United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 2017 No. 110

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 27, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

TRUMP PROMISE ON HEALTHCARE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Senate is poised to completely break Donald Trump's promises on healthcare. Remember, he promised insurance for everyone, it would be less expensive, and it wouldn't touch Medicaid.

Well, the CBO report, out yesterday, makes it devastatingly clear that the Republicans are ready to repudiate all three of those promises. Next year alone, 15 million Americans will lose their healthcare coverage.

Over the course of the decade, that number will swell to 22 million Americans. And because they have disguised the impact to appear later in the next decade, we will watch those numbers skyrocket.

Less expensive?

Well, under their proposal, a 64-year-old with a $56,800 income—not upper middle class by any stretch of the imagination—will, by 2026, face an annual insurance premium of $20,000. Impacts are most pronounced on low-income and older Americans.

Won't touch Medicaid?

Their proposal anticipates $772 billion over the next decade to be slashed from that budget, a 26 percent cut for the health insurance provider that gives care to most Americans, 16 percent fewer people, people with higher costs, less coverage, and poorer insurance.

They take a stab at the concern about the destabilization of the insurance market, which their proposal will do, by taking away the mandate that people have coverage, allowing people to wait until they are sick but still requiring insurers to cover them.

There is an escape hatch. They don't have to provide that if there has been a break in coverage. Then there is 6 months' delay required before people can sign up. Think about what a 6-month delay could mean for somebody who is just diagnosed for cancer. It is the equivalent of a death sentence.

The people you trust for your healthcare do not support this bill. The American Medical Association, hospitals, people who deal with rheumatism, cerebral palsy, cancer advocates, across the board they express reservations or outright opposition.

Who do you trust with your medical care—who do you rely on who supports it?

No one you rely on supports this measure.

And make no mistake, healthcare in America will be worse. That is why the people you trust don't support it. Seniors in nursing homes and disabled children will suffer and, yes, we ought to admit it; people will die. There is very good research available that is logical, suggesting that for every 20 million people who do not have insurance coverage, an extra 24,000 people a year die year after year.

And why are we doing this?

To fulfill a campaign pledge and to be able to cut taxes for those who need it the least. This massive reduction in healthcare finances massive tax reductions. This is immoral.

There is a reason that it was hatched in secret, keeping it away even from Republican senators while it was being formulated, and why they are trying to jam this through in 1 week—a parody of Republican complaints about not enough process for ObamaCare. This is unprecedented and it is wrong.

It is our job, each and every one of us, to make sure the American public knows what is at stake before it is too late.

SUPPORT FOR THE VENEZUELAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last week's general assembly meeting of the Organization of American States, the OAS, in Cancun, was intended to get greater support from the region to hold Nicolas Maduro and his regime accountable for their horrific actions against the Venezuelan people.

However, we fell short of the 23 votes needed to fully enforce a resolution condemning Maduro for convening a fake constituent assembly with the

Printed on recycled paper.

purpose of undermining the democratically elected national assembly.

I commend the 20 nations. Thank you to the 20 nations that stood up to the Venezuelan tyrant; especially I want to single out Barbados, the Bahamas, St. Lucia, Jamaica, Guyana, and Belize.

To our allies in the Caribbean who voted with the people of Venezuela and not with the regime, I say: Thank you.

And to those who voted against the people of Venezuela and with the regime, my message to you is: Wake up.

The Maduro regime is a sinking ship and, as that economy continues to implode, it will take some of the Caribbean nations along with it.

It is in the best interest of the Caribbean nations to work with the United States, with Canada, with Mexico, and other regional allies to put an end to the abusive tactics of the Maduro regime once and for all.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, countries like Nicaragua, whose leader Ortega is a kindred spirit of Maduro, spoke out to oppose the meeting and criticized the OAS for what it called interference in Venezuelans' domestic issues.

Ortega condemned the OAS for taking its rightful action to apply the Inter-American Democratic Charter for Venezuela, yet Ortega wants us to believe that he is in favor of negotiating in good faith with the OAS to improve the electoral, the political, and the human rights situation in Nicaragua. What a farce.

