by the Jewish state against the Palestinians and their Arab enablers, who were gathering in a concerted effort to wipe Israel off the map. Against all odds, Israel won quickly and decisively and the map was redrawn to ensure that Israel was not endangered by its own borders, the weakness of which Israel's enemies had attempted to exploit.

Of course, the defeated party, the Palestinians, have not accepted this outcome. Israel has time and again invited them to negotiate a resolution—just one that involves Israel's continued existence as a Jewish state, something that the Palestinian Authority has over and over refused to acknowledge or accept.

Therein lies the bottom line for Israeli security. The pre-1967 lines proved indefensible. So rather than, as the Obama administration, treat them as some sort of gold standard, Israel's security interest has deemed them intolerable and any resolution to this issue should not be dictated by the United States or the United Nations but rather should be negotiated and decided upon directly by the sovereign nation of Israel and by the Palestinians.

Secondly, the resolution falsely claims that Israel's sovereignty over the eastern part of Jerusalem and areas that it controls after the Six-Day War, including Judea and Samaria, are supposedly ''occupied Palestinian territory''. This is nothing short of absurd. What that means is that, under the terms of the United Nations resolution that the Obama administration acquiesced to—indeed, there are considerable reports that the Obama administration, President Obama, and John Kerry actively encouraged and facilitated it—the Jewish Quarter, the Old City of Jerusalem, is illegal and illegitimate and not justifiably a part of Israel. Under the terms of that resolution, the location of holy sites for the Jewish people, including the most important holy site, the Temple Mount, is illegal and illegitimate to be a part of Israel. Under the terms of the resolution, the Western Wall, where Jews from all over the world go to pray, is deemed ''occupied Palestinian territory,'' illegal and illegitimate.

It is more than a little ironic that President Obama went to the Western Wall to place a yarmulke there, pretending to show respect to Israel, and yet his administration, in an outgoing act of contempt, declares the Western Wall not part of the nation of Israel.

This couldn't be further from the truth. It was also an affront to Jews around the world that the resolution was adopted on the eve of Hanukkah. For 8 days, Jews lit candles all over the world to remember the miracle that happened there, and to commemorate the heroic battle fought by the Maccabees that liberated Jerusalem and restored their right to worship freely and the rededication of the Temple in Jerusalem. How ironic it is that on the eve of a celebration liberating Jerusalem and rededicating the Temple in Jerusalem, the Obama administration and the United Nations would declare that Jerusalem and the Temple are not legitimately part of Israel.

How disgraceful—the United States should be not be facilitating the adoption of a resolution that at its core attempts to distort and rewrite recent history as well as the historical connection of the Jewish people to the land of Israel that goes back thousands of years.

Third, the resolution will also help fuel the Palestinian diplomatic, economic, and legal warfare campaign against Israel, particularly because of its provision that calls on states to make a distinction in their dealings with Israel between pre-1967 Israel and Israel beyond the 1967 lines, encouraging boycotts, divestments, and sanctions against Israel and potentially leading to Israelis and Americans being brought in front of the International Criminal Court.

Palestinian leaders are already promising to use this resolution to push the International Criminal Court to launch a formal investigation against Israel.

That was not an unintended consequence of this action. That was precisely the intent of the United Nations and the Obama administration—to facilitate assaults on the nation of Israel.

Yet even after this disgraceful United Nations resolution, it was clear that the administration was not yet done, with Secretary of State John Kerry delivering just days later a truly shameful speech attacking Israel. His speech, very much like Kerry's 2014 remarks likening Israel to an apartheid state, will only enflame rising anti-Semitism in Europe. It will encourage the mullahs, who hate Israel and hate America, and it will further facilitate ''lawfare,'' the growing assaults on Israel through transnational legal fora.

President Obama and John Kerry's actions were designed to secure a legacy, and in that, they have succeeded. History will record and the world will note that Barack Obama and John Kerry are relentless enemies of Israel.

Kerry's speech drew a stunning moral equivalence between our great friend and ally Israel and the Palestinian Authority, which is currently formed by a ''unity'' government with the vicious terrorists of Hamas.

Secretary Kerry declared the Hamas regime and Gaza ''radical'' in the same way that he declared the duly elected Government of Israel ''extreme.'' That moral equivalence is false, and it is a lie.

The IDF, defending the people of Israel, protecting people, and keeping them safe, is not the same moral equivalent of terrorists who strap bombs to their bodies and seek to murder innocent women and children.

Kerry declared the vicious terrorism sponsored by Hamas equal to the Israeli settlements in the West Bank, and he equated Israel's celebration of its birth with the Palestinian description of this event as the ''disaster.''

Unlike Barack Obama and John Kerry, I do not consider the existence and creation of Israel to be a disaster, and the Government of the United States should not be suggesting such a thing.

Kerry's speech attempted to lay out a historic and seismic shift toward the delegitimization of our ally Israel. It is a sign of their radicalism and refusal to defend American interests that Obama and Kerry chose to attack the only inclusive democracy in the Middle East—a strong, steadfast ally of America—while simultaneously turning a blind eye to the Islamic terrorism that grows daily.

Unfortunately, President Obama still has 2 weeks left in his Presidency, and he may not yet be done betraying Israel.

Next week, on Sunday, January 15, France is convening a conference with 70 other nations designed to serve as an extension of the U.N. resolution and the Kerry speech—an all-out assault on Israel. I am deeply concerned that what is decided at this conference will be used to try to further impose parameters or even audaciously to recognize a so-called independent Palestinian state through another Security Council resolution. The Security Council is scheduled to meet on January 17—conveniently, 3 days before Obama and Kerry leave office.

Let me speak a moment to our friends and allies across the globe.

When the President of the United States, when the administration of the United States attempts to encourage you to support their positions in the United Nations, that can be highly persuasive. It has been an arena, a forum that Barack Obama has flourished in, even as he has shown condescension and contempt for the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States.

But to our friends and allies, let me remind you: The Obama administration is coming to an end on January 20. If you desire to continue being a friend to America, if you desire a continued close working relationship with America, then I call upon our allies: Do not join in attacking Israel on January 15 in France or on January 17 at the Security Council.

The new administration—President-Elect Trump—has loudly condemned the U.N. resolution and the Obama administration's complicity in its passage.

I would encourage our friends and allies not even to attend the January 15 conference, or, if they do choose to attend, to oppose and stand up and speak out against any further attempts to attack or undermine or delegitimize America or Israel.

I want to commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for offering resolutions to repudiate this administration for their actions of the last few weeks. It says something when you see Republicans and Democrats in Congress coming together, united to say: This action by the Obama administration is beyond the pale.

Let me underscore again to our friends and allies, to our Ambassadors, to heads of state, to friendships and relationships that we value so much: Listen to the bipartisan consensus of Congress, and do not go along with the bitter, clinging radicalism of the Obama administration, attempting to lash out and strike out at Israel with their last breath in office.

As commendable as these resolutions are, I believe the Senate and the Congress need to go further—that we need to take concrete steps so that there will be repercussions and consequences for the United Nations and the Palestinians for their behavior. That is why I am working with my colleague Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM on introducing legislation, along with other Members of this body, designed to cut the funding to the United Nations—designed to cut U.S. taxpayer funding going to the U.N.—unless and until they repeal this disgraceful anti-Israel resolution.

We know, previously, that one way to get the U.N.'s attention is to cut off their money. We know from the failure of other U.N. organizations to recognize so-called Palestine as a member-state after American tax dollars were withheld from UNESCO for doing so in 2011 that the U.N. over and over values its pocketbook over its leftist values.

However unintentionally, President Obama's misguided foreign policy has led to an unprecedented rapprochement between Israel and America's Arab allies, such as Egypt, Jordan, and the UAE. We have also seen hopeful signs of shifting positions at the United Nations, as countries such as Brazil, Mexico, Italy, and Australia have recently signaled that they may no longer vote reflexively in favor of the Palestinians.

Great Britain, although it voted for the resolution, has recently demonstrated an unprecedented degree of support for the Jewish state.

These changes represent a significant opportunity for the United States to bolster one of our most important allies, an opportunity we can preserve for the President-elect by not letting Mr. Obama squander it on the way out the door.

America should be leading the charge at the United Nations and around the world to rally burgeoning support for Israel, not trying to stab the Jewish state in the back.

Just over a week ago, I spoke with Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu. I told the Prime Minister that, despite the disgraceful actions of the United Nations, America stands resolutely with the nation of Israel, that the American people stand with Israel, and that I believe there is a very real possibility that the extreme and radical actions of Obama and Kerry will, in fact, backfire.

It is not accidental that they waited until after the election to do this. They could have tried to do that this summer, but Obama and Kerry knew well that the American people do not support their attempting to attack Israel. So they waited until after the election.

They waited until they were on their way out the door.

Kerry, in his speech, said Israel cannot be both democratic and Jewish—one or the other, but not both.

This is an inanity that is deemed profound only in Marxist faculty lounges.

Israel is Jewish, it is democratic, and it is and should remain both. I believe that by revealing just how extreme they are, by removing the fake mask of support for Israel that Obama and Kerry have chosen to do in the last several weeks, it will help to galvanize support in this body and across the world for our friend and ally, the nation of Israel.

Israel is not only our friend and ally, but it is a partner of the United States. That alliance benefits the vital national security interest of America. Israel's military benefits the national security of the United States of America. The Israeli intelligence services benefit the United States of America. Israel's steadfastness against radical Islamic terrorism, which has declared war on both Israel and America, benefits the national security interests of this country.

It is Israel—the thriving, one and only Jewish state—that stands on the frontlines for America and, more broadly, Western civilization against the global threats we face. Our commitment to Israel must be restored and strengthened. I look forward to taking action with my colleagues—I hope on both sides of the aisle—in the near future to repudiate Obama's shameful attack on Israel, to repudiate the United Nations' efforts to undermine Israel, and to reaffirm America's strong and unshakable friendship and support for the nation of Israel.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1 and ask unanimous consent that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for Mr. PAUL, proposes an amendment numbered 1.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of January 4, 2017, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, with the permission of the chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, would the Senator mind if it comes off of the resolution time?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this is the 152nd time I have come to the floor for my ''Time to Wake Up'' speech, warning about the perilous effects of climate change. I am going to continue this in the new Congress, continuing to present the latest and most compelling scientific evidence of the changes that are coming our way driven by carbon pollution.

Nobody should take my word for it. I urge my colleagues to listen to their own home State's climatologists, their own home State's university researchers, their own home State's public health officials, and their own constituents who are out there fighting to protect their communities from the changes that are already happening right before their eyes.

In Rhode Island, we have a lot of fishermen, just as Louisiana has, Mr. President. The president of the Rhode Island Commercial Fishermen's Association is Chris Brown. Just this past week, he was the subject of a New York Times article. ''Climate change is going to make it hard on some of those species that are not particularly fond of warm or warming waters,'' he told the Times. ''We used to come right here''—where he was on his boat, *The Proud Mary*—''and catch two, three, four thousand pounds a day, sometimes 10.'' But the whiting, the fish he was after, have moved north to cooler waters.

The Times reports that two-thirds of marine species off the northeast coast have moved from their traditional ranges into deeper and cooler water.

John Manderson is a biologist at NOAA's northeast fisheries science center, and he told the Times in that article that public policy needs to keep pace with the rapidly changing oceans, where species are shifting northward in response to warming 10 times as quickly as they do on the land. ''Our ideas of property rights and laws are purely land-based,'' he said, ''but the ocean is all about flux and turbulence and movement.''

In Rhode Island, fishermen are getting clobbered by that flux.

Captain Dave Monti is a member of the Rhode Island Marine Fisheries Council. He wrote in the Providence Journal this week:

> I often think about the fish and how important it is to grow them to abundance so there are more fish for all to catch and eat. . . . In 2017 we need a fish-first agenda, or someday there may be no fish left to catch. Climate change, acidification, overfishing by world nations, and changing federal strategies could make it the worst of times for fish in 2017. . . . We need to make an effort to understand what is happening to the environment and the fish, and then take that second step of communicating it to others to affect policy.

That is what I am being asked.

The Providence Journal also recently wrote about how in Rhode Island the sea is moving higher and farther inland, as it is in Louisiana, which is the State losing ground fastest to the ocean of all the 50. They reported on StormTools, a program developed by Rhode Island's Coastal Resources Management Council director Grover Fugate and University of Rhode Island emeritus professor of ocean engineering Malcolm Spaulding. StormTools provides 3D maps of the potential flooding damage along Rhode Island's coast. The Journal described the project as ''one of the most sophisticated models developed anywhere to project future damage from storm surges and sea level rise.'' And we are taking the results seriously.

The Journal quoted William DePasquale, who is the director of planning in one of our cities, Warwick, RI. He said, ''When I saw some of those scenarios, my jaw hit the ground.'' That is what we are looking at, and Warwick is now using those maps to prepare for the future.

The Providence Journal has also recently written about Matunuck Beach in South Kingstown. Town manager Stephen Alfred warns that if the sea takes out Matunuck Beach Road, 240 homes will be totally cut off, without a water supply or access to emergency services.

The article features Kevin Finnegan, who owns the Ocean Mist, a renowned local establishment. The Journal said:

> The Ocean Mist has occupied the same spot under different names since Prohibition ended in 1933. But the ocean has moved. Where once beach bathers had to plan a trek across sand to reach the water from the Mist, waves now flood the supports holding up the tavern's deck.

Finnegan and the town of North Kingstown are scrambling to build seawalls. Engineer Bill Ladd, who works for Finnegan and who the Providence Journal reports had his first beer at the Ocean Mist back when the drinking age was 18, estimates that the two walls may only buy Matunuck Beach 20 or 30 more years against the oncoming ocean. That is because, as The Independent—a local newspaper in the southern part of Rhode Island—reported in December, about 4 feet of Matunuck Beach is eroding every year. According to Director Fugate of the CRMC, that erosion will more than double by the end of the century. Rhode Island is not a big State. We cannot afford to have this much reclaimed by the ocean.

The Independent article quotes North Kingstown Town Council president Kerry McKay, who says that climate change threatens the property values of his community's coastal homes, which is a significant portion of the town's revenue base.

> He said historical values ''will have to change'' as coastal concerns rise, and residents ''have to be more receptive'' to redoing building infrastructure, such as through elevating houses.

He also said that homes ''may not be there'' in 20 years, resulting in a ''major revenue loss.''

Another Providence Journal article last week featured Tanner Steeves, a

wildlife biologist with the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, which has to tear up roads and parking lots along the Sakonnet River as the seas rise. The Journal writes:

As the barrier beach just south of Sapowet Point has narrowed—losing nearly 100 feet since 1939—the salt marsh on the other side has become more susceptible to flooding.

The Independent made Rhode Island's case for climate action in a December editorial. They said:

The signs are clear, if not immediately visible to most.

There are the well-documented, widely publicized shifts with global import, such as the loss of polar ice and the growing frequency of extreme weather events. Locally, there are changes in the ecology of Narragansett Bay, and locations at which the effects of a rising sea level—sometimes subtle, sometimes less so—may be plainly seen. . . . But we encourage all Rhode Islanders, from coastal communities and beyond, to remain attuned to the situation—in terms of both what the sea is telling us and what is being proposed to prepare for coming changes. The stakes are enormously high, and the broadest possible effort is required to meet the challenge.

That is the message to me from Rhode Island. That is why I give these speeches.

As I continue to push for honest debate on this issue in Congress, I also tour around the country to see folks on the ground in other States. I have now been to 15 States. In the closing months of 2016, I hit Texas and Pennsylvania.

In Texas, I joined Representative Elliott Naishtat, the advocacy group Public Citizen Texas, and Texas environmental advocates at a public event in Austin to call out Congressman LAMAR SMITH, Republican chairman of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, for his abuse of congressional power to harass public officials and climate scientists, including subpoenas demanding that States attorneys general divulge their investigative materials relating to their inquiries into ExxonMobil's potentially fraudulent climate misinformation. The committee is also harassing the Union of Concerned Scientists, 350.org, Greenpeace, and various university scientists because they are exposing Exxon for years of misleading the public on its understanding of climate change. Texans are taking notice. The San Antonio Express-News, which had previously always endorsed Congressman SMITH for reelection, decided not to endorse him in this latest election cycle. The paper cited his ''bullying on the issue of climate change'' as behavior that ''should concern all Americans.''

I joined a panel discussion with leading scientists from Texas universities to discuss their research into climate change in Texas. The panel included Dr. John Anderson from Rice University, Dr. Andrew Dessler from Texas A&M University, Drs. Charles Jackson and Kerry Cook from the University of Texas at Austin, and Dr. Katherine Hayhoe from Texas Tech University. They had a unified voice on the dangers of climate change.

Dr. Hayhoe said Texans are seeing changes all around them.

We get hit by drought. We get hit by heat. We get hit by storms. We get hit by sea level rise. And we're starting to see those impacts today. . . . Texas is really at the forefront of this problem.

Dr. Anderson of Rice agreed that the Texas climate is already changing. He said:

Accelerated sea-level rise is real, not a prediction. Its causes are known—thermal expansion of the oceans and melting of glaciers and ice sheets—and it is causing unprecedented change along the Texas coast.

Dr. Dessler from Texas A&M laid out what he called ''the fundamental and rock-solid aspects of climate science: humans are loading the atmosphere with carbon, this is warming the climate, and this future warming is a huge risk to our society and the environment. We should insist that our elected representatives rely on this sound science when formulating policy.''

I returned to Austin in November to speak to the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities. President David Dooley of the University of Rhode Island had invited me to join a panel that he moderated with, among others, Dr. John Nielsen-Gammon, Texas State climatologist and professor at Texas A&M University.

The bottom line was simple: Climate change is real, and the scientists at our universities will be increasingly forced to defend good science, academic freedom, and climate action. University leadership will have to defend their scientists against the onslaught of FOIA requests and personal attacks that are the modus operandi for climate deniers and against the phony science fronts propped up by the fossil fuel industry to spread calculated misinformation. The American scientific community faces a real threat from that operation.

On to Pennsylvania, I had the opportunity to spend a day traveling with my friend and colleague BOB CASEY around southeastern Pennsylvania getting a firsthand look at the effects of climate change and hearing about the work Pennsylvanians are doing to address it. At the University of Pennsylvania's Morris Arboretum, leaders from Children's Hospital of Philadelphia's Community Asthma Prevention Program, Moms Clean Air Force, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and other groups talked about kids with asthma and other conditions that worsen when temperatures and pollution levels are high.

In Malvern, we toured the LEED platinum North American headquarters of Saint-Gobain, the world's largest building materials company. The company is demonstrating that green building materials and technologies can be married with stylish design to produce stunning results. With operations in Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and around the globe, Saint-Gobain is developing innovative technologies to reduce pollution, generate clean energy, and improve air quality for millions of people.

From there, we visited the John Heinz National Wildlife Refuge, which is the Nation's first urban wildlife refuge and Pennsylvania's largest freshwater tidal wetland. Lamar Gore, the refuge manager, showed us how the refuge is at risk from the saltwater pushed in by rising sea levels. The refuge is adjacent to the Philadelphia International Airport, along the Delaware River.

As you can see from these graphics reproduced from the New York Times, at 5 feet of sea level rise, some of the city goes underwater and the refuge is in real trouble. Water encroaches upon the Philadelphia airport. At 12 feet of sea level rise, 6 percent of the city—including the refuge, airport, and parts of downtown Philly—is underwater. Projections that parts of Philadelphia will one day be uninhabitable due to sea level rise are one of the major drivers for forward-looking climate mitigation and adaptation policies of Philadelphia's Office of Sustainability. Senator CASEY and I met with them too.

Being in Pennsylvania gave me a chance to connect with Dr. Robert Brulle of Drexel University. He is the scholar who documented the intricate propaganda web of fossil fuel industry-funded climate denial, connecting over 100 organizations, from trade associations, to conservative think tanks, to plain old phony front groups. The purpose of this climate denial apparatus is, to quote Dr. Brulle, ''a deliberate and organized effort to misdirect the public discussion and distort the public's understanding of climate.''

I will wrap up with a special thank-you to one of the folks who helped organize my Texas trip: Tom Smith, who has been director of Public Citizen of Texas for more than 30 years. Known by his friends and colleagues as Smitty and known for his signature straw hat, over his career he has testified more than 1,000 times before the Texas Legislature and Congress—Mr. Uphill Struggle indeed. He was successful, though, and central in creating the Texas Emissions Reduction Program, which led to wide-scale deployment of solar and wind across Texas. A true environmental champion, Smitty retires this year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent tribute from the Texas Tribune entitled: ''Analysis: 'Smitty,' a Texas Lobbyist for the Small Fry, Retiring after 31 years.''

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Texas Tribune, Sept. 21, 2016]

ANALYSIS: ''SMITTY,'' A TEXAS LOBBYIST FOR THE SMALL FRY, RETIRING AFTER 31 YEARS

(By Ross Ramsey)

Tom ''Smitty'' Smith, a colorful lobbyist and liberal activist who turned Public Citizen Texas into a strong voice on environmental, utility, consumer and ethics issues, is hanging up his spurs after 31 years.

In the early 90s—the heyday of consumer rights legislation and regulation in Texas—Robert Cullick, then a reporter at the Houston Chronicle, gave Tom ''Smitty'' Smith of Public Citizen Texas an unofficial title: Everybody's Third Paragraph.

Smith, 66, announced his retirement Tuesday from his official post after 31 years, ending a long run of organizing and lobbying on behalf of consumers and citizens on a range of issues like utilities, insurance and political ethics. He was often the voice of the opposition in legislative fights and in the media, which earned him that reporter's epithet.

He's from that part of the Austin lobby that doesn't wear fancy suits, doesn't drive the latest luxury cars and doesn't spend its time fawning over and feeding elected officials. Smitty has a beard, an omnipresent straw hat and, often, a colorful sheaf of flyers making his points on whatever cause he's pushing at the time.

Smitty has been a leading voice for government intervention and regulation of big industries and interests in the capital of a state with conservative, business-friendly politicians from both parties who pride themselves on light regulation, low taxes and a Wild West approach to money in politics.

For the most part, Smith seems to have disagreed strongly, vociferously, but agreeably. He doesn't wear his wins or his losses on his sleeve.

''The thing that I learned time after time, story after story, is that people standing up does make a difference,'' Smith says. ''It does change policy.''

''Citizen activism does matter, and it's the only known antidote to organized political corruption and political money,'' he says.

His causes over the years have included food security, decommissioning costs of the nuclear reactors owned by various Texas utilities, insurance regulations, ethics and campaign finance laws. He's lobbied on environmental issues and product safety.

He counts the ethics reforms of 1991 as one of his big wins. As unregulated as Texas political ethics and campaign finance might seem today, things were a lot looser before reformers used a flurry of scandals and attendant media coverage to force changes. Smith is proud of a medical bill of rights that gave consumers some leverage with their doctors and their health insurers.

Public Citizen was a key player in the creation of the State Office of Administrative Hearings, which took administrative courts out of several regulatory agencies and put them in a central office, farther from the reach of regulated industries and elected officials. Smith now points to the Texas Railroad Commission, which still has its own administrative hearings, as an example of a too-close relationship between regulators, the companies they regulate and the judges supposed to referee their differences.

He was an early and noisy advocate for renewable energy, urging regulators and lawmakers to promote wind and solar generation—and transmission lines to carry their power—as an alternative to coal plants and other generating sources. That looks easier from a 2016 vantage point than it did in 1989, when an appointed utilities regulator derided alternative energy in an open meeting by saying that he hadn't smoked enough dope to move the state in that direction.

That regulator is gone now, and Texas leads the nation in wind energy. Chalk one up for the environmental advocates.

Smitty is leaving with unfulfilled wishes. He'd like to have made more progress on Texas emissions and climate change, on campaign finance reforms and conflict-of-interest laws.

The ethics reforms of 1991 included creation of the Texas Ethics Commission and a number of significant regulations on the behavior of the Texans contending for and holding state office. There is always more, of course. Smith had a list of 13 reforms that year, and eight made it into law. Some of the remaining items remain undone 25 years later.

''All the time I've been working here, Texas politics has been largely controlled by organized businesses pooling their money together and making significant contributions to key legislators,'' Smith says. ''Legislators are more concerned about injuring their donors than they are about injuring their constituents.''

He illustrates that with stories, like one about a legislator asking, during a House debate, if his colleagues knew the difference between a campaign contribution and a bribe. ''You have to report the campaign contribution.'' And another, when a member—former state Rep. Eddie Cavazos, D-Corpus Christi, who went on to become a lobbyist—was making a plea for cutting the influence of big donors. Cavazos recalls telling a story about getting simultaneous calls from a big donor and from someone who wasn't a political friend. He says he told his colleagues, ''You know which one you're going to answer first.''

''I'm sorry to see Smitty go,'' Cavazos said Tuesday. ''He provided a large voice in the Legislature that was needed—a balancing voice. He's a good guy.''

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, in the article, he is quoted as saying: ''The thing that I learned time after time, story after story, is that people standing up does make a difference. It does change policy.''

Good words to end the speech by. Thank you, Smitty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOKER. 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. BOOKER. Mr. President, I am really proud to stand here, having represented New Jersey now a little bit over 3 years in the U.S. Senate. I have to say that I have developed a great respect for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I have a deep belief that this is a body that can do good things for the American people. We don't always agree, and too many things are not getting done, but I have seen this body at its best. I have seen our ability to rise to the occasion. Along the way, I have made friendships and found respect for people and my colleagues across the aisle, as well as fellow Democrats.

I have witnessed occasions where Members of both parties have put principle before partisanship and evidenced a willingness to actually embrace personal political risk to stand up for what they believe is right and honorable and in the best interest of our country. Given this, this is a day in which I rise with painful disappointment. Frankly, I feel a deep sense of astonishment and even a sense of crisis. Thus, I feel a deepened determination to fight with everything I have against the efforts of my Republican colleagues that I believe will harm our country as a whole but particularly the most vulnerable people in our country.

This is about the Republican push, really the race—what I believe is a reckless race—to repeal the Affordable Care Act without putting forth any legislation, any proposal, any plan on how they intend to replace it. This is fundamentally dangerous, and it will hurt millions of Americans. I have heard over the past month people rightfully saying: Well, this is how the Affordable Care Act was implemented.

I understand the frustrations that have resulted from that, and people think this was jammed through along partisan lines many years ago using similar legislative tactics. The truth is, that is simply not the case. The Affordable Care Act went through a long and arduous process and received input from doctors, nurses, patient groups, medical specialists, medical professionals of all types.

The Affordable Care Act started with listening sessions, then hearings, then came the advice and counsel of policy experts, businesses, market experts, insurance companies, health nonprofits, hospitals—literally thousands and thousands of people over thousands of hours, often through public discourse, putting forth ideas that actually shaped and changed legislation. I wasn't in the body then. I was a mayor in Newark, NJ, but I know this occupied months of debate.

Years later, Republicans are seeking to undo this work with a kind of plan to move forward. They are saying that they have a plan, but no plan exists.

I am a big believer that there are things we can and we must do to improve health care in America, to improve the Affordable Care Act, but what I have to make clear is that it is profoundly irresponsible to repeal the Affordable Care Act and not put anything in place. There is no plan.

This is at a time that everyone agrees—people in the Republican Party and Democratic Party continue to talk about the achievements of the Affordable Care Act, things that they want to maintain, things they believe make a real difference. Those are things I have heard Republicans praise and even say again they want to protect. These things are making a lifesaving difference for millions of Americans.

Let's be clear. The overwhelming majority of Americans believe that we should not give the power back to insurance companies to deny people health insurance because of a preexisting condition. Let's be clear. Most people believe that we should allow young people, young adults to stay on their parents' plans up to the age of 26.

We also believe that requiring health plans cover preventive services is a profoundly important thing to do for individuals in this country, but it actually saves Americans money by pushing people to do preventive care—mammograms, birth control, and mental health care—without cost sharing. These are logical things that the majority of Americans believe in, such as closing the prescription drug coverage gap, which too many seniors on Medicare and people with disabilities have had to face, known as that doughnut hole. We believe in prohibiting insurance companies from charging women more money simply because of their gender. The overwhelming majority of Americans believe in requiring the insurance companies to spend more on patient care and less on administrative costs, and the insurance companies shouldn't be allowed to gouge the American people while making massive profits at the same time.

There is so much that people believe in and want to have preserved, and these are tremendous things for America. There are bank account savings; there are lifesaving policies, all of which are popular with Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. They are popular with people on both sides of the aisle in this body.

Some Republicans have said that what they are doing will not threaten these accomplishments, but this couldn't be any further from the truth. The way they are going about this puts the health care system in a perilous position. The health care system is complicated in nuance, and to think you can repeal something without replacing it right away shows a lack of understanding of what is going to happen and what the consequences will be.

What the Republicans are doing now is quite contrary to what the Democrats did before the ACA passed in 2010. Republicans are not putting forth a proposal. They are not speaking to the health care needs of all Americans. They are not inviting professionals from all different backgrounds to help shape a plan for America. They are not even fulfilling what I heard countless Republicans on the campaign trail, including our President-elect, say: They would repeal and then replace. They are just not replacing.

The replace part put forth by the mantra of many Republicans has not materialized. It doesn't exist. There is no plan to replace, no statement of principles, no outline of features, no framework for a plan, no explanation of how they would pay for the things they claim they like. There is no specific timeline for when a plan might materialize or even any substantive hint of what many Republican colleagues plan on doing to address the crisis—the crisis that will surely come as a result of repealing the Affordable Care Act without giving forth any replacement.

I say time and again: Show us the plan before you repeal this legislation. If you do not do that, you will be responsible for pain, suffering, chaotic markets, and for many Americans' health care problems. There are many people who don't understand this. They listen to the political rhetoric, and they think: Hey, you might be that one who, if you are wealthy enough or secure enough, if you are a Member of this body, in fact, this concept of repealing and maybe figuring out a replacement down the road might sound good. But if you are one illness away from bankruptcy, if you know and remember the challenges of having a child with a preexisting condition, if you know that one injury, one unexpected fall could place your family in peril but for the insurance you have, if you are one of the 20 million Americans who used to be uninsured and now you have insurance, you know how perilous this moment is. You know that you can't afford the recklessness of any politician—a Republican move that equates to jumping off a cliff and then packing your parachute on the way down.

Repealing without replacing is simply irresponsible, it is dangerous, and it is threatening to our country's well-being. People—families, children, the elderly—will suffer.

This is a moment where we need Republican leaders to tell the truth and say: We want to improve our health care system. We may not believe in ObamaCare, but we can't tear it down unless we do the responsible thing and put forth a replacement.

Right now, what we have is political rhetoric that is not just rhetoric. It is perilous. It is dangerous. It is threatening to our Nation. This will inflict immediate catastrophe upon families, causing millions to lose their health insurance, and it will unleash chaos with market uncertainty and cost spikes.

There is no defense for what is being done. I don't understand it. There is no logic here whatsoever. Elections were won. You now have the floor and the ability to put forth your great vision for health care in America, but doing it backward and repealing something and not offering up a plan is truly putting politics before people. This is a move of grand political theater that comes with profound public consequences affecting millions.

As a Democratic Senator, some people will say that this is just political rhetoric, but these are not just partisan words. This is the truth and don't take my word for it. Look at the words of other more thoughtful—other very thoughtful people, Democrats and Republicans, businesspeople and nonprofit leaders, conservative think tanks and nonpartisan groups, speaking with a chorus to the point I am making. Experts across sectors, across industries, and across the country are taking a hard look at what a repeal will mean for the American people without a replacement. People from all across sectors of our country are saying what the Republicans are doing is reckless, and the consequences are dire.

Take the American Medical Association, the preeminent association of physicians. Mind you, this is an organization that opposed the enactment of the Affordable Care Act. They have urged—this chorus of doctors has urged that ''before any action is taken, policymakers should lay out for the American people, in reasonable detail, what will replace current policies. Patients and other stakeholders should be able to clearly compare current policy to new proposals so they can make informed decisions.''

The American Medical Association isn't a political organization. They are thoughtful people whose fundamental concern is the doctors in this Nation and the health care of the people. Another respected organization representing American hospitals made it clear. The American Hospital Association warned that Republican action of repealing without a plan would result in an ''unprecedented health care crisis.''

Are Republicans listening to doctors and hospitals or are they rushing forth, willing to risk a crisis for our country, and for what? They are a President for 4 years, a Congress for 2. What is the rush to put forth a plan and just repeal? Will they listen to these experts? What about the president of America's leading cancer group, the American Cancer Society? Will they listen to them? They urge Congress to ''consider the future of the Affordable Care Act. It is critically important that cancer patients, survivors and those at risk of the disease don't face any gap in coverage of prevention or treatment. . . . Delaying enactment of a replacement for 2 or 3 years could lead to the collapse of the individual health market with long-term consequences.''

This organization is respected by people on both sides of the aisle and is not playing partisan games. They are calling out the truth; that it is a reckless Republican move to repeal without replacing. Will Republicans listen to the American Diabetes Association? Folks with diabetes are Independents, Republicans, and Democrats, and this is an organization respected by people on both sides of the aisle. They say:

> The Association strongly opposes going back to a time when . . . treatment for preexisting conditions like diabetes could be excluded from coverage; when people could find their insurance coverage was no longer available just when they needed it most.

What is the Republican plan to address these concerns and to pay for these concerns? Will they listen to private businesspeople? They, too, join in the chorus of Americans urging that Republicans not endanger the lives and livelihoods of millions.

The Main Street Alliance. We all have main streets in our States and our communities. A group representing these small businesses from across the country urges lawmakers to consider the devastating effect a repeal without

replace would have on small businesses:

> Small business owners depend on healthy and vibrant communities to keep us profitable in the engines of economic growth. . . . Changes to our current health care system are needed, but not in the form of cuts to critical programs or through taking away our health coverage.

There are some Senators who are speaking out. It is not the entire Republican caucus. There are some who are saying exactly what I am saying. Yet we are still rushing toward a vote, even with Republican Senators having the courage to stand up. Just yesterday Republican Senator RAND PAUL of Kentucky, before voting to proceed to this measure, said: ''It is imperative that Republicans do a replacement simultaneous to a repeal.'' I respect my Republican colleague for saying what is common sense and speaking up against the reckless actions being taken by the Republican Party as a whole, and some fellow Republican Senators have joined him in similar statements, including LAMAR ALEXANDER, the chair of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. The Republican from Tennessee, who noted in an interview in November 2016 that when it comes to the ACA, ''what we need to focus on first''—Senator ALEXANDER said—''is what would we replace it with and what are the steps that it would take to do that?''

Republican Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine shared in an interview last month that she was ''concerned about the speed in which this is occurring'' and expressed concern over what would happen to her constituents in Maine who had signed up for insurance through the ACA, saying: ''You just can't drop insurance for 84,000 people in my State.''

I not only talk about Republicans in this body, but there are conservative think tanks focused on our country that are speaking out now as well. The American Enterprise Institute said in a 2015 report that ''repealing the law without a plausible plan for replacing it would be a mistake.''

So here we have it from all over the country, people across the political spectrum, experts, market analysts, insurance executives, doctors, nurses, hospital leaders, patient groups; these people in our country who are beyond politics and even beyond their opinions of the Affordable Care Act when it was enacted are now speaking in a chorus of conviction in one voice: Don't repeal the Affordable Care Act without a clear plan to preserve the things that are making America healthier and more financially strong and secure. Don't recklessly rush into a politically motivated move that would endanger the health care of millions of Americans, increase the costs for millions of Americans, throw insurance markets into chaos, endanger our hospitals' financial stability, and put our most vulnerable Americans into crisis: our seniors, people in nursing homes, retired coal miners, people recovering from drug addiction, the poor and other underserved communities.

We are America, and this is a time that we must call, not to party rhetoric but to who we are and what we stand for. We cannot let this repeal without replacement happen. We must know what the Republican plan is so experts, market analysts, insurance folks, doctors, everyone understands what will happen. Americans will be hurt. It is time to put our country and the people first. There is no rush. The voters gave this body 2 years. It gave the Presidency 4 years. We must now fight these efforts. We must resist. We must call to the conscience of neighbors and appeal to the moral compasses of our Republican leaders to do what they said they would do—put forth your plan. Let the American people know what they are going to do and do not thrust millions of your fellow country men and women off a cliff and shout promises to them as they fall: ''Hey, don't worry. We will figure something out before you hit the ground.'' Where is the honor in that strategy? Call the public together, gather your experts, put forth a thoughtful process, and develop what you think is better, what improves upon what we have now, what doesn't diminish our unassailable gains that we have had but build upon them. Give us a plan, not empty promises. Give America hope. Don't plunge millions into despair and uncertainty. Show decency, not costly craven politics. We know who we are as a country. Profound are the words, ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.—That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men. . . . ''

This government, this body, the United States Senate, led by Republicans here and in the House and in the White House, must stand for these ideals. Health care is critical to life. We must stand for these ideals. Health care is critical to liberty, our freedom from fear, our freedom from illness, our freedom from deprivation. We must stand for these principles. Health care is critical to the happiness, the joy, the greatness of America. To secure these rights, governments are instituted, and we were elected to stand for the American people, by the American people, to fight to defend our brothers and sisters. This government and actors must put our ideals first, not partisanship and not theater. Do not attack these ideals through a rash and reckless repeal. Be thoughtful. Be kind. Be magnanimous. The well-being of our Nation is in the balance.

May God bless us in this time of crisis. May wisdom prevail over politics.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN HIGGINS

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise today to offer my warmest wishes to my legislative director, Stephen Higgins, as he begins the next chapter of his truly remarkable professional career. It is a career that is characterized by unshakable dedication to the common good and supreme attention to detail. These qualities make Stephen Higgins a true professional. His service is a labor of love for our country and this institution in particular.

Stephen has worked in the Senate longer than all but nine of its current Members, serving this Chamber for 23 years. Stephen still remembers his first day on payroll: March 21, 1994. He began with Senator William Cohen of Maine as a counsel on the Juvenile Justice Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. There he began what would become a decades-long mission: to advance crime victims' rights.

A year later, Stephen joined the office of Senator Jon Kyl of Arizona, where he would distinguish himself as a committed, talented lawyer over the next 18 years, serving as chief counsel in Senator Kyl's personal office and for 14 years as chief counsel on his Judiciary Committee staff. During that time, Stephen played the lead role, supporting efforts to pass a bipartisan crime victims' rights constitutional amendment. The end result: After 8 years of hard work, a landmark statute was passed by a vote of 96 to 1. This is one of Stephen's proudest accomplishments. ''We did something significant to help crime victims,'' he said. ''We enshrined into law the rights of crime victims to be informed, present, and heard.''

To put it simply, Stephen Higgins helped humanize America's criminal justice system. This work reflects his sincere beliefs about that system. ''The criminal justice system is about seeking the truth,'' he said. ''The truth matters.''

For Stephen Higgins, the truth has always mattered. He is a man of high character and great personal integrity. These attributes made him exceptionally well-suited for work in another critical realm of the Senate: judicial nominations. ''Judges hold people's lives in their hands,'' Stephen said. ''Their decisions have life-altering consequences.''

Most recently, Stephen played a key role in the nomination of Omaha attorney Bob Rossiter to serve as U.S. district court judge for the District of Nebraska, and last year, the Senate confirmed Judge Rossiter unanimously. This was a beautiful capstone to Stephen's Senate career.

He leaves the Senate now for a new position: managing director of the

Human Ecology Institute at the Catholic University of America. This is an interdisciplinary research institute that will apply the rich intellectual tradition of the Catholic Church to contemporary problems in our society. As Stephen said, ''I love the Senate. The only institution I love more is the Catholic Church.'' Sounds like a match made in Heaven. As he takes his new post, I know Stephen will work like it all depends upon him and pray like it all depends upon God.

I thank Stephen's wife of 18 years, Lauren, and their two children, James and Elizabeth, for loaning him to us here in the Senate, because it is a sacrifice. I know they are proud of you, Stephen, as are your parents, Joe and Shelley, and your brother, David.

So, Stephen, thank you so much for all you have done for my office, for the Senate, and for the people of this country. Good luck. God bless.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If no one yields time, the time will be divided equally.

The Senator from Utah.

BEARS EARS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, on January 20 of this year, change is coming to the White House. But until that day, it appears that President Obama will desperately cling to the status quo and continue to do what he has done on far too many occasions: abuse his Executive powers to put in place unpopular policies without the cooperation of Congress and then pretend as if everyone somehow supports him.

The most recent case in point involves President Obama's recent decision to designate as a new national monument some 1.35 million acres of public land in San Juan County, UT—the poorest county in the State of Utah, nearly the size of Delaware. This is a small county that is tucked into the southeast corner of our State. It includes—and the national monument is named after—the region's distinctive Bears Ears buttes, which mark the ancestral homeland and sacred site of many members of the Navajo and Ute Tribes who live in San Juan County, UT.

President Obama announced the Bears Ears National Monument on December 28, right between Christmas and New Year's Eve, as most Americans were busy enjoying the holiday season and when he was still enjoying time with his family in Hawaii. That same day, his administration released an explanatory document that was officially christened a ''Fact Sheet.'' It was christened that way by the White House officials who wrote it. But, in reality, it reads much more like an elaborate book of fiction.

Of all the falsehoods peddled in this bogus fact sheet, the most egregious—and, in many ways, the most insulting—is the claim that the residents in San Juan County, including local members of the Navajo Nation and members of the Ute Tribe, supported the President's decision to turn Bears Ears into a national monument.

The document says:

> The creation of the Bears Ears National Monument in Utah [. . .] follow[s] years of robust public input from tribes, local elected officials, and diverse stakeholders, and draws from legislation introduced in Congress. In addition to protecting more land and water than any administration in history—

And here is the kicker—

> President Obama has taken unprecedented steps to elevate the voices of Native peoples in the management of our national resources.

''Unprecedented steps to elevate the voices of Native peoples.'' Nothing could be further from the truth in this situation. Perhaps if we replace the word ''elevate'' with the word ''exploit,'' that sentence might apply to the situation in Bears Ears.

Now, there is no denying that many Native American people supported President Obama's designation of the Bears Ears National Monument. But the inconvenient truth too often ignored by the Obama administration and its supporters is that virtually all of this tribal support came from Native Americans residing outside of Utah, not inside Utah, and certainly not within San Juan County where this 1.35 million-acre designation occurred.

In fact, the most prominent Native American group that advocated for a national monument in Utah is actually an alliance called the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, which is made up of several tribes, and most of its members reside outside of the State of Utah.

Yet, national monument advocates routinely invoke the Inter-Tribal Coalition as the authoritative mouthpiece of all Native Americans in the Southwestern United States.

So how did a coalition of Native American tribes from Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico rise to such a position of prominence in a debate over a national monument in a remote corner of Utah? Well, part of the answer can be found in the cozy relationships between well-funded environmental advocacy groups, powerful outdoor retail companies, and tribal organizations.

Recent investigative reporting by the Deseret News shows how radical wealthy environmental organizations, supported by the outdoor recreational industry, channeled millions of dollars to the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition only after they realized that ''hitching [their] success'' to the Navajo Nation was the only way they could achieve their longstanding goal of creating a national monument in Southeastern Utah.

The ability of uber-rich environmentalists to essentially buy a national monument in Bears Ears explains why the people of San Juan County—including the Navajo residents, whose lives and livelihoods are intricately linked to the Bears Ears Utes—stand united in opposition to a monument designation.

For the people of the Navajo Nation who live in San Juan County, taking care of their ancestral land—protecting and preserving it for the next generation—isn't optional, it is a sacred duty. It is part of their faith. It is part of who they are.

The same is true in many respects in my own faith. As a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, I share many of these views. My church teaches that the Earth is a divine creation that belongs to God. This means that human beings have a spiritual responsibility—an obligation to God—to be wise stewards over the Earth, to conserve it for our children and our grandchildren.

The Navajo people of San Juan County have always faithfully fulfilled their responsibility in the Bears Ears region, and so have the Utes who reside in the area. Caring for their homelands—and respecting it as their forefathers did—is the cultural lifeblood of the Native American people of Southeastern Utah. Take away their access to their land—restrict their stewardship over the Earth's bounty for the sake of increasing the access of wealthy urbanites who use the outdoors for their own purposes—and it won't be long before their culture begins to fade away.

The people of San Juan County understand this. They have seen their worst nightmares become reality in other Utah counties as a result of Presidential national monument designations. That is why on December 29, the day after President Obama announced the Bears Ears monument, a crowd of Utahns assembled to hold a protest on the steps of the San Juan County Courthouse.

Braving the frigid weather of that day, they gathered together to demonstrate that they—the individuals and the families who will be most directly affected by a Bears Ears national monument—believe that the President has no business seizing vast stretches of land to be micromanaged and mismanaged by distant Federal land agencies.

But the protesters weren't just angry. They were resolute, confident about the future, and determined to keep fighting for their right to participate in the management of the land in their community—the land that most directly affects them.

Of course, environmentalists and national monument advocates want the people of San Juan County to believe that this fight is simply over, that they have lost, that there is nothing they can do about something that affects them in a very real, very personal, very intimate way. In their view, President Obama's proclamation of the Bears Ears National Monument is permanent. It is irreversible, as if it were carved into stone. As one White House official recently told the Washington Post: ''We do not see that the Trump administration has authority to undo this.''

But they say this only because they are not looking hard enough. The truth is what can be done through unilateral

Executive action can also be undone the same way. Such is the impermanence of Executive power in our constitutional republic, where major policy changes require broad consensus, forged through legislative compromise, to endure the test of time.

In a recent Wall Street Journal article, two prominent constitutional scholars, Todd Gaziano and John Yoo, explain this point as it relates specifically to President Obama's use of the Antiquities Act to designate the Bears Ears National Monument. The Antiquities Act of 1906, as they explain, does not create an irreversible monument. When a President uses it, its use is not necessarily indelible.

Gaziano and Yoo write:

> After studying the President's legal authority [under the Antiquities Act], we conclude that he can rescind monument designations [. . .] the law's text and original purposes strongly support a president's ability to unilaterally correct his predecessor's abuses.

In other words, starting on January 20, President-Elect Trump can use his Executive powers to rescind President Obama's designation of the Bears Ears National Monument. I have asked the future Trump administration to do precisely that.

I have also recently cosponsored Senator MURKOWSKI's bill, the Improved National Monument Designation Process Act, which would require all future Presidents to obtain congressional and State approval prior to designating a national monument. I have done these things, and I will do more, because I believe the preponderance of evidence proves that President Obama abused his powers—the powers granted to him under the Antiquities Act—in designating the Bears Ears National Monument.

This isn't just my opinion. It is the opinion of most of my fellow Utahns, including those patriots who assembled on the county courthouse steps in the rural town of Monticello on December 29.

These are the people who were ignored by the Obama administration. These are the people who were cut out of the decisionmaking process that produced this particular national monument designation. These are the voices that were stifled by the wealthy, out-of-State, well-connected environmental groups that spent millions of dollars to lock up our land for their exclusive use.

So it is fitting to let one of them—one of the residents of San Juan County—have the last word today. I think Suzy Johnson put it best when she said:

> Mr. Obama, you have failed the grassroots natives. A true leader listens and finds common ground. The fight for our land is not over. Your name will blow away in the wind.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I ask that the time I use be charged against the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, this is the first time I have risen to speak on this Senate floor. I want to start by thanking my fellow Marylanders for the honor of representing them in this great United States Senate. I want to thank my colleague Mr. CARDIN, the senior Senator from Maryland, for joining us. I thank the new Senator from California, Ms. HARRIS, for joining us as well. I want to say to my fellow Marylanders that I look forward to working every day for their benefit and for the benefit of our Nation. I want to say to my new colleagues in the Senate—Republicans and Democrats alike—I look forward to working with all of you in the years to come for the good of our Nation.

I understand it is somewhat unusual for a new Member to speak so soon on the Senate floor, but what we are witnessing today in the Senate is not business as usual, and these are not ordinary times. Having served as the lead Democrat on the House Budget Committee, I know that never before has the Senate rushed out of the gate so quickly to enact a budget procedure to deny the minority party—and by extension, hundreds of millions of Americans—their rights in this United States Senate. Yet here we are, speeding to use the budget process to fast-track a so-called reconciliation bill that will destroy the Affordable Care Act and, in doing so, wipe out access to affordable care for over 30 million Americans and create total chaos throughout the American health care system. That is reckless. It is irresponsible, and it violates the traditions of this institution.

I may be new to the Senate, but I am not new to the way this Senate has proudly been described by its Members, both Democrats and Republicans, both current and former Members. My colleague Senator HARRIS will attest that one piece of advice we all received from both Republican and Democratic Members of this Senate was to read the chapter in Robert Caro's book about Lyndon Johnson entitled ''The Desks of the Senate,'' where Robert Caro talks about the burnished mahogany tops, and he tells the story of the Senate through the Senators who were protagonists in great debates throughout our history. He highlights the idea that this Senate is supposed to be a deliberative body that reflects on issues with a thoughtful exchange of ideas. Unfortunately, that certainly does not describe the Senate of this moment. Having just arrived from the House of Representatives, what we are witnessing today is much more like the tyranny of the majority characteristic of that body.

This Senate is supposed to be different, but at least for now it seems very much like the House I just left.

As a result of the fast-track process in the Senate, we will be overriding and roughshodding over the will of a majority of the American population, and Americans are just now waking up to learn about the bait-and-switch scheme that has been perpetrated on them. For more than 6 years, Republicans in this Senate and in the House of Representatives have said repeatedly that they would repeal ObamaCare but replace it—replace it with something, they said, that will be much better. Now we know, as the clock ticks down, that has been a farce. There is no Republican replacement bill to provide the kind of coverage and benefits of the Affordable Care Act, and the consequences of that failure are going to be devastating for the country.

Let us take a moment to look at the human toll. First, there are the 22 million Americans who previously had no health insurance before the Affordable Care Act but are now covered through the health care exchanges and through expanded Medicaid. These are people who have been denied access to coverage because they had preexisting conditions or their kids had preexisting conditions—whether it was asthma, diabetes, heart conditions—so they were either outright denied by insurance companies or priced out of the market. That 22 million may be a big number, hard to comprehend, but behind that number are many families like Carlos and Isabelle Martins, who live not far from where I live in Silver Spring, MD. They could no longer afford health insurance through their employer. Shortly before the Affordable Care Act was enacted, Carlos was told he needed a liver transplant to survive. His wife Isabelle said that without the Affordable Care Act, he would never have received that lifesaving treatment.

There is the case of Diane Bongiorni, who now lives in Hyattsville, MD. She previously had open-heart surgery. When her Cobra expired, it was only because of the Affordable Care Act that she was able to get coverage and not be denied because of that earlier, relevant preexisting condition. Days after she was on the Affordable Care Act, a cardiologist told her one of her heart valves was failing and she would need another surgery immediately, and she has told us that she ''would have died'' had she not had that coverage.

In addition to Diane and Carlos and the other 22 million Americans who would have been denied affordable health care before the Affordable Care Act and Medicaid expansion, there are an additional 7 million Americans on the health care exchanges today who are projected to totally lose that coverage if Republicans pull the plug on the Affordable Care Act. That is over 30 million Americans who will lose access to affordable care directly.

There is no doubt that in those health care exchanges, we have seen increases in premiums and some of the copays, and we need to do something about it, which is why I and many of my colleagues have put forward ideas to address the increases we are seeing in the health care exchanges in terms of costs. We put those ideas on the

table, and we would welcome our Republican colleagues to join us to improve the Affordable Care Act. You don't fix a health care system, you don't fix those problems by blowing up the entire Affordable Care Act. That is not a solution.

I also want to focus for a moment on the tens of millions of Americans who are not included in that 30 million who benefit directly from the Affordable Care Act but who are benefitting right now from ObamaCare. They may not realize it now, but mark my word they are going to face very unpleasant and unexpected consequences if the Affordable Care Act is ripped apart.

First, let us take a look at the overwhelming number of Americans who get their health care not on the health care exchanges but through their private employer—most Members of this body, most Americans. The premiums in those plans have actually risen much more slowly since the Affordable Care Act was enacted than before. The overwhelming number of Americans who are on those plans have benefited dramatically from the reduction of costs. Why did that happen? Because all those people who had been previously denied access to health care who are in the ObamaCare exchanges, they used to show up in the hospital as their primary care provider or, since they weren't getting any care at all because they couldn't afford the bill, they were showing up at those hospitals when there was an emergency, when cost was most expensive. We don't deny people care in an emergency, and then they get the bill and they can't pay the bill. That is why so many people were going bankrupt in America before the Affordable Care Act. But somebody pays. Who pays? Well, everybody else in the system pays. Everybody else who has private insurance through their employer pays or taxpayers in States pay for the uncompensated care that hospitals would otherwise have to carry. In the end, people's premiums were going up really fast, but by providing the health care system through ObamaCare for those exchanges, however imperfect, it has helped those other tens of millions of Americans. Let us look at Medicare beneficiaries, millions of seniors. Watch out. Their costs are going to rise in three and maybe four ways right away.

First of all, their Part B premiums that every senior on Medicare pays are going to go up. Why is that? Because as part of the Affordable Care Act, we got rid of some of the overpayments, the excessive subsidies that were being paid to certain providers, including some of the managed care providers who were paid, on average, 115 percent more than fee for service. We said that makes no sense. That is a waste of Medicare beneficiaries' money. So we reformed that by saving the Medicare system money. We also save the Medicare beneficiaries money in their premiums because those premiums are set partly to the overall cost of Medicare. If you reduce the cost of Medicare in a smart way, you reduce those premiums. That is why seniors have seen such slow increases in their Part B premiums since the enactment of the Affordable Care Act. Those will go right back up.

Second, seniors on Medicare no longer have to pay for preventive health screenings, cancer screenings, diabetes screenings, other kinds of preventive health care because we want to encourage them to identify the problems early and solve them for their own health care purposes but also because it saves money in the system. You get rid of the Affordable Care Act, those seniors are going to be paying premium copays for those preventive health services.

Prescription drug costs. Seniors—and there are millions and millions of them who face high prescription drug costs—are benefiting today from the fact that we are steadily in the process of closing the prescription drug doughnut hole. We had an absolute crisis in this country where so many seniors were faced with the difficult choices of getting the medications they needed to live day-to-day and keep a roof over their head. That is why we are closing the prescription drug doughnut hole. You get rid of the Affordable Care Act, all those seniors who, on average, have saved thousands of dollars with the Affordable Care Act are going to see their costs go up.

Finally, if you enact the plan that has been put forward by the Speaker of the House, PAUL RYAN, and by the person who President-Elect Trump has nominated to be his Secretary of Health and Human Services, TOM PRICE—I encourage every American to look at their plan because they want to voucherize Medicare, and they want to save the Medicare system money by raising the prices and the risks on every Medicare beneficiary. That is the result of that plan.

The Affordable Care Act benefits 30 million people directly, and we need to make sure we don't put them in harm's way, but it also benefits all these other people in the system, the people on the employer-provided health plans who have seen historically low premium increases and seniors on Medicare.

Rural hospitals will be particularly hard hit by repealing the Affordable Care Act. So the proposed Republican action is going to hit those 30 million Americans, including my neighbors in Silver Spring. It is also going to hit those other tens of millions of Americans who right now may not realize the extent to which they are benefiting from the Affordable Care Act. Yet our Republican colleagues have not put forward a single plan to help either the 30 million or all the other Americans who are benefiting from the Affordable Care Act. Instead, we see a rush to generate chaos throughout the health care system. That is counter to what the President-elect has said he wants. Here is what Donald Trump said on ''60 Minutes'':

> Everybody's got to be covered.
>
> Everybody.
>
> I am going to take care of everybody.

Well, it is really important that the majority in the Senate and the House talk to the President—elect because they are not on the same road when it comes to that commitment. When the President-elect was asked about finding a way to keep the ObamaCare rules that prevent discrimination based on preexisting conditions, he said, ''I like those very much.'' When he was asked about the provision that allows children to stay on their parents' insurance plans until they are 26 years old, he said, ''We're going to very much try to keep that.''

Here is the dirty little secret. Many people—Republicans and Democrats in this Chamber—know there are only a very few ways you can design a health care system that meets those conditions. One way, which many Democrats have historically supported, is the idea of Medicare for all. The other way is the ObamaCare model. It was not always known as the ObamaCare model.

The foundation for ObamaCare actually had its roots in the conservative Heritage Foundation think tank reports. It was an idea long promoted by Republicans, including many Republican Senators, some of them still here today. It is an idea rooted in the concept of personal responsibility, the idea that every American needs to do their part and help pay for their health insurance, otherwise, if they don't pay, they are going to force other people to pay when they go seek that care in the emergency room or wherever it may be. In order for that idea to work, the idea that was put forward by the Heritage Foundation, the idea in ObamaCare, everyone needs to have coverage because it would not make a lot of sense for us to be paying out all the time if we were able to wait until we got sick and then decide to pay. That is the idea of having everyone in the pool have insurance. The idea is, you don't want to use it, but you buy that protection. If other people don't buy the protection, then the rest of the folks feel like they are being taken advantage of, which is why everyone has to be in the pool, which is why it was an idea that came out of the Heritage Foundation.

In fact, I have the Heritage official report right here: Critical issues—a national health care system. This was back in 1989.

I want to read the three elements in the Republican plan.

Element No. 1, every resident in the United States must by law be enrolled in an adequate health care plan that covers major health care costs.

No. 2, for working Americans, obtaining health care protection must be a family responsibility.

No. 3, the government's proper role is to monitor the health market, subsidize needy individuals to allow them

to obtain sufficient services, and encourage competition.

That sounds like a description of ObamaCare. It is—which is why, of course, it was dubbed ''RomneyCare'' when they adopted this model for the State of Massachusetts. He adopted it based on the Republican's Heritage model.

So here is the problem: Republicans can't come up with an alternative. That is why it has not happened for 6 years, because if you are going to come up with an alternative, you have to go to either one of two models. One is Medicare for all. The other is the idea that every American has to be in the system and the idea based on personal responsibility, which at its start was a Republican idea. When President Obama adopted it, for many months, some Republican Senators were willing to go along, but then the politics overtook them, and since then, we have had the Republicans opposing their own proposed model for providing health care. So rather than repeal and replace, since there is no replace, it is repeal and run.

Here is the problem for our colleagues politically, but more importantly, here is the problem for all Americans and all our constituents: No one is going to be able to hide from the devastating consequences of undoing the Affordable Care Act, which is going to hurt not just the 30 million Americans who are directly benefiting through the exchanges and the Medicare expansion, the Medicaid expansion, but also all those seniors on Medicare and the others getting health care through their private employers.

As I said at the outset, it is truly sad to see the Senate at this point and in this state, especially because of the terrible consequences it is going to have on the American people.

You know, the very first time I was ever on the floor of the Senate was in 1985. I was not thinking of running for office myself at that time. It was the farthest thing from my mind. I was actually working—it was in the middle of the Cold War. I was working on national security and foreign policy issues for a moderate Republican Senator by the name of ''Mac'' Mathias from the State of Maryland.

I talked about the desks of the Senate at the outset of my remarks. Senator Mathias sat right there, one seat behind the seat Senator BOOKER is sitting in right now.

Great to see you.

That is where Senator Mathias sat. The reason I happened to be sitting next to him that day is he was working with Senator Kennedy that day. Senator Kennedy was at a desk back there, I believe. It was the second from the aisle. It had been his brother Jack Kennedy's desk in the Senate before him. Even though there were many desks between the desk of Senator Kennedy and the desk of Senator Mathias and the center aisle between them, they were able to work together for the good of the country, just as many Senators from both parties have done since. That is the way the Senate is supposed to work. That is the way the Senate was described in the Robert Caro book that Republicans and Democrats alike told us to read as new Members before we came here.

I am really glad to be here. I am excited to get to work on behalf of Marylanders and work for the good of our State and the country. I wish it could have been at a moment when the Senate was not hellbent on breaking the very traditions that have made it great, the tradition of being a deliberative body and not using right out of the gate, the very first thing, a process to short-circuit the will of the minority party. That is not what any of us were taught the Senate was about.

It is particularly troubling that the Senate is engaged in breaking that tradition in order to undermine affordable health care for tens of millions of Americans and generate chaos in our health care system. I will fight every day to prevent that from happening.

I will also fight every day to try to live up to the true tradition of the Senate, which is people trying to work together for the good of the country. It is disappointing to be here at a time when the Senate is embarked on violating that tradition in order to strip Americans of their health care. I hope we will not let that happen. I will fight every day to prevent that from happening and then work with my colleagues to try to make sure we address the real priorities and concerns of the American people.

I thank my colleagues for joining me on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, because——

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, may I ask my colleague to yield for just one moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Yes, for one moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Thank you. I appreciate the courtesy. I just wanted to take this time to welcome Senator VAN HOLLEN to the Senate. Senator VAN HOLLEN gave his maiden speech from the desk that was held by Senator Mikulski. I know Senator Mikulski would be very proud of what he said here on the floor and very proud of Senator VAN HOLLEN being here in the Senate. I look forward to working with him.

I want to tell the people of Maryland and the people of this Nation that what you heard tonight, you heard a person who is committed to making our system work, who is committed to working with every Member of the Senate. But he will stand up for the principles and will stand up on behalf of the people of Maryland.

Again, welcome. It is wonderful to have him here in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I just want to add my commendation. It was such a well done, brilliant, articulate, carefully thought out speech. But it is not a surprise because our new Senator, the junior Senator from Maryland, is like that. We are so excited to have him and our freshman class—some of his colleagues came here today. We wish it had been larger in quantity, but they sure make up for it in quality, as Senator VAN HOLLEN's speech showed. And parenthetically, maybe he will be able to increase that quantity in one of his other new jobs.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, it is because of ObamaCare that the health insurance markets in this country are badly damaged. They have gotten worse each year. They are now near collapse.

You were told 8 years ago that if you like your health insurance, you can keep it. Millions can't. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. Millions of Americans were not able to keep their doctor. You were told that your health insurance premiums would go down $2,500. They have actually gone up probably $3,500. Some people don't have a choice in plans. Some counties don't even have a plan in the exchange. If you could get a plan, you might not be able to afford it. If you could afford the plan, you might not be able to use it because of the high copayments you have to have. So it is not a very good situation.

It took 6 years for the health insurance market to get as bad as I just described. It will take time for those markets to be restored. The next few years in health care will be challenging if ObamaCare is repealed or even if it is not repealed. If ObamaCare is not repealed, it will be even longer before Americans have access to a functioning health insurance market and the insurance plans they want.

When it comes to health care, every second counts. We owe it to the American people who are sick or who could get sick, as well as families and businesses trying to plan for the future, to start fixing that problem right now. That is the result of the election. That is what the Senate is going to do.

The Affordable Care Act, which could more appropriately be called the Unaffordable Care Act, has been a case of over-promise and under-delivery. People were told that their premiums would go down and that if they liked their doctor, their hospital, or their health care plan, they could keep all of it. The reality is much different. More than half of the country had two or fewer insurance plans from which to choose this year. Some regions had no insurance plans available at all. Even those who were strong supporters of the health care law, like the Minnesota Governor whom I like to quote, have

said the Affordable Care Act ''is no longer affordable to many Americans.''

In my State of Iowa, the Affordable Care Act premium increases this year were over 40 percent for many individuals. Few people, of course, can afford that. Families that did manage to purchase Affordable Care Act insurance found that they could no longer afford to use it.

One Iowan recently called my office and told me that his premiums have increased 400 percent in 3 years. He also said that his deductible went up to—can you believe it—$14,000. Last year, one of his children had a major medical problem, and they had to pay for all of that care out of their pocket—not from the insurance. The family paid $12,000 for the Affordable Care Act insurance, which did not pay for any health care. Of course, that just doesn't make any sense whatsoever.

The problem is that the Affordable Care Act did nothing to address the underlying causes of the high cost of health care; that is, what it costs for a hospital or a doctor to purchase or maintain medical equipment, purchase medicines, carry malpractice insurance, and a lot of other costs they have.

Rather than address the actual cost to care, President Obama and his colleagues chose to bypass real health care reform for an unsustainable entitlement and bureaucratic mandates that have priced people out of the health insurance market, rather than provide those same people with affordable and quality coverage.

So we are at it now. It is time for real health care reform, not the misguided policies that we were promised 8 years ago that now have turned out to be what I describe as misguided policies. It is time to deliver to Americans what we were promised. It is time to provide accessible, affordable health care to all Americans. But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to work with us. They know that the Affordable Care Act is falling apart. They know it is unaffordable.

As we have heard in speeches this week, the other side is trying to distract attention from the Affordable Care Act collapse by using scare tactics, like you recently heard. It is time for the Democrats to step up, instead of doubling down. It is time for statesmanship, not gamesmanship. It is time for the Democrats to stop defending the ''un-Affordable Care Act'' and deliver Americans what was promised.

I look forward to working with my colleagues and the Trump administration to deliver affordable health care to all Americans in the tradition of the Senate, which is what didn't happen in 2009. It was strictly a one-party program put before the Congress to pass. That is why it has failed—because so many of the people who could have made a good bill pass in 2009 were shut out of the process because this body had 60 Democratic Members and they didn't have to pay any attention to Republicans.

They spent maybe 8 or 9 months trying to work with the Republicans to negotiate a bipartisan deal. But before that was completed, they said: Take it or leave it. The Republican minority at that time was not going to be dictated to, and we were pushed out of the room.

Then what ended up being the Affordable Care Act was written in the big black hole of Senate Majority Leader Reid's office, without the bipartisan input which has made so many social programs in America successful. I would name the Social Security Act. I would name civil rights legislation, Medicare legislation, and Medicaid legislation, which all had broad bipartisan support to get them passed. In the case of the Civil Rights Act, a higher proportion of Republicans voted for it than Democrats voted for it—just one example.

That is the tradition of the Senate when you have major social legislation that has been successful, and that is why the Affordable Care Act was not successful—because it was strictly a partisan approach that was used to have it become law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, January 9, the Senate vote in relation to the Paul amendment No. 1; further, that the Senate vote in relation to the Sanders amendment No. 19 at 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we will have a side-by-side amendment to the Sanders amendment, and we will circulate that amendment as soon as possible.

TO CONSTITUTE THE MAJORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 7, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 7) to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 7) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

TO CONSTITUTE THE MINORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 8, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 8) to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 8) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, these committee resolutions reflect the fact that Senator BLUNT will remain chair and Senator SCHUMER will remain ranking member of the Rules Committee until the inaugural ceremonies have been completed.

It is my understanding that following the inauguration, Senator SHELBY will become chair and Senator KLOBUCHAR will become ranking member of the Rules Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. President.

We have just agreed to the committee resolution numbers on each committee. I would make just a couple of points, if I might.

Our caucus has some serious concerns about letting the Intelligence Committee and Armed Services Committee exclusively handle the issue of Russia's interference in the election.

While much of the information relating to Russia's interference in our election can be pulled together by the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees, the legislative actions that

will be required to respond fully to Russia's interference need to be a wide-ranging endeavor that can only be done by a select committee.

I have spoken with Leader MCCONNELL. I have told him that we will let the committee organizing resolution go forward, but I did put the majority leader on notice that if the work of the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees is deemed insufficient or incomplete or taking too long, this matter may well need to be revisited before the committee funding resolution comes up in February.

Also, I understand additional information with respect to Russia's interference in our election will be released in the coming days, and that could also change our view as to the way we ought to proceed.

I have spoken to the majority leader about these concerns. He carefully listened, and we will keep a careful eye on how things are going in the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees with regard to Russia's interference in the election.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE FUNDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in the 112th Congress the Senate adopted a new funding allocation for Senate committees. This approach has served the Senate well for the past three Congresses. I believe this approach will continue to serve the interests of the Senate and the public, regardless of which party is in the majority, by helping to retain core committee staff with institutional knowledge. This funding allocation is based on the party division of the Senate, with 10 percent of the total majority and minority salary baseline going to the majority for administrative expenses. However, regardless of the party division of the Senate, the minority share of the majority and minority salary baseline will never be less than 40 percent, and the majority share will not exceed 60 percent. It is my intent that this approach will continue to serve the Senate for this Congress and future Congresses.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this approach met our needs for the last three Congresses, and I too would like to see it continue. In addition, special reserves have been restored to its historic purpose. We should continue to fund special reserves to the extent possible in order to be able to assist committees that face urgent, unanticipated, nonrecurring needs. Recognizing the tight budgets we will face for the foreseeable future, it is necessary to continue to bring funding authorizations more in line with our actual resources while ensuring that committees are able to fulfill their responsibilities. I look forward to continuing to work with the majority leader to accomplish this.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a joint leadership letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT LEADERSHIP LETTER

We mutually commit to the following for the 115th Congress:

The Rules Committee is to determine the budgets of the committees of the Senate. The budgets of the committees, including joint and special committees, and all other subgroups, shall be apportioned to reflect the ratio of the Senate as of this date, including an additional ten percent (10%) from the majority and minority salary baseline to be allocated to the chairman for administrative expenses.

Special Reserves has been restored to its historic purpose. Requests for funding will only be considered when submitted by a committee chairman and ranking member for unanticipated, non-recurring needs. Such requests shall be granted only upon the approval of the chairman and ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Funds for committee expenses shall be available to each chairman consistent with the Senate rules and practices of the 114th Congress.

The division of committee office space shall be commensurate with this funding agreement.

The chairman and ranking member of any committee may, by mutual agreement, modify the apportionment of committee funding and office space.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 19

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 19, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] proposes an amendment numbered 19.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prevent the Senate from breaking Donald Trump's promise that ''there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid'')

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD BREAK DONALD TRUMP'S PROMISE NOT TO CUT SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, OR MEDICAID.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);

(2) increase either the early or full retirement age for the benefits described in paragraph (1);

(3) privatize Social Security;

(4) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits for individuals entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under the Medicare program under title XVIII of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

(5) result in a reduction of benefits or eligibility for individuals enrolled in, or eligible to receive medical assistance through, a State Medicaid plan or waiver under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) 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 subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 20

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for Ms. HIRONO, proposes an amendment numbered 20.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To protect the Medicare and Medicaid programs)

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PRIVATIZE MEDICARE OR LIMIT FEDERAL FUNDING FOR MEDICAID.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) privatize the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or turn the program into a voucher system;

(2) increase the eligibility age under the Medicare program; or

(3) block grant the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), impose per capita spending caps on State Medicaid programs, or decrease coverage under such program from current levels.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) 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 subsection (a).

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.

FOREIGN CULTURAL EXCHANGE JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY CLARIFICATION BILL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the final hour of our legislative business early last December 10, we passed a remarkable bill. It had no ideological division, did not cost the taxpayers a dime, and will benefit Americans in every part of the country. And, like the House did, we passed it unanimously.

This bill had the somewhat unwieldy title of the Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act. While not lending itself to a catchy acronym, it is accurately descriptive. For more than 50 years, a Federal law has provided legal protection for art loaned by foreign governments for exhibition in the United States. Confidence in that protection is an essential piece of the complex arrangements that can take years to complete in order to bring wonderful exhibits to American museums for everyone to enjoy.

America has hundreds of museums of all sorts. The art museum at Brigham Young University, for example, is one of the largest and best attended in the Mountain West. When it began working on a major exhibition of art from Islamic countries, some of its loan requests were unexpectedly denied. It turns out that a 2007 Federal court decision had made such loans risky, rather than secure. After that court decision, the act of lending, even after State Department review and approval, could actually lead to a new category of lawsuits against the foreign lenders.

This legislation, now signed into law, reverses that court decision and clarifies that lending art after State Department review does not raise the possibility of new litigation. Foreign governments can once again have confidence that lending art for exhibition will improve cultural understanding and enrich people's lives without the threat of new lawsuits.

The bill has two narrow exceptions. I want to thank Dr. Wesley Fisher, director of research at the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany, and Rabbi Andrew Baker, director of International Jewish Affairs at the American Jewish Committee, for their help in drafting the exception for Nazi-era claims. The second exception covers comparable state-sponsored coercive campaigns of cultural plunder. Art that was looted in such a campaign should not be given protection for exhibition in the United States.

The senior Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, was my principal partner in this effort. She and her staff have been patient, thoughtful, and dedicated; in particular, I want to thank her chief counsel, Eric Haren, and counsel Lartease Tiffith for working so diligently with my own chief counsel, Tom Jipping. The problem to be solved was clear, but it was challenging to find the right language to solve that problem without unintended consequences.

I also want to thank the Association of Art Museum Directors, their director of government affairs Anita Difanis, and their special counsel Josh Knerly. They have been committed to this goal from the start, and their effort began with educating many of us about this unique area of law and policy. They mobilized hundreds of art institutions and associations to support this bill. And they were flexible about many things while staying focused on the essentials.

I gratefully acknowledge the consistent support for this legislation from the BYU Museum of Art, the Utah Fine Arts Museum, and the Utah Museums Association. We have a vibrant art community in Utah, and this legislation means that these fine institutions have additional opportunities to bring new experiences to the people in our great State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a letter from James S. Snyder, director of The Israel Museum in Jerusalem. He writes that the risk of new lawsuits has been ''a disincentive to lend works to American museums,'' but that this legislation ''will ensure that museums worldwide can continue to lend to American museums in the precise spirit of international cultural cooperation that U.S. Immunity from Seizure protection was intended to provide.'' That, in a nutshell, is the problem and the solution we are enacting today.

This legislation restores the confidence that foreign governments need to lend art for exhibitions that Americans across the country can enjoy. That is something we can all be proud of.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ISRAEL MUSEUM,
Jerusalem, March 17, 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate,
Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: I am Director of The Israel Museum, Jerusalem, an encyclopedic museum embracing the history of material world culture from pre-historic archaeology of the ancient Holy Land through the rise of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam; Jewish world culture; and the fine arts of the Western and non-Western traditions. Our collections comprise over 500,000 objects, and our 600,000 sq. ft. campus sits on a signature 20-acre site in Jerusalem. We are internationally active as producers of temporary exhibitions in Jerusalem and internationally and as major borrowers and lenders from sister institutions worldwide.

Our international museum community, which enjoys a close and collegial relationship with our American counterparts, is concerned about the trend toward a weakening of the Immunity from Seizure protection customarily offered by U.S. museums when they request loans from foreign museums. These concerns are two-fold:

First, that foreign museums risk being sued in connection with works loaned to an American exhibition if there is a question that works on loan are held by their lending institutions in violation of international law. The act of lending can therefore be used as the basis to seek damages in a U.S. court, which is counter to the premise that Immunity from Seizure protects works on loan from legal action while they are on loan; and

Secondly, foreign museums that loan works with clear provenance to an American exhibition may nonetheless be sued with regard to other works in their collections that may lack full provenance. In this regard, the simple act of lending, in the spirit of international exchange, opens us to possible claims with regard to any and all works in our collections.

Each of these potential circumstances raises troubling concerns, and, taken together, they are a disincentive to lend works to American museums, given the potential risk of suit in U.S. courts. And this prospect is exactly what U.S. Immunity from Seizure was originally established to avoid.

Anything that you can do to strengthen Immunity from Seizure in the U.S. will ensure that museums worldwide can continue to lend to American museums in the precise spirit of international cultural cooperation that U.S. Immunity from Seizure protection was intended to provide.

Please let me know if I can answer any further questions in this matter.

Sincerely,

JAMES S. SNYDER,
Director.

TRIBUTE TO SARAH R. SALDAÑA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today I would like to pay tribute to a dedicated public servant and Texan, Sarah R. Saldaña. Ms. Saldaña is stepping down as Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, and retiring after many years of Federal service.

Born as the youngest of seven children to working-class parents in Corpus Christi, TX, Director Saldaña learned the importance of hard work and education at a young age. After she graduated from W.B. Ray High School in 1970, Director Saldaña attended Del Mar Junior College and graduated summa cum laude from Texas A&M, formerly Texas A&I, University in 1973. Shortly thereafter, she began her career as an 8th grade language arts teacher at D.A. Hulcy Middle School in Dallas. Later, she worked as a technician for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEOC, and as an investigator and management intern for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD. Additionally, she worked as a Federal Representative for the Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration until 1981.

Ms. Saldaña then decided to pursue a legal education at Southern Methodist University, SMU, in Dallas, TX, where she earned her J.D. in 1984. Following graduation, she clerked for the Honorable U.S. District Judge Barefoot Sanders. As a trial attorney, Director Saldaña was an associate for the law firms of Haynes and Boone, and then Baker Botts, where she became partner in their trial department.

In 2004, she returned to public service and became an assistant U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Texas, where she prosecuted a variety of criminal cases. She also served as the deputy criminal chief in charge of the district's major fraud and public corruption section.

In 2011, Ms. Saldaña was nominated and confirmed to become the first Latina United States attorney in the history of Texas and only the second woman to hold that position in the 135-year history of Texas' Northern District—a region that includes the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex and spans 100 counties and stretches across 95,000 square miles.

In 2014, Ms. Saldaña was confirmed to lead the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. As ICE's Director, she helped to oversee the largest investigative agency within the Department of Homeland Security and to protect the safety and security of the United States.

Throughout her career, she has served with integrity and character. Ms. Saldaña has served the people of Texas and the United States with honor—fighting illegal immigration, public corruption, organized crime, sexual predators, and other dangerous criminals.

Her legacy will continue to benefit the American people and I join with her family, friends, and coworkers in saying that her experience and dedication to public service will be missed.

I offer my appreciation to Sarah R. Saldaña for her service to our Nation and send my best wishes for the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BETH BELL

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize an exceptional public servant, Dr. Beth Bell, who is retiring from the directorship of the National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases, NCEZID, at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC.

Dr. Bell began her career with the CDC in 1992, in my home State, as an epidemic intelligence service, EIS, officer assigned to the Washington State Department of Health, where she led a seminal investigation into E. coli infections. After completing her EIS training, she moved to CDC Atlanta to join the hepatitis branch in the division of viral and rickettsial diseases, later serving as chief of the epidemiology branch in the division of viral hepatitis. During her 13 years working on viral hepatitis, she led important efforts to better understand the epidemiology of hepatitis A in the United States, applying this knowledge to the development and implementation of hepatitis A vaccination policy. These extraordinary efforts contributed to reductions in national hepatitis A incidence of more than 95 percent. She also worked on implementation of global infant hepatitis A and B vaccination programs during the early days of the Global Alliance for Vaccines Initiative. She later served as the acting deputy director of the National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases during the H1N1 influenza pandemic before being appointed director of the newly formed Center for Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases, NCEZID, in 2010.

In that role, Dr. Bell has been at the forefront of the agency's critical and complex emergency response efforts. In 2014–2015, Dr. Bell was called upon to lead the center through the largest Ebola epidemic in history. After reaching a near breaking point where, according to CDC Director Dr. Tom Frieden, it was ''spiraling out of control'' in late 2014, the epidemic was contained through the aggressive use of proven outbreak-control measures such as patient isolation and contact tracing.

In 2016, Dr. Bell found herself leading the response to yet another pandemic as Zika exploded in South and Central America, Puerto Rico and the Caribbean, and Florida. The impact of Zika on women and children through microcephaly, a life-threatening condition in which children are born with unusually small heads, was heartbreaking and historically significant—never before has a mosquito-borne infection caused such devastating birth defects. CDC's early alert—under Dr. Bell's leadership—to people traveling to countries with Zika likely prevented an untold number of infections among women of child-bearing age; and, continuing through her very last day of Federal service, Dr. Bell was critical in CDC's support for U.S. territories, cities, and States—as well as other impacted countries.

In addition, Dr. Bell oversaw the Center's response to chikungunya spreading throughout the Americas in 2013–14, the second-largest outbreak of West Nile virus disease in the United States in 2012, and hundreds of outbreaks of foodborne disease. Her leadership of the Center during each of these outbreaks has been remarkable, and all Americans have benefited from her steady hand and commitment to service. Dr. Bell also held leadership roles during CDC responses to the 2001 anthrax attacks and Hurricane Katrina in 2005. Her outstanding leadership, scientific judgment, and expertise have been critical to the success of the Center in these endeavors.

In 2012, she was called upon to lead the Center's response to the fungal meningitis outbreak associated with contaminated steroid products—America's largest healthcare related outbreak ever. The New York Times called it ''one of the most shocking outbreaks in the annals of American medicine.'' Following her testimony before the Senate HELP committee, Dr. Bell was lauded for CDC's prompt and decisive role in the response, which likely prevented many hundreds of infections and deaths among patients who would otherwise have received injections of fungus-contaminated medication.

She also directed two new cross-cutting infectious disease initiatives that have already shown benefits to the field of public health: the Advanced Molecular Detection, AMD, and the Antibiotic Resistance Solutions Initiatives, Together, these initiatives are helping scientists better understand how infections spread and transforming our national capacity to detect, respond, contain, and prevent drug-resistant infections. Because of Dr. Bell's leadership, our Nation will be better equipped to address the growing threat of antibiotic resistance, as well as a myriad of other public health threats.

Dr. Bell exemplifies steadfastness and courage in protecting the Nation's health. She has demonstrated an unwavering level of dedication and passion for public health at all levels, recognizing the important roles of State, local, county, tribal, and Federal partners.

Dr. Bell has been a true public servant. I ask that we honor Dr. Bell today for her invaluable leadership to the CDC and America's public health efforts.

TRIBUTE TO RAY MABUS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Secretary Ray Mabus on his retirement as the 75th Secretary of the Navy. It has been a great pleasure to work with Secretary Mabus during his impressive and storied tenure as the longest serving Secretary of the Navy since World War I.

Since his confirmation in 2009, Secretary Mabus has continually reaffirmed his commitment to ensuring America's naval forces are second to none. During his more than 7 years of service, Secretary Mabus has also demonstrated an unwavering commitment to building our naval fleet and supporting America's shipbuilding industrial base. He has put 84 ships under contract across the country, more than the last three Navy secretaries combined, and invested significantly in our aging shipbuilding infrastructure.

Secretary Mabus's focus on increasing shipbuilding has allowed the men and women at Bath Iron Works, BIW, to continue building high-quality destroyers, which are the workhorses of our Navy. To allow the Navy to operate these ships to their fullest potential while remaining mindful of the budget constraints faced by our military, Secretary Mabus supported energy initiatives to reduce dependence on fossil fuels. His focus on power-saving technologies, like diesel-electric plants in new ships, has reduced the Navy and Marine Corps' fuel expenses by 30 percent.

In Maine, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, PNSY, has received approximately $100 million in modernization funds since 2009, enabling it to maintain its status as the gold standard for public naval shipyards and further

hone its efficiency and effectiveness in submarine repair.

While advancing these reforms, Secretary Mabus visited Navy and Marine Corps installations across the globe, traveling over 1.3 million miles to over 150 countries and territories and all 50 States. When measured in distance, Secretary Mabus has travelled to the moon and back almost three times. In 2009, he and I visited the hard-working men and women at BIW and PNSY together. Since that first visit, Secretary Mabus has worked tirelessly to support our shipbuilding industrial base and ensure our Navy and Marine Corps have the tools they need to succeed.

In addition, Secretary Mabus's leadership in 2010 on the Gulf Coast's long-term recovery plan following the Deepwater Horizon oil spill was exemplary. His work securing the future of the Gulf Coast made Americans and certainly his home State of Mississippi proud.

Finally, his emphasis on platforms, power, and partnerships allowed our Navy to grow in strength, but Secretary Mabus never forgot those who make the system work: the people.

Secretary Mabus was instrumental in advancing the repeal of don't ask, don't tell in 2011, a harmful policy that barred Americans from serving their country simply because of their sexual orientation. His efforts helped to ensure that all patriots who willingly answer the call to arms may proudly serve their Nation.

Similarly, as discussions on military integration have evolved with a new focus on women in combat, Secretary Mabus again stepped up to become a leader on gender equality in the military. His support for integration of women into the Navy and Marine Corps, in all occupations and specialties, and his expansion of maternity leave have ensured that women can serve in the military jobs they love.

Secretary Mabus has also taken steps to support career flexibility, continuing education, and family well-being for all members of the Navy and Marine Corps. He worked to ensure that all those who serve in uniform are provided the mental health care they need and deserve. By supporting and empowering a dedicated, intelligent, and committed personnel base, Secretary Mabus has enabled our Navy to remain the powerful fighting force that it is today.

With his retirement, we lose a true patriot who served his country as a civilian, as well as in uniform, and we lose a visionary leader who saw how our Armed Forces could be better—and did everything in his power to make it happen. It has been a personal and professional pleasure to work with Secretary Mabus, and I wish him fair winds and following seas.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JOHN AND STEPHANIE HEKKEL

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I have the honor of recognizing John and Stephanie Hekkel of Anaconda in celebration of the rebuilding of Club Moderne.

The bar had been considered an area landmark since its founding in 1937 and was truly a sight to behold. With its rounded front facade and Carrara glass panels, it reflected the Art Deco style of the time of its founding. It was designed by Bozeman-based architect Fred Willson and built by local carpenters and craftspeople under the direction of the first owner, John ''Skinny'' Francisco.

Until recently, the Club Moderne had changed very little since its opening day, and in 1986, it was added to the National Register of Historic Places.

In 1997, the Francisco family sold the bar to a close friend, longtime bartender, and Anaconda native John Hekkel who continued its legacy as a flagship watering hole, especially for area law enforcement and firefighters, while maintaining its retro atmosphere.

A recent Yelp review described taking a step inside ''like walking inside a time capsule!''

Last April, it also won the top award in The Big Tap: 2016 Historic Bars Tournament Championship, an online contest sponsored by the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Unfortunately, Club Moderne was destroyed in a fire in October, a tragic loss to the Anaconda community.

The night the fire happened, I understand John Hekkel stayed at the bar until 4:00 in the morning and, after the fire was extinguished, grabbed a shovel and physically helped with the cleanup.

Just this week, I was thrilled to hear the Hekkels announce plans to rebuild the bar and restore this historic establishment.

This is a true Montana story. Montanans pull themselves up by their bootstraps, even in times of hardship or loss.

I invite fellow Montanans to stop by to try whatever's on tap or a Moscow Mule, which is an Anaconda specialty.

The Hekkels, through Club Moderne, have welcomed those just passing through our State and native Montanans alike for generations. As small business owners, they have brought their community together. I wish them all my best as they restore Club Moderne and renew it as a bright spot in the Anaconda community. I look forward to visiting with John and Stephanie there when they reopen.•

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 10:29 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 21. An act 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.

H.R. 69. An act to authorize 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.

H.R. 70. An act to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes.

H.R. 71. An act 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.

H.R. 72. An act to ensure the Government Accountability Office has adequate access to information.

H.R. 73. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes.

H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution 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.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 21. An act 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; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 69. An act 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; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 70. An act to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs .

H.R. 71. An act 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; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 72. An act to ensure the Government Accountability Office has adequate access to

information; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 73. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to require information on contributors to Presidential library fundraising organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.J. Res. 3. Joint resolution 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; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–1. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to review the changes to the Federal floodplain management regulations to assess whether exceptions should be made for potential building projects; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 421

Whereas, Blight is a growing problem in many communities in this Commonwealth; and

Whereas, Changes made to the Federal floodplain management regulations were issued by executive order in January 2015; and

Whereas, Flood insurance is now required under the executive order, making the redevelopment and revitalization of older, blighted properties financially straining; and

Whereas, Federal agencies are obligated to apply these standards to all Federal actions, including federally approved permits, federally backed home loans and flood insurance regulations and many Housing and Urban Development programs, including the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program; and

Whereas, While these changes were intended to enhance the safety and security of citizens during floods and to diminish the risk of flood loss, the modifications to the Federal floodplain management regulations have hindered the ability of our older communities to develop creative, nonprohibitive ways to renovate abandoned buildings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urge the President and the Congress of the United States to review the changes to the Federal floodplain management regulations to assess whether exceptions should be made for potential building projects so that applications can be submitted to the Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency for review and consideration under the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program and so that the applications are not at an economic disadvantage; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

POM–2. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida urging the United States Congress to enact legislation to promote economic recovery in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE MEMORIAL 601

Whereas, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the State of Florida share a strong cultural bond and are important trade partners, and

Whereas, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has experienced a prolonged and difficult economic recession that has led to mass unemployment in Puerto Rico and decreased trade opportunities with the State of Florida, and

Whereas, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has public debts in excess of $72 billion, which continue to cripple Puerto Rico's ability to improve and sustain economic growth, and

Whereas, the 1984 amendments to the United States Bankruptcy Code prohibit the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico from authorizing its municipalities and public utilities to file for bankruptcy relief under Chapter 9 of the code, and

Whereas, the United States Bankruptcy Code amendments require Puerto Rico's municipalities and public utilities to engage in piecemeal negotiations with each of their creditors, rather than consolidating debt and developing a comprehensive plan for repayment, and

Whereas, the citizens of Puerto Rico are suffering greatly due to their government's inability to renegotiate the terms of this debt under a comprehensive plan, and

Whereas, the United States Government has an obligation to promote and assist the economic prosperity of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as an important territory of our nation, and

Whereas, the United States Congress eliminated a tax exemption for manufacturers from Section 936 of the Internal Revenue Code, greatly contributing to an increase in unemployment in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and

Whereas, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico would greatly benefit from new ideas and programs that promote economic development to bring high paying jobs back to Puerto Rico, and

Whereas, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the State of Florida would both benefit from Puerto Rico's renewed economic prosperity, and

Whereas, the national debt of the United States is currently more than $19 trillion. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact legislation to promote economic recovery in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico consistent with sound fiscal principles necessary to reduce the national debt; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.

POM–3. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to curb and clarify the role and authority of the United States Department of Education as it relates to the ''supplement not supplant'' provisions in the Every Student Succeeds Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 214

Whereas, The federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) requires that federal Title I funding to low-income students supplements, rather than supplants, state and local dollars. This provision is intended to keep local school districts from using federal Title I dollars as a replacement for state and local dollars in low-income schools; and

Whereas, To enforce this provision, the U.S. Department of Education has proposed burdensome regulations to require school districts to show that average per-pupil state and local spending in Title I schools is at least equal to the average spending in non-Title I schools. The rules allow several different options for districts to calculate spending and demonstrate compliance with ''supplement not supplant''; and

Whereas, The proposed regulations exceed the legal authority of the department and blatantly trample on explicit statutory prohibitions. Specific prohibitions in the ''supplement not supplant'' provisions include subdivision 1118(b)(4), which says, ''Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize or permit the Secretary to prescribe the specific methodology a local educational agency uses to allocate state and local funds to each school receiving assistance under this part''; and

Whereas, School district personnel have complained that the proposed regulations would be unworkable. The School Superintendents Association (AASA) stated that the proposed regulation ''glosses over the realities of school finance, the reality of how and when funds are allocated, the extent to which districts do or do not have complete flexibility, the patterns of teacher sorting and hiring, and the likelihood that many students would experience the rule, as drafted, in a way that undermines true efforts aimed at increasing education equity''. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the President of the United States to direct the U.S. Department of Education to stop its federal overreach as it relates to the ''supplement not supplant'' provisions of the Every Student Succeeds Act; and be it further

Resolved, That we memorialize Congress to enact legislation that clarifies the Department of Education's role and authority as it pertains to ''supplement not supplant'' provisions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, and the U.S. Department of Education as public comment on proposed rules.

POM–4. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to pass the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Education and Reform Act of 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 204

Whereas, The ADA was enacted in 1990 to improve access and equality for disabled Americans. After 25 years in effect, the integrity of the ADA is in question because of the onslaught of lawsuits against small businesses due to minor and correctable infractions; and

Whereas, Small businesses provide goods and services that are vital to our economy and it is important that every effort is made to ensure disabled Americans have access to those goods and services. When there are minor and easily correctable ADA infractions, small businesses are increasingly being faced with lawsuits by individuals; and

Whereas, The threat or actual occurrence of a lawsuit places small business in the dilemma of choosing whether to settle the suit or face the potentially exorbitant cost of litigation in terms of both time and money. Additionally, plaintiffs who abuse the ADA system often file multiple cases, many with businesses and properties; and

Whereas, The ADA Education and Reform Act of 2015 proposes to provide business owners an opportunity to remedy alleged ADA violations before facing the cost of legal fees. The act would provide business owners a 120–day window within which to make the public accommodation corrections that they were cited for under the ADA. It restores the ADA to its original purpose of enabling access and accommodation to disabled Americans. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Senators of the 98th Legislature of the state of Michigan, on behalf of all citizens of this state, respectfully urge the U.S. Congress to pass the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Education and Reform Act of 2015; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM–5. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress and the President of the United States to enact legislation to ensure that students from the State of New Jersey and throughout the United States have access to debt-free higher education at public colleges and universities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 183

Whereas, A college education is one of the most valuable investments a family can make, but it has never been more difficult for families to afford the dream of college as the cost has grown exponentially in recent decades; and

Whereas, According to the White House, the cost of college has risen more than 250 percent over the last three decades, while income for typical families grew by only 16 percent, making it difficult for a student to graduate without debt; and

Whereas, As a result, an increasing number of young Americans, including many from New Jersey, have been forced to borrow significant amounts to afford the cost of higher education. According to a study from LendEDU, New Jersey ranks ninth in the country in student loan debt, with the average student loan debt for New Jersey's public and private college and university graduates at over $30,000 in 2016; and

Whereas, Student loan debt saddles the very students who most depend on a college degree to level the economic playing field with a burden that constrains their career choices, hurts their credit ratings, prevents them from fully participating in the economy, and threatens essential milestones of the American dream such as buying a home or car, starting a family, and saving for retirement; and

Whereas, Young people in the State of New Jersey and throughout the country should have the same opportunity offered to those who went to college in previous generations, including the ability to attend public colleges and universities without taking on burdensome debt; and

Whereas, Because of the importance of higher education to the nation's economy, the United States and its state governments should expand the opportunity to pursue and attain a college degree; and

Whereas, Public investment in higher education pays off, as evidenced by the fact that workers with college degrees earn more money, pay more taxes, and rely less on government services; and

Whereas, A national goal of establishing a debt-free public higher education system would include significant federal aid to states, including New Jersey. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House urges Congress and the President of the United States to enact legislation to ensure that students from the State of New Jersey and throughout the United States have access to debt-free higher education at public colleges and universities.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President and Vice-President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, and every member of Congress elected from this State.

POM–6. A memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida applying to the United States Congress to call a convention under Article V of the United States Constitution with the sole agenda of proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution to set a limit on the number of terms that a person may be elected as a member of the United States House of Representatives and to set a limit on the number of terms that a person may be elected as a member of the United States Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE MEMORIAL 417

Whereas, Article V of the Constitution of the United States requires Congress to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution upon application of two-thirds of the states, and

Whereas, a continuous and growing concern has been expressed that the best interests of the nation will be served by limiting the terms of members of Congress, and

Whereas, the voters of the State of Florida, by the gathering of petition signatures, placed on the general election ballot of 1992 a measure to limit the consecutive years of service for several offices, including the offices of United States Representative and United States Senator, and

Whereas, the voters of Florida incorporated this limitation into the State Constitution as Section 4 of Article VI, by an approval vote that exceeded 76 percent in the general election of 1992, and

Whereas, in 1995, the United States Supreme Court ruled in U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton, 514 U.S. 779 (1995), a five-to-four decision, that the individual states did not possess the requisite authority to establish term limits, or additional qualifications, for persons elected to the United States House of Representatives or the United States Senate, and

Whereas, upon reflecting on the intent of the voters of this state and their overwhelming support for congressional term limits, the Legislature, in its 114th Regular Session since Statehood in 1845, did express through a memorial to Congress the desire to receive an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of consecutive terms that a person may serve in the United States House of Representatives or the United States Senate, and

Whereas, the Legislature; in its 118th Regular Session since statehood in 1845, does desire to see a convention called under Article V of the Constitution of the United States with the sole agenda of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on the subject of congressional term limits as specified in this memorial. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

(1) That the Legislature of the State of Florida does hereby make application to Congress, pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States, to call an Article V convention with the sole agenda of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to set a limit on the number of terms that a person may be elected as a member of the United States House of Representatives and to set a limit on the number of terms that a person may be elected as a member of the United States Senate.

(2) That this application does not revoke or supersede Senate Memorial 476 as passed by the 2014 Florida Legislature, but constitutes a separate, independent application addressing congressional term limits as specified in this application.

(3) That this application is revoked and withdrawn, nullified, and superseded to the same effect as if it had never been passed, and retroactive to the date of passage, if it is used for the purpose of calling a convention or used in support of conducting a convention to amend the Constitution of the United States with any agenda other than to set a limit on the number of terms that a person may be elected as a member of the United States House of Representatives and to set a limit on the number of terms that a person may be elected as a member of the United States Senate.

(4) That this application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the several states have made application on the subject of congressional term limits as specified in this application.

(5) That this application be aggregated with the applications from other states on the same subject for the purpose of attaining the two-thirds majority needed to require Congress to call a limited Article V convention as specified in this application, but not be aggregated with any other applications on any other subject; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this application be dispatched to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to each member of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress, and to the presiding officer of each house of the legislature of each state.

POM–7. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the Town of Boonton, New Jersey, expressing condemnation of publications and distribution of any and all images that purport to glorify or justify violence against law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM–8. A resolution adopted by the Town Board of the Charter Township of Waterford, Michigan, relative to the Refugee Resettlement Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 32. A bill to provide for conservation, enhanced recreation opportunities, and development of renewable energy in the California Desert Conservation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr.

BLUNT, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 33. A bill to provide for congressional approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments, to establish requirements for the declaration of marine national monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 34. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for ''midnight rules'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 35. A bill to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 36. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for extensions of detention of certain aliens ordered removed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 37. A bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 38. A bill to decrease the cost of hiring, and increase the take-home pay of, Puerto Rican workers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 39. A bill to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 40. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 41. 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 Finance.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 42. A bill to inspire women to enter the aerospace field, including science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, through mentorship and outreach; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 43. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit individuals eligible for Indian Health Service assistance to qualify for health savings accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 44. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to improve nonretaliation provisions relating to equal pay requirements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SASSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 45. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 46. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen intensive cardiac rehabilitations programs under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 47. A bill to prevent proposed regulations relating to restrictions on liquidation of an interest with respect to estate, gift, and generation-skipping transfer taxes from taking effect; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 48. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchasing of hearing aids; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 49. A bill to provide a leasing program within the Coastal Plain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 50. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow refunds for Federal motor fuel excise taxes on fuels used in mobile mammography vehicles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 51. A bill to make habitual drunk drivers inadmissible and removable and to require the detention of any alien who is unlawfully present in the United States and has been charged with driving under the influence or driving while intoxicated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 52. A bill to make aliens associated with a criminal gang inadmissible, deportable, and ineligible for various forms of relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 53. A bill to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 54. A bill to prohibit the creation of an immigration-related registry program that classifies people on the basis of religion, race, age, gender, ethnicity, national origin, nationality, or citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 55. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of Fort Ontario in the State of New York; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 56. A bill to require each agency to repeal or amend 2 or more rules before issuing or amending a rule; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DAINES, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 57. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 7. A resolution to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 8. A resolution to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 16

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 16, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 18

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 18, a bill to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity by repealing the income tax and other taxes, abolishing the Internal Revenue Service, and enacting a national sales tax to be administered primarily by the States.

S. 21

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 27

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of 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.

S. 30

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 30, a bill to extend the civil statute of limitations for victims of Federal sex offenses.

S.J. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution 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.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 5, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of Israel.

S. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 32. A bill to provide for conservation, enhanced recreation opportunities, and development of renewable energy in the California Desert Conservation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the Desert Protection and Recreation Act of 2017.

This bill, a decade in the making, charts a commonsense path forward for the California desert. The goal is simple: to manage California's fragile desert resources in a sustainable and comprehensive manner.

This bill provides something for everyone that appreciates the national treasure that is the California desert. That this bill provides something for everyone is a result of the painstaking effort to build consensus among the array of groups that use the desert, including: environmental groups; Federal, State, and local governments; the off-road community; cattle ranchers; mining interests; and energy companies and California's public utility companies.

As I will further describe later, the bill preserves 230,000 acres of wilderness and another 44,000 acres of national park land, each unrivaled for their unique natural landscapes. The bill also safeguards 77 miles of free-flowing rivers and the abundant life and rich biodiversity these rivers and streams often support.

Importantly, the bill provides certainty to off-road enthusiasts, establishing 142,000 acres of permanent off-highway recreation areas—a first for the Nation. I made a commitment to off-roaders to enact the entire bill, not just parts of the bill. I hope to fulfill that promise.

The efforts to protect the desert are a long time coming. This effort first began with the original California Desert Protection Act, signed into law more than twenty years ago.

Picking up where my predecessors left off, I introduced that bill only three months after I was sworn in as a senator. Through hard work and perseverance, we were able to pass that law on the last day of the 103rd Congress, and President Clinton signed the bill into law in October 1994.

The original Desert Protection Act was a crowning achievement for desert conservation, establishing 69 new Wilderness areas, creating the Mojave National Preserve, and converting Death Valley and Joshua Tree National Monuments into National Parks. All told, we were able to protect, or increase protections for, about 9.6 million acres.

It continues to attract millions of tourists to southern California, which is a boon for the economy.

It has ensured that these enduring landscapes will be preserved for future generations.

Since we passed the 1994 desert conservation bill, we've tried to build on this legacy of conservation. After years of collaboration with an array of stakeholders, we introduced new legislation in 2009.

The goal of that bill was simple: to help manage California's desert resources through a comprehensive approach that balanced conservation, recreation, energy production, among other needs.

After years of work, including two hearings in the Senate, we reached a major milestone this past February, when President Obama designated three new national monuments in the California desert: Castle Mountains, Mojave Trails, and Sand to Snow.

Those monuments, based on the legislation I had introduced, created one of the world's largest desert reserves, encompassing nearly 1.8 million acres of America's public lands.

Those monuments connect vital wildlife corridors and habitats, preserve cultural resources, and establish an important buffer to the inevitable changes climate change will usher in for these fragile desert ecosystems.

While the newly-designated desert monuments formed a cornerstone for future desert protection, our work is not complete. That is why I am introducing this legislation today.

While I supported President Obama's decision to create three national monuments in the Mojave Desert, his authority under the Antiquities Act did not allow him to include the many other valuable provisions in the original legislation.

Our intention has always been to balance the many uses of the desert through legislation, and that remains the case today. That is why I reintroduced that legislation immediately following the President's designation, and that is why I am introducing a bill again today: to make the rest of the provisions a reality.

The legislation I am introducing today therefore includes all of the provisions the President was not able to enact through executive action under the Antiquities Act.

These negotiated provisions—which represent our best attempt to achieve consensus among desert stakeholders—deserve to become law.

That legislation includes many additional conservation areas and provides permanent protection for five Off-Highway Recreation Areas covering approximately 142,000 acres. Off-roaders were a vital part of the coalition we put together, and unfortunately those lands could not be designated under executive action. Off-roaders deserve certainty about their future use of the land, just as there is now certainty for conservation purposes. I gave them my word that I would fight for them, and I intend to do so again in this new Congress.

This bill would also expand wilderness areas in the desert, by designating five additional wilderness areas that cover 230,000 acres of land near Fort Irwin.

The bill would ensure clean and free-flowing rivers, through the designation of 77 miles of rivers as Wild and Scenic Rivers; add to our national parks, by expanding Death Valley National Park Wilderness by 39,000 acres and Joshua Tree National Park by 4,500 acres; expand National Scenic Areas, by adding

18,610 acres to the Alabama Hills National Scenic Area in Inyo County; and protect 81,000 acres of land in San Bernardino and Imperial County, and requires the Department of the Interior to protect petroglyphs and other cultural resources important to the surrounding tribes and communities.

Lastly, the bill will facilitate renewable energy development in a way that protects delicate habitat.

I want to highlight some of the key provisions of this legislation:

By designating five new wilderness areas, this bill protects fragile desert ecosystems across 230,000 acres of wilderness near Fort Irwin. This includes 88,000 acres of Avawatz Mountains, 8,000-acre Great Falls Basin Wilderness, the 80,000-acre Soda Mountains Wilderness, and the 32,500-acre Death Valley Wilderness.

The desert's sweeping desert vistas and rugged mountain terrain not only provide for a truly remarkable backcountry experience, but also provide vital refuge for everything from bighorn sheep and desert tortoises to Joshua Trees and Native American artifacts.

This bill is more than just wilderness, however. It also designates four new Wild and Scenic Rivers, totaling 77 miles in length. These beautiful waterways, carved through the heart of the arid desert, are Deep Creek and the Whitewater River in and near the San Bernardino National Forest, as well as the Amargosa River and Surprise Canyon Creek near Death Valley National Park.

The bill also releases 126,000 acres of land from their existing wilderness study area designation in response to requests from local government and recreation users. This will allow the land to be made available for other purposes, including recreational off-highway vehicle use on designated routes.

We must also take into account another use of the desert land: renewable energy. I believe that we can honor our commitment to conservation while fulfilling California's pledge to develop a clean energy portfolio.

Balancing conservation, development and other uses is possible, we just need to come up with the right solutions. Thankfully, some of these compromises are already in place.

By April 2009, solar and wind companies had proposed 28 projects to be included in the Mojave Trails National Monument, including sites on former Catellus lands intended for permanent conservation. I visited some of those sites at the time, including one particularly beautiful area known as the Broadwell Valley, where thousands of acres of pristine lands were proposed for development. Seeing it first hand, I quickly came to the conclusion that those lands were simply not the right place for renewable energy development.

Since then, 26 of the 28 applications have been withdrawn. This is due in part to the state and federal governments' efforts to develop and finalize the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan—an ambitious effort to comprehensively manage renewable energy, conservation, and recreation on 22.5 million acres of California desert.

By working with our state to develop this Plan, the federal government has shown it can be an effective partner in the State's efforts to combat climate change, all while protecting the magnificent, yet fragile, California desert landscape.

The bill also makes use of about 370,000 acres of isolated, unusable parcels of State lands spread across the California desert. These small isolated parcels of State land in wilderness, national parks and monuments would be exchanged for Federal lands elsewhere that could potentially provide the State with viable sites for renewable energy development, off-highway vehicle recreation, or other commercial purposes.

This blueprint will help identify pristine lands that warrant protection and direct energy projects elsewhere.

This is a fair balancing of priorities, and I think it provides a clear path forward.

I strongly urge my colleagues to take a good look at this legislation. I hope they understand that the many stakeholders involved have made their voices heard.

As you can see, there are many diverse interests in California's desert lands, an it is not easy to bring them all into agreement. But after years of painstaking efforts, they have reached agreement on this bill.

Desert conservation has never been a partisan issue. Over the years, legislators have come together across party lines to preserve this great piece of land.

Given our past success, I am hopeful this Congress will take this legislation up and move it forward. Most importantly, I hope this body recognizes the simple fact that desert conservation has never been a partisan issue.

Over the years, legislators have come together across party lines to preserve this great piece of land. It's the right thing to do.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 49. A bill to provide a leasing program within the Coastal Plain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to once again open a small portion of the Arctic coastal plain, in my home State of Alaska, to oil and gas development. I am introducing the bill because, now more than ever, new production in northern Alaska is vital not only to my state's future, but also to our Nation's energy and economic security.

It has been known for more than nearly 4 decades that the 1.5 million acres of the Arctic coastal plain that lie inside the northern one-eleventh of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge are the most prospective lands in North America for a major conventional oil and gas discovery. The U.S. Geological Survey continues to estimate that this part of the coastal plain—which represents just 3 percent of the coastal plain in all of northern Alaska—has a mean likelihood of containing 10.4 billion barrels of oil and 8.6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, as well as a reasonable chance of economically producing 16 billion barrels of oil. Even the relatively recent major finds in North Dakota's Bakken field and the recent estimates of shale oil in Texas' Wolfcamp formation pale in comparison, as ANWR is likely to hold over three times more conventional oil than any other onshore energy deposit in North America.

In the 1990s, opponents dismissed ANWR's potential and argued that the nearby National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska was forecast to contain almost as much oil. However, early this decade the U.S. Geological Survey significantly reduced its oil estimates in the 23 million acre reserve. Instead of containing somewhere between the 6.7 to 15 billion barrels as forecast in 2002, the USGS now forecasts a mean of 896 million barrels—a dramatic downward revision. While I still believe oil production must be allowed to proceed in NPRA and that development of satellite fields must be allowed to occur, the revised forecast means that opening a small area on shore to the east on the coastal plain, is now more vital than ever for America's economic and national security interests.

That is especially the case given that President Obama late last year closed almost all of Alaska's outer continental shelf oil and gas deposits to future exploration and development. That makes production of onshore deposits even more vital for Alaska's economic future, and for the Nation's long-term energy security.

America once received more than 10 percent of its daily domestic oil production from fields in Alaska. You heard correctly, production already occurs in Arctic Alaska, and has for nearly 40 years. We have successfully balanced resource development with environmental protection. Alaskans have proven, over and over again, that those endeavors are not mutually exclusive.

Today, however, we face a tipping point. Alaska's North Slope production has declined for years and now accounts for just under 5 percent of the Nation's daily production. It is now forecast to decline further to levels next decade that will threaten the continued operation of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. A closure of TAPS would shut down all northern Alaska oil production. This would devastate Alaska's economy, drag global oil prices even higher, and deepen our energy dependence on unstable petrostates throughout the world, especially once oil shale production peaks in the Lower 48 States.

Anyone who takes the long view on energy policy recognizes that no matter what energy policy our Nation pursues, we will use substantial amounts of oil well into the future. The more of that oil we produce at home, the better off our economy, our trade deficit, our employment levels, and the world's environment will be. To help meet future demand both here in America and throughout the rest of the world, and to help avoid a tremendous price spike in the event of supply disruptions, we need to take steps today to ensure new production is brought online, as soon as possible.

ANWR development will provide huge benefits for the U.S. Treasury. Let's examine this with some simple math. ANWR's mean estimate of over 10 billion barrels, at even today's $50 per barrel price, means that there is half a trillion dollars worth of oil locked up beneath this small area in northern Alaska—and even more when prices rebound. That is half a trillion taxable dollars, and it is difficult to calculate or even fathom the corporate and payoll taxes that this would generate for our treasury. But we do know that there are hundreds of billions of dollars in pure Federal royalties since my bill devotes 50 percent of the value to a Federal share, rather than the 10 percent which current law allows.

As our Nation grapples with a huge budget deficit, nearly $20 trillion in national debt, and a lack of capital to incentivize new energy development, it is folly for America to further delay new onshore oil development from Alaska. The question is no longer, ''Should we drill in ANWR?'' Today, it has become, ''Can we afford not to?''

I understand that no matter what happens, some will remain opposed to development in this region. The outgoing administration has attempted to not only prohibit oil and gas development onshore in the coastal plain—proposing to forever lock the area up into formal wilderness—but also has proposed to impede oil and even natural gas development from vast portions of NPRA and from the offshore waters of the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas. This mindset ignores Alaska's economic realities, it ignores the Nation's looming energy challenges, and it ignores the fact that Arctic oil production can proceed without any significant environmental impact. Our development has coexisted productively with polar bears, and will not harm the Porcupine caribou herd or any other form of wildlife on the Arctic coast. The groups who oppose my legislation seem totally oblivious to strides made in directional, extended reach drilling, three- and four-dimensional seismic testing, and new pipeline leak detection technology, all of which permit Alaskan energy development to proceed safely without harm to wildlife or the environment.

For all these reasons, I am reintroducing legislation to open the coastal plain of ANWR to development. At the same time, I am again focusing and narrowing that development so that just 2,000 acres of the 1.5 million acre coastal plain can be physically disturbed by roads, pipelines, wells, buildings or other support facilities. At most, just one-tenth of 1 percent of the refuge's coastal plain would be impacted. For comparison's sake, 2,000 acres is roughly the size of National Airport—compared to an area roughly three times the size of the state of Maryland. It is hardly a blip on the map.

Limiting development to such a small area is important. It will help guarantee—beyond any shadow of doubt—the preservation in a natural state of more than sufficient habitat for caribou, muskoxen, polar bear, and Arctic bird life. My legislation also includes stringent environmental standards.

The bill, named the Alaska Oil and Gas Production Act, AOGPA, which is being cosponsored by my colleague from Alaska, Senator DAN SULLIVAN, also includes guaranteed finding to mitigate any impacts in the region, and guarantees that the Federal Government will receive half of all revenues generated.

For decades, Alaskans, whom polls show overwhelmingly support ANWR development, have been asking permission to explore and develop oil in the coastal plain. Finally, technology has advanced so that it is possible to develop oil and gas from the coastal plain with little or no impact on the area and its wildlife.

At this time of unsustainable debt, and an unstable global environment, we need to pursue domestic development opportunities more than ever. My ANWR bill offers us a chance to produce more of our own energy, for the good of the American people, in an environmentally-friendly way. I hope this Congress, given the new administration that will soon take office, will have the common sense to allow America to help itself by developing ANWR's substantial resources. This is critical to my state and the Nation as a whole. And with this in mind, I will work to educate the members of this chamber about ANWR. I will show why such development should occur, why it must occur, and how it can benefit our Nation at a time when we need the domestic jobs and energy security that ANWR will produce.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 54. A bill to prohibit the creation of an immigration-related registry program that classifies people on the basis of religion, race, age, gender, ethnicity, national origin, nationality, or citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today, I introduced the Protect American Families from Unnecessary Registration and Deportation Act of 2017, or the Protect American Families Act. This critical bill would advance civil and human rights by ensuring we protect American immigrants from being wrongfully targeted by the Federal Government because of who they are or how they worship. I thank Senators ELIZABETH WARREN, BRIAN SCHATZ, ED MARKEY, PATTY MURRAY, BERNIE SANDERS, PATRICK LEAHY, JEFF MERKLEY, MAZIE HIRONO, and RON WYDEN for joining me on this important legislation.

Enshrined in the Constitution are the ideas that all people are free to practice the religion of their choice and that we will not discriminate because of your faith or national origin. Creating a Federal immigration program that requires people to register their status with the Federal Government on the basis of their religion, race, ethnicity, gender, age, nationality, national origin, or citizenship is contrary to those values. Because the United States is the world's beacon of democracy, we must lead by example and live the values we preach.

Yet, in troubling times we have not always stayed true to our values. During World War II, soon after Imperial Japan attacked United States Naval Base Pearl Harbor, President Franklin Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066. That order authorized the Secretary of War to designate particular areas as military zones, which allowed for the removal of Japanese Americans from certain parts of the United States. Subsequently, more than 110,000 Japanese Americans were relocated to internment camps.

Similarly, in 2002, the year following the tragic terrorist attacks on September 11, the Federal Government created the National Security Entry-Exist Registration System, NSEERS. This Federal program required non-citizen visa holders from certain countries to register with the Federal Government. The registration process included fingerprinting, photographs, and interrogation. Once an individual registered, NSEERS required the person to regularly check in with immigration officials. Finally, NSEERS monitored people who registered with the program to ensure that no one remained in the country longer than the law permitted them.

Inconsistent with the American values of religious freedom and nondiscrimination, the NSEERS program wrongly targeted males over 16 years old from the following countries: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, Eritrea, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, and North Korea. Thus, 24 out of the 25 countries listed in the NSEERS program were Arab and Muslim countries. This was another moment in our nation's history where our leaders succumbed to the politics of

fear and adopted a program that tore at the very fabric of our country.

Immigration-registry programs do not make the public more safe. The purpose of NSEERS was to identify and capture terrorists. Yet, despite registering over 83,000 people, the program yielded zero terrorism convictions. Without proof of a single terrorist related conviction, the NSEERS program did not do its job of keeping the homeland safe.

But immigration-registry programs do result in discrimination. The fact that NSEERS led to the forced registry, interrogation, and deportations of immigrants from predominantly Muslim or Arab countries is proof that broadly defined enforcement programs often result in racial and religious profiling. That is why the United Nations and major American civil rights groups condemned NSEERS for unfairly singling out Muslims. By targeting Muslims, NSEERS sent the wrong message that America does not welcome immigrants from certain lands.

While the Obama administration dismantled the NSEERS program, this alone will not prevent the incoming administration from attempting to follow through on its threats to create a registry based on religion or national origin. On the campaign trail President-elect Trump called for a ''total and complete shutdown'' of Muslim immigrants entering the United States. Additionally, he has called for ''extreme vetting'' of immigrants reminiscent of NSEERS. It is incumbent upon congressional leaders to ensure that the United States does not sacrifice its values in the face of fear.

Today, I introduce the Protect American Families Act to ensure that America protects the rights and liberties of American immigrants from overly broad, ineffective, and discriminatory registry programs. This bill would prohibit the Federal Government from requiring noncitizens to register or check in with the Federal Government simply because of their religion, race, ethnicity, age, gender, national origin, nationality, or citizenship. Banning the creation of a discriminatory registration program is not only consistent with our democratic values, but it allows law enforcement to focus resources on the real threats to our safety.

The bill has commonsense exemptions. Data collection is critical in our fight against terrorists, and the bill allows the government to collect routine data on the entry and exit of noncitizens. The bill would also protect important immigration programs like Temporary Protected Status, Deferred Enforced Departure, the Visa Waiver Program, and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. This provision makes clear that legitimate Federal programs that confer immigration benefits are not prohibited by the ban on enforcement immigration programs that target immigrants and other vulnerable Americans.

In his First Inaugural Address, President Roosevelt said that ''the only thing we have to fear is fear itself.'' Unfortunately, he failed to live up to that statement when he issued Executive Order 9066. But we have a chance to fulfill that vision. We have a chance to stand up against fear and stay true to our American values in the face of hardship. I am proud to introduce the Protect American Families Act today, and I urge my colleagues to support its speedy passage through the Senate.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 7—TO CONSTITUTE THE MAJORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 7

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the majority party's membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Mr. Roberts (Chairman), Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Hoeven, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Thune, Mr. Daines, Mr. Perdue.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Cochran (Chairman), Mr. McConnell, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Alexander, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Graham, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Moran, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Boozman, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Rubio.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. McCain (Chairman), Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Graham, Mr. Sasse.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Crapo (Chairman), Mr. Shelby, Mr. Corker, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Perdue, Ms. Tillis, Mr. Kennedy.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Thune (Chairman), Mr. Wicker, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Heller, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Lee, Mr. Johnson, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Young.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Murkowski (Chairman), Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Risch, Mr. Lee, Mr. Flake, Mr. Daines, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Portman.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Barrasso (Chairman), Mr. Inhofe, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Moran, Mr. Rounds, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Hatch (Chairman), Mr. Grassley, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Thune, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott, Mr. Cassidy.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Corker (Chairman), Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Flake, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Young, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Alexander (Chairman), Mr. Enzi, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Ms. Collins, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Young, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Roberts, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Scott.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. Johnson (Chairman), Mr. McCain, Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Daines.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Grassley (Chairman), Mr. Hatch, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Lee, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Flake, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Kennedy.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Burr (Chairman), Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Collins, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Cornyn.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Ms. Collins (Chairman), Mr. Hatch, Mr. Flake, Mr. Scott, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Corker, Mr. Burr, Mr. Rubio, Mrs. Fischer.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Enzi (Chairman), Mr. Grassley, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Graham, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Corker, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Boozman.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Hoeven (Chairman), Mr. Barrasso, Mr. McCain, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Moran.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. Lee (Vice Chairman), Mr. Cotton, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Portman, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Cassidy.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Blunt (Chairman), Mr. McConnell, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mr. Risch (Chairman), Mr. Rubio, Mr. Paul, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Young, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Rounds, and Mr. Kennedy.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Isakson (Chairman), Mr. Moran, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Isakson (Chairman), Mr. Roberts, Mr. Risch.

SENATE RESOLUTION 8—TO CONSTITUTE THE MINORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 8

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party's membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Brown, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Bennet, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Donnelly, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Casey, Mr. Van Hollen.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Leahy, Mrs. Murray, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Reed, Mr. Tester, Mr. Udall, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Coons, Mr. Schatz, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Van Hollen.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Reed, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. McCaskill, Mrs. Shaheen, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr.

Donnelly, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Kaine, Mr. King, Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Warren, Mr. Peters.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Brown, Mr. Reed, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Tester, Mr. Warner, Ms. Warren, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Donnelly, Mr. Schatz, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. Cortez Masto.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Nelson, Ms. Cantwell, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Schatz, Mr. Markey, Mr. Booker, Mr. Udall, Mr. Peters, Ms. Baldwin, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Hassan, Ms. Cortez Masto.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Sanders, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Franken, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Hirono, Mr. King, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Cortez Masto.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Carper, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Merkley, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Booker, Mr. Markey, Ms. Duckworth, Ms. Harris.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Wyden, Ms. Stabenow, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Carper, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Brown, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Casey, Mr. Warner, Mrs. McCaskill.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Cardin, Mr. Menendez, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Coons, Mr. Udall, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Markey, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Booker.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mrs. Murray, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Casey, Mr. Franken, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Whitehouse, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Murphy, Ms. Warren, Mr. Kaine, Ms. Hassan.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mrs. McCaskill, Mr. Carper, Mr. Tester, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Peters, Ms. Hassan, Ms. Harris.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Warner (Vice Chairman), Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. King, Mr. Manchin, Ms. Harris and Mr. Reed (ex officio).

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Whitehouse, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Franken, Mr. Coons, Mr. Blumenthal, Ms. Hirono.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Sanders, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Warner, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Kaine, Mr. King, Mr. Van Hollen, Ms. Harris.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Schumer, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Udall, Mr. Warner, Mr. Leahy, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. King, Ms. Cortez Masto.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mrs. Shaheen, Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Cardin, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Markey, Mr. Booker, Mr. Coons, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Duckworth.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Tester, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Brown, Mr. Blumenthal, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Manchin.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Mr. Casey, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Whitehouse, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Donnelly, Ms. Warren, Ms. Cortez Masto.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. Heinrich, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Peters, Ms. Hassan.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Coons (Vice Chairman), Mr. Schatz, Mrs. Shaheen.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Udall (Vice Chairman), Ms. Cantwell, Mr. Tester, Mr. Franken, Mr. Schatz, Ms. Heitkamp, Ms. Cortez Masto.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 8. Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COONS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KING, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MERKLEY) proposed an amendment 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.

SA 9. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 10. Mr. MENENDEZ 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 11. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) 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 12. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. FRANKEN) 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 13. Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KING, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) 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 14. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. BENNET) 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 15. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) 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 16. Mr. VAN HOLLEN 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 17. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. WARREN) 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 18. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 19. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. COONS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S . Con. Res. 3, supra.

SA 20. Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra.

SA 21. Mr. PETERS 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 8. Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COONS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KING, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MERKLEY) proposed an amendment 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; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. DON'T MAKE AMERICA SICK AGAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any legislation that makes America sick again, as described in subsection (b).

(b) LEGISLATION MAKING AMERICA SICK AGAIN.—For purposes of subsection (a), legislation that makes America sick again refers to any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that the Congressional Budget Office determines would—

(1) reduce the number of Americans enrolled in public or private health insurance coverage, as determined based on the March 2016 updated baseline budget projections by the Congressional Budget Office;

(2) increase health insurance premiums or total out-of-pocket health care costs for Americans with private health insurance; or

(3) reduce the scope and scale of benefits covered by private health insurance, as compared to the benefits Americans would have received pursuant to the requirements under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148; 124 Stat. 130) and the amendments made by that title.

(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.

SA 9. Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

by her 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 THE REPEAL OF THE MEDICARE PART D NONINTERFERENCE CLAUSE.

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 the repeal of the noninterference clause under the Medicare part D prescription drug program in order to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate for the best possible price for prescription drugs 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 10. Mr. MENENDEZ 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 IV, add the following:

SEC. 4____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD AFFECT MEDICAID ENROLLMENT, BENEFITS, OR STATE SPENDING.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would affect the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) unless such legislation receives certification from the Congressional Budget Office and the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services that the legislation would not result in—

(1) a decrease in enrollment in such program;

(2) a reduction in the benefits offered under such program, including benefits offered by States as optional additional services; or

(3) an increase in State spending under such program.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) 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 subsection (a).

SA 11. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) 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 IV, add the following:

SEC. 4____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REDUCE MEDICAID BENEFITS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would affect the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) unless such legislation receives certification from the Congressional Budget Office and the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services that the legislation would not result in a reduction of the benefits provided under such program, including benefits that are offered by a State as an optional additional service.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) 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 subsection (a).

SA 12. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. FRANKEN) 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 IV, add the following:

SEC. 4____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PENALIZE MEDICAID EXPANSION STATES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would affect the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) unless such legislation receives certification from the Congressional Budget Office that the legislation would not result in—

(1) decreased enrollment in such program in States which have opted to expand eligibility for medical assistance under such program for low-income, non-elderly individuals under the eligibility option established by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act under section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.); or

(2) increased State spending on such program in such States.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) 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 subsection (a).

SA 13. Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KING, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) 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 IV, add the following:

SEC. 4____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REPEAL THE HEALTH REFORMS THAT CLOSED THE PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE GAP UNDER MEDICARE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would repeal health reform legislation that closed the coverage gap 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.).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) 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 subsection (a).

SA 14. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. BENNET) 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:

On page 49, strike lines 4 through 11.

SA 15. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) 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 IV, add the following:

SEC. 4____. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REDUCE THE PREMIUM TAX CREDITS PROVIDED BY THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce the premium tax credits provided by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) 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 subsection (a).

SA 16. Mr. VAN HOLLEN 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 title II.

SA 17. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Ms. WARREN) 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 IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCING FUNDING FOR DISEASE PREVENTION EFFORTS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) result in a reduction or elimination of funding under section 4002 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–11);

(2) reduce the Federal resources provided to communities to invest in effective, proven prevention efforts; or

(3) increase the prevalence of disease amongst children.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) 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 subsection (a).

SA 18. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. COONS, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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 IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE THE DEFICIT OR REDUCE A SURPLUS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any reconciliation bill or reconciliation resolution, or an amendment to, motion on, conference report on, or amendment between the Houses in relation to a reconciliation bill or reconciliation resolution that would cause or increase a deficit or reduce a surplus in either of the following periods:

(1) The period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 4 fiscal years following the budget year.

(2) The period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—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.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of deficit increases and reductions in a surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

SA 19. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. COONS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) 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; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD BREAK DONALD TRUMP'S PROMISE NOT TO CUT SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, OR MEDICAID.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);

(2) increase either the early or full retirement age for the benefits described in paragraph (1);

(3) privatize Social Security;

(4) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits for individuals entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under the Medicare program under title XVIII of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

(5) result in a reduction of benefits or eligibility for individuals enrolled in, or eligible to receive medical assistance through, a State Medicaid plan or waiver under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) 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 subsection (a).

SA 20. Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PRIVATIZE MEDICARE OR LIMIT FEDERAL FUNDING FOR MEDICAID.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) privatize the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or turn the program into a voucher system;

(2) increase the eligibility age under the Medicare program; or

(3) block grant the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), impose per capita spending caps on State Medicaid programs, or decrease coverage under such program from current levels.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) 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 subsection (a).

SA 21. Mr. PETERS 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 IV, add the following:

SEC. 4___. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CAUSE VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS TO LOSE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would repeal any provision in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) prior to the enactment of a law to ensure that no veteran or dependent that gained health care coverage through such Act's Exchanges or Medicaid expansion will lose coverage.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) 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 subsection (a).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I have five requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 5, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 5, 2017 at 3 p.m., to conduct a classified briefing entitled ''Recent Administration Actions in Response to Russian Hacking and Harassment of U.S. Diplomats.''

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 5, 2017, at 2 p.m. in room SH–219 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following legislative fellows in my office be given floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress: Sophia Vogt, Emily Douglas, Kripa Sreepada, Katherine Tsantiris, Chris Jones, and Noah Ben-Aderet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 6, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12:45 p.m., Friday, January 6; 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; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the Senate stand in recess, to then proceed as a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives under the provisions of S. Con. Res. 2, for the counting of the electoral ballots; further, that upon dissolution of the joint session, the Senate stand adjourned until 2 p.m., Monday, January 9; 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 12:45 P.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 6:48 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 6, 2017, at 12:45 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

MARY ELLEN BARBERA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2018, VICE JONATHAN LIPPMAN, TERM EXPIRED.

DAVID V. BREWER, OF OREGON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2019. (REAPPOINTMENT)

WILFREDO MARTINEZ, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2019. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CHASE ROGERS, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

EXPORT–IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

CLAUDIA SLACIK, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT–IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2019, VICE PATRICIA M. LOUI, TERM EXPIRED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING CLAYTON BENTCH

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Clayton Bentch. Clayton is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1376, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Clayton has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Clayton has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Clayton has led his troop as the Patrol Leader, become a Brotherhood member of the Order of the Arrow, and holds the rank of Firebuilder in the tribe of Mic-O-Say. Clayton has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Clayton Bentch for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CHIEF DANIEL KEVIN BAUM COMPLETES FIRE OFFICER PROGRAM

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Chief Daniel Kevin Baum of Pearland, TX, for successfully completing the Executive Fire Officer Program (EFOP).

Completion of this program provides senior fire officers with the skills and expertise that are needed to combat today's challenging environment. Daniel previously served as chief of the Pearland EMS agency, has a Masters in Emergency and Disaster Management, and has over 10 years of experience in fire administration. Our community is safer thanks to his commitment to fire safety awareness and protection.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations and thank you to Chief Daniel Baum for completing the Executive Fire Officer Program. We appreciate his hard work, dedication and service for Pearland.

HONORING CHRISTIAN CHARLES TORCHIA

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Christian Charles Torchia. Christian is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1351, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Christian has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Christian has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Christian contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Christian restored a section of hiking trail in Green Hills of Platte Wildlife Preserve in Parkville, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Christian Charles Torchia for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

BAY AREA REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER ACHIEVES CHEST PAIN CENTER ACCREDITATION

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Bay Area Regional Medical Center in Houston, TX for achieving Chest Pain Center Accreditation with PCI and Resuscitation from the Society of Cardiovascular Patient Care.

Bay Area Regional is the first and only hospital in Houston and only the fifth in Texas to achieve this outstanding recognition. This accreditation is achieved by hospitals proven to have a higher level of expertise regarding patients with heart attack symptoms. Bay Area Regional has stacked its staff with a dedicated and expert cardiology team that ensures its patients receive the best care and treatment, while also promoting community awareness to prepare and prevent heart attacks. Their hard work and success keeps Houstonians healthy.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Bay Area Regional Medical Center for achieving Chest Pain Center Accreditation. We are very proud and happy to have such an exceptional hospital so close to home. Thank you for all your hard work.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 21

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, I voted against H.R. 21, a bill that would allow Congress to summarily reject any regulation finalized during the final year of a President's administration.

Current law, under the Congressional Review Act (CRA), already allows Congress to invalidate rules adopted in the final 60 legislative days of an outgoing Administration on a case-by-case basis, preventing agencies from promulgating that rule or any substantially similar rule.

Today's bill, however, would allow Republicans to invalidate important regulations protecting public health, consumer rights, and the environment en bloc, without debating each rule individually or providing the transparency and accountability that would come from a rule-by-rule vote.

This means that rules finalized after the thorough and public process set forth by law—or extended by lawsuits—that agencies must follow are invalidated, even if the underlying problems remain, and with no plan to fix those underlying problems. For instance, rules limiting horse soring or strengthening consumer protections regarding organic food could be blocked under this rule.

The voters elected President Obama to a second, full four-year term. This deeply anti-democratic effort by the Republican majority not only undermines the President, it also leaves Americans and our environment holding the bag. H.R. 21 is perhaps more detrimental than the Senate's refusal to fill the Supreme Court vacancy because this bill would allow Congress to invalidate an entire year of an entire administration's work.

HONORING JOEL MADDEN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Joel Madden. Joel is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1099, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Joel has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Joel has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Joel contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Joel Madden for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN RECOGNITION OF THOMAS WILLIAMS, STATE DIRECTOR OF USDA RURAL DEVELOPMENT—PENNSYLVANIA

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Thomas Williams, State Director of U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development for Pennsylvania. Appointed to the USDA by President Obama in July 2009, Mr. Williams will retire from federal service on January 7, 2017.

As State Director for Pennsylvania, Mr. Williams was responsible for securing loans, grants, loan guarantees and technical assistance offered through 40 Rural Development housing, utility and business programs. Mr. Williams managed 106 employees and 9 regional offices across Pennsylvania, as well as the state office in Harrisburg. During his seven years with the USDA, Rural Development invested over $5 billion in Pennsylvania infrastructure.

Prior to his tenure with the USDA, Mr. Williams served as a congressional aide to former U.S. Congressman Paul Kanjorski. Mr. Williams also worked with several communities in Pennsylvania and New York to assist local development and economic development efforts. Mr. Williams is a graduate of Wilkes University and received his Master's degree from Bloomsburg University. He currently resides in Mountain Top with his wife, Nancy.

It is an honor to recognize Thomas Williams for his service to our country, and I wish him all the best in his retirement.

KATIE HYDE EARNS GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Katie Hyde of Sugar Land, TX, for earning her Girl Scout Gold Award.

The Gold Award is the highest achievement a Girl Scout can earn. To earn this distinguished award, Katie had to spend at least 80 hours developing and executing a project that would benefit the community and have a long-term impact on girls as well. Her Gold project included building sets of horse jumps for the therapeutic riding program at Southern Equestrian Center, which will make it easier for those with physical or mental disabilities to ride horses.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Katie Hyde for earning her Girl Scout Gold Award. We are confident she will have continued success in her future endeavors. We are very proud.

HONORING RAYMOND PROBST, JR.

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Raymond Probst, Jr. Raymond is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1099, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Raymond has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Raymond has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Raymond contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Raymond Probst, Jr., for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN RECOGNITION OF SHERIFF GLYNN COOPER

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my personal congratulations and best wishes to an outstanding leader and exceptional public servant, Chattahoochee County Sheriff Glynn Cooper. Sheriff Cooper will be retiring from his position as Sheriff and a surprise celebration will be held for him on Saturday, January 7, 2017 at 2:00 p.m. at the Roscoe Robinson Recreation Center in Cusseta, Georgia.

Glynn Cooper was born in Schley County, Georgia on April 15, 1934 to Wesley and Mozelle Cooper. He, along with his brothers, Fred, Leonard, and Drane, worked on farms in Stewart and Webster counties in Georgia.

He met the love of his life, Estelle, at a dance and they married on December 11, 1954. As a newlywed couple, they lived with his parents until Sheriff Cooper could secure a home in Cusseta, Georgia, where he still lives today. They welcomed a daughter, Glynda, on October 12, 1957. Estelle was Sheriff Cooper's partner, supporter, and best friend until she passed away in 1998.

Growing up on a farm taught Sheriff Cooper to be a jack of all trades. He worked at Preston's Garage in Columbus, Georgia until he opened Cooper's Garage in Cusseta. He and Estelle, who was Senior Clerk at the Post Office, began purchasing and building Cooper Rental Properties, a business which remains in the family to this day.

He had set his sights on being elected Sheriff of Chattahoochee County but initially suffered a loss. Never a quitter, he was elected Sheriff in 1973 and maintained a one-man office with the radio call number 651. He soon dubbed Estelle as 651½ on the radio. With his family's support, Sheriff Cooper has been a faithful servant to the people of Chattahoochee County for a remarkable 43 years. He has earned the distinction of being the second-longest-serving Sheriff in the state of Georgia.

Sheriff Cooper is also actively involved in the community. He previously served on the school board and City Council. He also volunteered his time and efforts to serving on numerous civic organizations. Raised in a Christian home, he joined Louvale Missionary Baptist Church at a young age. Today, he is a faithful member of Cusseta Baptist Church.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays often said: "You make your living by what you get; you make your life by what you give." Not only has Sheriff Cooper made his living by keeping watch over the citizens of Chattahoochee County, but he has also made his life by giving back to the County in so many ways. We are all very grateful for his tireless advocacy in keeping our community safe. A man of great integrity, his efforts, his dedication, and his work ethic are unparalleled, but his heart for helping others utilizing these qualities has made his life's work truly special.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in honoring Sheriff Glynn Cooper for his dedicated service to the people of Chattahoochee County as he retires from his position as Sheriff.

INTRODUCTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO ELIMINATE THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE AND PROVIDE FOR THE DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a constitutional amendment I introduced today to eliminate the electoral college and provide for the direct election of our nation's President and Vice President.

As Founding Father Thomas Jefferson said, "I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions, but laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions change, with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times. We might well as require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilized society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors."

For the second time in recent memory, and for the fifth time in our history, the national popular vote winner will not become President because of the electoral college. This has happened twice to candidates from Tennessee: Al Gore and Andrew Jackson.

The reason is because the electoral college, established to prevent an uninformed citizenry from directly electing our nation's President, no longer fits our nation's needs.

When the Founders established the electoral college it was in an era of limited nationwide communication. The electoral structure

was premised on a theory that citizens would have a better chance of knowing about electors from their home states than about presidential candidates from out-of-state. Electors were supposed to be people of good judgment who were trusted with picking a qualified President and Vice President on behalf of the people. They held the responsibility of choosing a President because it was believed that the general public could not be properly informed of the candidates and the values each held.

That notion—that citizens should be prevented from directly electing the President—is antithetical to our understanding of democracy today, and our electoral process has not evolved to match our abilities to communicate, collect information, and make informed decisions about candidates. The development of mass media and the internet has made information about presidential candidates easily accessible to U.S. citizens across the country and around the world. The people no longer need the buffer of the electoral college to be knowledgeable about and decide who will be president. Today, citizens have a far better chance of knowing about out-of-state presidential candidates than knowing about presidential electors from their home states. Most people do not even know who their electors are.

While our ability to communicate has evolved so has the electoral college, but not in a positive way. Electors are now little more than rubber stamps who are chosen based on their political parties and who represent the interests of those political parties, rather than representing the people. Most states legally bind their electors to vote for whomever wins that state's popular vote, so electors can no longer exercise individual judgment when selecting a candidate.

In our country, ''We the People,'' are supposed to determine who represents us in elective office. Yet, we use an anachronistic process for choosing who will hold the highest offices in the land.

It is time for us to fix this, and that is why I have introduced this amendment today.

Since our nation first adopted our Constitution, ''We the People,'' have amended it repeatedly to expand the opportunity for citizens to directly elect our leaders:

The 15th Amendment guarantees the right of all citizens to vote, regardless of race.

The 19th Amendment guarantees the right of all citizens to vote, regardless of gender.

The 26th Amendment guarantees the right of all citizens 18 years of age and older to vote, regardless of age.

And the 17th Amendment empowers citizens to directly elect U.S. Senators.

We need to amend our Constitution to empower citizens to directly elect the President and the Vice President of the United States.

Working together, I know we can make our electoral college fit the world we live in today, and make our Constitution better reflect the ''more perfect Union'' to which it aspires.

HONORING AARON JACOB STOCKMAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Aaron Jacob Stockman. Aaron is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1394, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Aaron has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Aaron has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Aaron contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Aaron Jacob Stockman for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN MEMORY OF MR. A. WARREN KULP, JR.

HON. THOMAS J. ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of A. Warren Kulp, Jr., better known as Sonny, of Riviera Beach, Florida, who passed away on December 31st in West Palm Beach, Florida at the age of 81.

Sonny's life was the American Dream personified; after graduating from Hilltown High School in Pennsylvania in 1953, he worked as a self-employed dairy farmer for his entire life. He also earned his real estate license and worked as the head of the real estate department for eight years in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. After moving to Florida with his wife Judith, he worked at the Palm Beach Kennel Club until his retirement in 2007.

Outside of work, Sonny pursued many different interests. He was a loyal, lifelong Republican and served as an officer and committee chairman for the Pennridge Republican Club. Sonny was a member of Trinity United Methodist Church in West Palm Beach and he was also an avid Steelers fan. We are deeply saddened by the loss of such a prominent and active member of our community.

Sonny is survived by his loving wife Judith, his two sons Steven and Richard, his daughter, Patricia, and six grandchildren: Kiamesha, Brianna, Mary, Frances, Patrick III and Anthony.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers are with Mr. Kulp's family and loved ones as they mourn his passing. He will be greatly missed.

TRIBUTE TO SAIPAN SHIPPING, INC.

HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN

OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, August 11, 1956 marks a watershed moment in the history of the Northern Mariana Islands. That was the day that Saipan Shipping, Incorporated, was established, setting the Marianas on a course for economic resiliency and self-sufficiency that endures today.

Seven years before the founding of Saipan Shipping, in the aftermath of World War II, Jose C. ''Joeten'' Tenorio started a small grocery story in Chalan Kanoa, Saipan. What started out as a way to help deliver goods to local customers eventually developed into one of the largest businesses in the Marianas.

However, as Joeten's business grew, he ran into a major obstacle: In 1956, regular Japanese liners from the war were gone, the Trust Territory government ships did not run regularly, and cargo bound for Saipan often sat in port on Guam for days or even weeks. The lack of reliable and affordable shipping service to Saipan increased the costs of goods shipped to a small and struggling island economy.

Not content to accept the status quo, Joeten decided to do something about it. He reached out to family and friends to buy 100 shares in a start-up shipping company, and, on August 11, 1956, they formed Saipan Shipping Company, Incorporated.

The company began with its first vessel, the M/V *Hope*, which was purchased for $50,000 from Kenneth T. Jones Jr., President of Jones and Guerrero Company, Incorporated, on Guam. The converted minesweeper with twin screws and a wooden hull made weekly runs between Guam and Saipan, as well as occasional trips to the Northern Islands to pick up copra, which was sold to Japanese purchasers at the time. The boat also collected brass, copper, and other metals left from the war on the islands. Often these goods were delivered to Japan directly by the M/V *Hope* when it sailed there each year to dry-dock.

In May 1962, Saipan Shipping purchased the M/V *Four Winds*, also a former military and CIA vessel, from Bruan Shipping in Delaware. The *Four Winds* traveled a regular route between Saipan and Japan.

However, soon after the acquisition of the M/V *Four Winds*, Saipan Shipping would be challenged by two catastrophes. In November of 1962, just months after the acquisition of the *Four Winds*, the M/V *Hope* was struck by another vessel, the *Guam Bear*, which rendered the *Hope* unseaworthy. Days later, on November 11, Super Typhoon Karen hit Guam, sinking the *Hope* while it was in dry dock on Guam.

Despite these twin calamities, Saipan Shipping bounced back by taking the M/V *Four Winds* out of the Japan run to handle the local service run between Guam and Saipan, as well as quarterly trips to the Northern Islands.

Saipan Shipping continued to evolve in the years that followed. In 1965, the company began chartering the M/V *Ran Annim* from the Trust Territory government. In 1966, after the

M/V *Four Winds* was sold, the *Ran Annim* serviced the local route exclusively, until three years later, when it was replaced by the M/V *Mas Mauleg*, a larger vessel with passenger capacity.

In 1971, Saipan Shipping purchased the M/V *Normar* for local service and chartered the M/V *Mas Mauleg* to Micronesian Interocean Lines, Incorporated, a shipping company serving all the Micronesian islands. When Interocean Lines went bankrupt in 1974, Saipan Shipping saw an opportunity. The company started a joint shipping venture with Kyowa Shipping Company Limited, which marked the beginning of over 15 years of Saipan Shipping service to Micronesia and a partnership that endures to this day. The charters, however, were terminated in the late 1970s due to high costs caused by the global fuel crisis. Despite that termination, Saipan Shipping maintained service to Micronesia and the South Pacific by facilitating voyage space charters on the Kyowa vessels sailing these routes.

As the 1980s economic boom on Saipan dawned, Saipan Shipping flourished as it adapted to the changing needs of the island economy. In 1979, the company sold the M/V *Normar*, ending 23 years of almost continuous vessel ownership. The company then signed a charter contract with Transpac Marine in 1980 for weekly tug and barge service to Guam, Saipan, and Tinian. After Transpac Marine's barge #S–2009 ran aground on Guam in 1986, Marianas Tug & Barge became the charter company for Saipan Shipping.

In 1982, Saipan Shipping also negotiated a connecting carrier and agency agreement with American President Lines—a major U.S. shipping company, which supplemented the company's existing relationship with SeaLand Services.

These relationships resulted in Saipan Shipping becoming the primary carrier for American President Lines cargo loading and offloading on Saipan. Combined with the company's existing relationship with Kyowa, Saipan Shipping was poised to profit from the 1980s economic boom brought on by the growth of tourism and the garment industry.

In 1983, the first shipment of garments—all sweaters—was delivered from Saipan to New York. Saipan Shipping took the first containers to Guam. At the time, only three garment manufacturers were on Saipan. But, over time, the industry grew to eleven in 1987, then 23 in 1990. By 1997, there were more than 30 clothing factories on Saipan. By 1999, the value of clothing produced on Saipan had hit $1 billion, which translated into large profits for Saipan Shipping.

However, the expansion of the garment industry on Saipan also led to more competition in the shipping industry as shipping companies emerged to rival Saipan Shipping's foothold. Over time, though, Saipan Shipping pulled ahead. In 1996, American President Lines was purchased by Matson Navigation Company, a change that Saipan Shipping leveraged to transform its business once more. From being simply a carrier's principal agent, the company transitioned into more of a local partnership, with Saipan Shipping employees regularly participating in Matson's training programs at the turn of the century and working hand-in-hand to meet the shipping demands of the garment industry.

In that same year, Saipan Shipping pushed ahead with transforming its business, partnering with Kyowa and private investors to establish Marianas Steamship Agencies, Incorporated. This new company served as the husbanding agent for Saipan Shipping on Guam, providing goods and services needed by Saipan Shipping boats or crew.

In the early 21st century, major policy shifts at the national and international levels altered the economic landscape in the Marianas and profoundly impacted the shipping industry. The end of international quota restrictions in the global garment trade made it cost prohibitive for the garment industry to remain on Saipan, which led to all 31 garment factories closing shop in the early 2000s.

As a testament to its resiliency, however, Saipan Shipping endured while other shipping companies closed. Moreover, the company expanded. In 2001, Saipan Shipping ended 21 years of chartering boats with the purchase of Marianas Tug & Barge. The purchase included all of MarTug's equipment, most importantly the tugs *Sea Husky* and *Don Juan Tenorio*, and barges *Francisca III* and *Francisca IV*. All operations of MarTug were thus assumed, including the subsidiary Mid-Pacific Salvage, effectively adding marine salvaging to Saipan Shipping's portfolio of services.

Then the terrorist attacks of September 11 rocked our nation, and the world. The global economy reeled in the aftermath of the attacks, and new challenges arose for the shipping industry as more stringent regulations were adopted to increase national security. Undeterred, Saipan Shipping demonstrated its adaptability once again by upgrading its information technology to increase efficiency and profitability. The company automated many aspects of its business, which helped streamline customs and quarantine processing, customer clearance processing, and physical clearance of cargo.

Still standing as the lone local shipping company in the Marianas, Saipan Shipping moved confidently into the new millennium. In 2005, the company entered into an agency agreement with Marianas-based vessel operator, Seabridge, Incorporated, serving inter-island trade between Saipan and Guam.

Tragedy struck again in 2015 with Super Typhoon Soudelor, which wreaked more havoc on Saipan's port than many previous storms. But Saipan Shipping stood strong, rebounding and reaching out into the community to deliver much needed relief supplies.

Today, with construction booming and a budding gaming industry on Saipan, Saipan Shipping is adjusting as it always has to meet the demands of the local economy. And while competition has emerged, yet again, Saipan Shipping has adapted, yet again, to work with competitors to help the island economy prosper, yet again.

Jose C. ''Joeten'' Tenorio probably could not have imagined the remarkable evolution and many iterations of Saipan Shipping Company, Incorporated after its inception in 1956. But he would not have been surprised by Saipan Shipping's ability to adapt and thrive. Nor would Joeten have been surprised by the vital role that Saipan Shipping has played and continues to play in the local and regional economy.

After all, that is exactly why he helped start the company, to achieve the one purpose spelled out in its Articles of Incorporation in 1956 and to this day:

''The purpose of this Corporation is to engage in trade and commerce in and between [Saipan]'', the Marianas, the Pacific, and, indeed, the world.

THE HONOR ROLL SCHOOL CELEBRATES 25TH BIRTHDAY

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish the Honor Roll School in Sugar Land, TX, a happy 25th birthday.

The Honor Roll School is a private school with a focus of developing well-rounded, lifelong learners, with the social, emotional and academic skills to excel in the future. The school is made up of students from over 50 countries and every continent in the world. To celebrate their 25th year, the Honor Roll School held an international themed birthday party, which included special guests and speakers, along with booths and tables showcasing various countries.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to the Honor Roll School for teaching and preparing our children for a successful future these past 25 years. We truly appreciate all they have done and look forward to the next generation of Texans to complete the program.

IN RECOGNITION OF JACQUELINE NOONAN

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jacqueline Noonan, who recently retired as Mayor after 29 years of service and dedication to the city of Utica. On January 8th, friends and family will gather to celebrate her retirement and pay tribute to her many accomplishments.

Jackie graduated from Oakland University with a Bachelor's Degree in Secondary Education. She found great joy in working with kids as a teacher and later as a volunteer in the Utica Community Schools where her children attended school. In fact, if there was a way to get involved in her community, Jackie found it. A committed and prolific volunteer, Jackie served as a member of the Utica Community Schools Enrollment Advisory Board, volunteered with the Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts, was active in St. Lawrence Catholic Church, and helped new mothers with La Leche League International. While serving as Mayor, she continued to work closely with students as a spokesperson and advocate for the Macomb County Traffic Safety Association's ''Don't Drink and Drive'' alcohol education program. In 1991, she returned to the classroom teaching at Marlow Junior High and later at Eisenhower High School.

Jackie and her husband Jerry loved being a part of Utica's small town life where they ran a family business for 21 years. Jerry went to work for the Fire Department and later retired as the Assistant Fire Chief and Fire Inspector. Jackie was a founding member of the Friends of Utica Public Library and served on numerous committees throughout the community.

She was elected to City Council in 1981 and was elected Mayor in 1987.

As Mayor, Jackie understood that in addition to serving its residents, the City of Utica also plays a vital role in strengthening the region as a whole. She led the efforts to improve essential city services and responsiveness to constituents and businesses. Jackie spearheaded efforts to improve local roads including the widening of important roadways like M–59 and Van Dyke Avenue. Working closely with her on this project, I saw firsthand her dogged determination. Jackie also saw the value in establishing strong working relationships with her neighboring communities of Sterling Heights and Shelby Township as they shared services and resources. They even held their annual State of the City addresses together.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jackie and wishing her and her husband Jerry, and all their children and grandchildren the very best as they begin this next chapter. I am grateful to Jackie for her many years of dedicated public service, as well as for her friendship, and I am so pleased to join with the entire community in paying tribute to her, which is so deeply deserved.

BOND COUNTY BICENTENNIAL

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the bicentennial anniversary of Bond County in my home state of Illinois.

Bond County was created on January 4th, 1817 by an act of the Illinois Territorial Legislature. This event occurred nearly two years before Illinois was admitted into the Union as the 21st state.

The initial dimensions of Bond County were quite unique, as it was only 24 miles wide, but stretched over 600 miles north to include a portion of Michigan's Upper Peninsula. The county gets its name from Shadrach Bond, who had been an army colonel in the War of 1812, and, given the county's initial layout, had farmed well north of present-day Bond County. Shadrach Bond also served as the first governor of Illinois.

Over time Bond County gave birth to numerous other counties in the state, and ceded some of its land to Wisconsin and Michigan as well, so that today Bond County is one of the smaller counties in Illinois. Yet its rich history, along with the spirit and pride of its people, has outlasted all of these changes.

This year Bond County has planned a grand celebration in recognition of its bicentennial. This celebration began on January 5th with a commemorative program and a special proclamation by the County Board. Later this year, on July 2nd, the main celebration will occur with tours, a parade, food and many other activities, climaxing with a fireworks show.

I ask that we all join in that celebration as we pay tribute to the history and the people that made Bond County, and to the pioneering spirit that lives today in all of its citizens.

I stand today to salute Bond County on its 200th anniversary and to wish it the very best in the future.

KATE FOGLEMAN EARNS SPOT ON KIDS SWEETS SHOWDOWN

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kate Fogleman of Sugar Land, TX, for earning a spot on the Food Network show, Kids Sweets Showdown.

Kate is a 10-year-old girl who just loves to bake. She fell in love with watching kids baking competitions on the Food Network and was inspired to apply herself. After being turned down for the Kids Baking Championship show, she persevered and succeeded in earning a spot on the Food Network's new show, Kids Sweets Showdown. The show features talented kids preparing ''merry sweet treats'' in hopes of staying on the judges' ''nice list.'' Kate was featured on two episodes of the show, Santa Express and Snow Day Doughnuts. When she's not baking, Kate spends her time on her schools yearbook committee and dancing competitively for Dance Works in Missouri City, TX.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Kate Fogleman for earning a spot on Kids Sweets Showdown. We are extremely proud of her and look forward to her future success as a baker.

IN HONOR OF PATRICK J. MITCHELL

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the loss of a great Arizonan and American, Patrick J. Mitchell, 61, from Yuma, Arizona, who worked in Washington for many years, on November 27, 2016. Pat was a trusted advisor and advocate for many in Congress and he will be missed as a powerful advocate (with an Arizona perspective) for education, environment and natural resources, and labor issues in Washington DC councils.

Born in Yuma, AZ, on April 13, 1955, Pat was an accomplished athlete at Yuma High School where he was elected student body president. He went on to his beloved University of Arizona where he was elected student body president and from which he graduated in 1977. He received his Juris Doctorate from Arizona State University in 1981. Pat spent the next 35 years in politics and government fighting to improve the lives of others. He served as a congressional aide to Arizona Senator Dennis DeConcini, chief of staff to Representative Louise Slaughter from New York, political advisor to Arizona Governor Janet Napolitano and the late Representative Mo Udall from Arizona, and senior advisor to two presidential campaigns, including serving with the Simon campaign in Iowa. Pat also was a special assistant attorney general for the State of Arizona. He went on to start his own government affairs firm, Strategic Impact in Washington D.C., where he focused on appropriations, water and land management, and higher education issues. A beloved Arizona Wildcat fan, Pat was a member of the UA Bobcat Senior Honorary Society and served on the university's alumni board. He was also deeply involved with the Yuma community and in supporting Yuma's Catholic High School.

Pat cherished his family and he is predeceased by his parents, Henry and Helen (Curry) Mitchell of Yuma, and is survived by his brother Bryan Mitchell, sister Kathleen Dyer, nephews Ian and Dan Mitchell, and grandnieces Erin and Emily Mitchell. He often spoke of his father's military service to the nation.

Pat worked hard to ensure that the working families of Arizona had a voice when it came to national policy and debates, whether related to access to higher education or the natural beauty of the Nation. Pat was among those that rose to the challenge in a Republic that needs the best to engage in these national discussions. Few in this world loved their state and its people more.

IN RECOGNITION OF GENEVIEVE M. KUZIA

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Genevieve M. Kuzia, who is turning 100 years old on January 5, 2017.

Gerry, as she is known to all, was one of seven daughters born to Stephanie and Anthony Kazmierezyk in Boston, Massachusetts. As a child Gerry moved with her family down to Delaware for three years so her father could work on the railroad. In 1923, they moved back to the Commonwealth and settled in Hyde Park. After finishing at Hyde Park High School in 1935, Gerry worked for a law firm in Boston for several years.

It was at the wedding of a family friend that Gerry met Francis A. Kuzia, who had just been honorably discharged from the Marine Corps. Francis, or Frank as he was known, and Gerry fell in love and were married on July 13, 1942 and settled in Hyde Park to have three children—Paul, Susan and Robert. After raising three wonderful children and spending her time as a fulltime caring and loving mother, Gerry went back to work for the Hyde Park branch of the Boston Public Library where she worked for 16 years till her retirement in 1982.

After losing the love of her life, Frank, in 1993, Gerry moved to Braintree, Massachusetts before moving to the Cape Cod Senior Residences in 2009 due to failing eyesight. Always armed with a smile and a kind word, Gerry is beloved at Cape Cod Senior Residences.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Gerry on this joyous occasion. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing her many more years of good health and continued happiness.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. ERICA SARGENT

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Mrs. Erica Sargent for her service to my office and the people of California's 21st Congressional District.

Mrs. Sargent was born on May 30, 1990 in Los Banos, California, where she grew up on her family's dairy farm with her parents, Joey and Charlotte Mello, her sister Trisha, and her brother Michael. As a child, Erica took part in Future Farmers of America, where she showed dairy cows, Holsteins, Jerseys, and swine.

After graduating from Los Banos High School, Mrs. Sargent went on to receive her Bachelor's Degree in Agriculture Business at California State University, Fresno in 2013. While in college, Erica was a member of Delta Gamma Sorority and worked as a nanny part-time. On September 3, 2016, Erica married her husband Brandon Sargent.

Mrs. Sargent has held several positions with my office, in both Washington, D.C. and California over the past 4 years. She first joined my team as Staff Assistant in my Washington, D.C. office in July 2013. As Staff Assistant, she was instrumental in supporting others in daily tasks and helping the office run smoothly. In December 2013, she was promoted to Scheduler. Mrs. Sargent relocated from Washington, D.C. back to California's Central Valley, where she remained on my team as a Field Representative in Fresno County. Mrs. Sargent was known for her hard work and excellent community outreach. She was respected by her peers and was able to create and foster connections with constituents, business leaders, and public officials, all of which are integral skills of congressional staffers.

Outside of work, Erica enjoys spending time with her family, especially her husband, sister, and niece, Sofia. She is currently pursuing a Master's Degree from National University and hopes to become a school counselor.

Mrs. Sargent's time with my office will come to a close today, January 5, 2017, when she leaves to begin an internship in Laton, California, as a school counselor. Knowing Mrs. Sargent, her character, and her work ethic, I have no doubt that she will achieve many great things in her future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in commending Mrs. Erica Sargent for her public service to the people of the Central Valley and wishing her well as she embarks on the next chapter of her life.

HOUSTON METHODIST SUGAR LAND HOSPITAL EARNS AN ''A''

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Houston Methodist Sugar Land Hospital for earning an ''A'' for patient safety for the sixth year in a row.

Houston Methodist Sugar Land Hospital prides itself on the dedication of its physicians, nurses, technicians and staff to keep patients as healthy and safe as possible. Twice a year the Hospital Safety Score, part of The Leapfrog Group, grades hospitals based on how well they protect patients from errors, injuries, accidents and infections while in the hospital. Houston Methodist Sugar Land was one of 844 hospitals across the nation to earn an ''A'' grade in the fall 2016 survey.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Houston Methodist Sugar Land Hospital for earning an ''A'' for patient safety. We all benefit from their commitment to quality healthcare and we thank them for their hard work to keep Houstonians healthy.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 2017

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on Roll Call Votes 12 through 23 on the evening of January 5, 2017.

I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 26, the Regulations in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2017. I would have voted against all amendments that would weaken the underlying legislation, would have voted in favor of amendments that strengthen the underlying legislation, and would have voted in favor of final passage of this important legislation.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S73–S121

Measures Introduced: Twenty-six bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 32–57, and S. Res. 7–8. **Page S112–13**

Measures Passed:

Majority party's committee membership: Senate agreed to S. Res. 7, to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen. **Page S106**

Minority party's committee membership: Senate agreed to S. Res. 8, to constitute the minority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen. **Pages S106–07**

Measures Considered:

Budget Resolution—Agreement: Senate continued 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, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S75–S106, S107**

Pending:

Enzi (for Paul) Amendment No. 1, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S97–S106**

Sanders Amendment No. 19, relative to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. **Page S106**

Sanders (for Hirono/Donnelly) Amendment No. 20, to protect the Medicare and Medicaid programs. **Page S107**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 48 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 2), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to waive section 305(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, with respect to Kaine Amendment No. 8, relating to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Subsequently, the point of order that the amendment was in violation of section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, was sustained, and the amendment falls. **Page S79–95**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 5:30 p.m., on Monday, January 9, 2017, Senate vote on or in relation to Paul Amendment No. 1 (listed above); and that at 2:30 p.m., on Tuesday, January 10, 2017, Senate vote on or in relation to Sanders Amendment No. 19 (listed above). **Page S121**

Counting of Electoral Ballots—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 12:45 p.m., on Friday, January 6, 2017, Senate stand in recess, to then proceed as a body to the hall of the House of Representatives under the provisions of S. Con. Res. 2, to provide for the counting on January 6, 2017, of the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States; and that upon the dissolution of the Joint Session, Senate stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m., on Monday, January 9, 2017; and that following Leader remarks, Senate resume 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. **Page S121**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Mary Ellen Barbera, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2018.

David V. Brewer, of Oregon, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2019.

Wilfredo Martinez, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2019.

Chase Rogers, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the State Justice Institute for a term expiring September 17, 2018.

Claudia Slacik, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2019. **Page S121**

Messages From the House: **Page S110**

Measures Referred: Pages S110–11

Petitions and Memorials: Pages S111–12

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S113–14

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Page S114

Additional Statements: Pages S110–18

Amendments Submitted: Pages S118–20

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Pages S120–21

Privileges of the Floor: Page S121

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—2) Page S95

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:48 p.m., until 12:45 p.m. on Friday, January 6, 2017. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S121.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FOREIGN CYBER THREATS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine foreign cyber threats to the United States, after receiving testimony from James R. Clapper, Jr., Director of National Intelligence; and Marcel J. Lettre II, Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, and Admiral Michael S. Rogers, USN, Commander, Cyber Command, Director, National Security Agency, Chief, Central Security Services, both of the Department of Defense.

RUSSIAN HACKING AND HARASSMENT OF U.S. DIPLOMATS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee received a closed briefing on administration actions in response to Russian hacking and harassment of United States diplomats from Victoria Nuland, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, and Gentry O. Smith, Director, Office of Foreign Missions, both of the Department of State; Danny Toler, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, Cybersecurity and Communications, National Protection and Programs Directorate; and John Smith, Acting Director, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 115th Congress.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 55 public bills, H.R. 294–348; 1 private bill, H.R. 349; and 10 resolutions, H.J. Res. 19–20; H. Con. Res. 6–7; and H. Res. 23–28, were introduced. Pages H179–82

Additional Cosponsors: Page H184

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Reading of the Constitution: Pursuant to section 5(a) of H. Res. 5, the Chair recognized Representative Goodlatte for the reading of the Constitution. Pages H101–08

Recess: The House recessed at 11:15 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. Page H108

Objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace: The House agreed to H. Res. 11, objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 as an obstacle to Israeli-Palestinian peace, by a yea-and-nay vote of 342 yeas to 80 nays with 4 answering ''present'', Roll No. 11. Pages H146–65

H. Res. 22, the rule providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 11) and the bill (H.R. 26) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 10, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 235 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 9. Pages H113–24

Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2017: The House passed 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, by a recorded vote of 237 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 23. Pages H124–46, H173–74

Rejected the Murphy (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 recorded vote of 190 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 22. Page H172–73

Agreed to:

Goodlate amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–1) that revises monetary threshold for identification of major rules to imposition on the economy of costs of $100 million or more per year, adjusted for inflation, to conform to monetary threshold in related legislation; **Pages H134–35**

Messer amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 115–1) that requires each agency promulgating a new rule to identify and repeal or amend an existing rule or rules to completely offset any annual costs of the new rule to the United States economy (by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 185 noes, Roll No. 12); and **Pages H135–36, H165–66**

King (IA) amendment (No. 12 printed in H. Rept. 115–1) that creates a process for Congress to review all rules currently in effect over a 10 year period (by a recorded vote of 230 ayes to 193 noes, Roll No. 21). **Pages H144–46, H171–72**

Rejected:

Johnson (GA) amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 115–1) that sought to exempt rules that improve the employment, retention, and wages of workforce participants, especially those with significant barriers to employment; **Pages H140–41**

Grijalva amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 115–1) that sought to require an accounting of the greenhouse gas emission impacts associated with a rule as well as an analysis of the impacts on low-income and rural communities; if the rule increases carbon dioxide by a certain amount or increases the risk of certain health impacts to low-income or rural communities, then the rule is defined as a major rule (by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 13); **Pages H136–37, H166**

Castor (FL) amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 115–1) that sought to ensure any rule that will result in reduced incidence of cancer, premature mortality, asthma attacks, or respiratory disease in children is not considered a ''major rule'' under the bill (by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 233 noes, Roll No. 14); **Pages H137–38, H167**

Cicilline amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 115–1) that sought to exempt rules pertaining to the protection of the public health or safety from the requirements of the Act (by a recorded vote of 186 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 15); **Pages H138–39, H167–68**

Conyers amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 115–1) that sought to exempt rules that provide for reduction in the amount of lead in public drinking water (by a recorded vote of 192 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 16); **Pages H139–40, H168**

Johnson (GA) amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 115–1) that sought to expand the term ''special rule'' to include any safety product rule governing products used or consumed by children under 2 years of age (by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 234 noes, Roll No. 17); **Pages H140, H168–69**

Nadler amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 115–1) that sought to exempt from the bill's congressional approval requirement any rule pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards in order to prevent nuclear meltdowns (by a recorded vote of 194 ayes to 231 noes, Roll No. 18); **Pages H141–42, H169–70**

McNerney amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 115–1) that sought to ensure that any rule intended to ensure the safety of natural gas or hazardous materials pipelines or prevent, mitigate, or reduce the impact of spills from such pipelines is not considered a ''major rule'' under the bill (by a recorded vote of 190 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 19); and **Pages H142–43, H170**

Scott (VA) amendment (No. 11 printed in H. Rept. 115–1) that sought to exempt from the definition of a ''rule'' in the REINS Act of 2017 any rule that pertains to workplace health and safety made by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration or the Mine Safety and Health Administration that is necessary to prevent or reduce the incidence of traumatic injury, cancer or irreversible lung disease (by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 20). **Pages H143–44, H170–71**

H. Res. 22, the rule providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 11) and the bill (H.R. 26) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 231 ayes to 187 noes, Roll No. 10, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 235 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 9. **Pages H113–24**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon tomorrow, January 6th and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, January 9th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H174**

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 25, electing a Member to certain standing committee of the House of Representatives. **Page H174**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and thirteen recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H122–23, H123–24, H164, H165–66, H166, H167, H167–68, H168, H168–69, H169–70, H170, H170–71, H171–72, H173, and H173–74. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:54 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 6, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12:45 p.m., Friday, January 6

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will proceed as a body to the House of Representatives for a joint session to count the electoral ballots.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Friday, January 6

House Chamber

Program for Friday: The House will meet in Joint Session with the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E24
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E23
Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E24
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E24
Graves, Sam, Mo., E23, E23, E23, E24, E25
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E27
Jenkins, Lynn, Kans., E28
Keating, William R., Mass., E27
Levin, Sander M., Mich., E26
Olson, Pete, Tex., E23, E23, E24, E26, E27, E28
Rooney, Thomas J., Fla., E25
Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho, Northern Mariana Islands, E25
Shimkus, John, Ill., E27
Valadao, David G., Calif., E28

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.