Ortega has been doing Maduro's bidding at the OAS since day one, and we see right through him. Ortega has illustrated time and time again that he is not interested in any reforms, nor is he interested in restoring any democratic values back to the people of Nicaragua.

But Ortega was not the only one who abandoned the people of Venezuela. No. El Salvador is another nation that has not once voted alongside the U.S. on issues related to Venezuela, even though we continue to provide funds for the Central American Alliance for Prosperity plan. They like our money. They just don't want to look at things our way at all.

Last week, I signed onto a letter led by my dear friend ALBIO SIRES from New Jersey. He wrote this letter to the Department of the Treasury, urging it to designate the El Salvadorian Foreign Deputy Minister Jose Luis Merino as a foreign narcotics kingpin for his ties to illicit activities to drug trafficking, to money laundering, for the FARC—the FARC that is a U.S.-designated foreign terrorist organization.

It is pathetic that the Venezuelan regime continues to use certain countries at the OAS as its puppets to shield itself from regional criticism.

In the last 2 months, Mr. Speaker, more than 70 people have been killed by Maduro's regime in Venezuela. Hundreds have been arrested. Hundreds have been injured by the violence, including a 17-year-old protester who was shot in pointblank range by pro-Maduro police thugs.

It is unacceptable for us to stand idly by as this cruelty continues to happen. It is a disgrace that the region could not come together in a united front to call out the Maduro regime for the violent thugs that they are, a disgrace to our democratic principles and values, and a disgrace to the Inter-American Democratic Charter for which the OAS stands.

The deteriorating situation in Venezuela is an important matter for the region, for our own interests, Mr. Speaker. Our message must be to those countries that continue to vote against the people of Venezuela: Stop being cowards. Be courageous. Stand up to those corrupt bullies in Venezuela. Do it for the people of Venezuela. How many more have to give their lives in Venezuela for you to wake up? And if you don't stop to reassess your support for the thug Maduro, and your willingness to turn a blind eye toward the suffering of the Venezuelan people, perhaps America will start to reassess its relationship with you.

AMERICAN GROWN FLOWER MONTH

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, today I proudly introduce bipartisan legislation to recognize July as American Grown Flower Month. I have seen firsthand the value of the grown flower industry playing an important role in our economy and community during my visits with our Central Coast growers in my district.

California produces three-quarters of all cut flowers grown here in the United States. This generates thousands of jobs across our State and drives a staggering $1.13 billion in the economic activity each year.

Whether it is celebrating Mother's Day, a birthday, or a graduation, flowers have been used to mark special occasions dating back thousands of years.

I am committed to recognizing this industry's remarkable contribution to our country by designating July as American Grown Flower Month. We officially celebrate the incomparable beauty flowers bring to our homes and to our celebrations year round.

I also want to urge the White House to consider having American flowers in the White House for all occasions.

65TH ANNIVERSARY OF LEVITTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 65th anniversary of my hometown, Levittown, Pennsylvania.

On June 23, 1952, the first 20 families moved into Levittown, which is one of the first planned communities built in the U.S. With its partially framed housing, immature landscaping, and muddy streets, Levittown, in 1952, is a frontier outside of the city of Philadelphia.

Levittown's first official family, the Doughertys, moved into their home on Stonybrook Drive and embraced the American Dream of homeownership. And as Mrs. Dougherty told reporters in Levittown, she described Levittown as country living with city conveniences.

Between 1952 and 1958, Levitt & Sons built 17,311 single-family houses with lawns.

□ 1015

There were six models a family could choose from: the Levittowner, the Rancher, the Jubilee, the Pennsylvanian, the Colonial, and the Country Clubber. Levitt & Sons pushed the boundaries of housing construction by perfecting the homebuilding assembly line.

Levittown remains a special place in Bucks County. Originally designed as a completed community, Levittown grew into the model middle class community. In fact, it became a popular place for hundreds of returning World War II veterans who wanted to start families of their own. Now Levittown is home to over 50,000 residents with schools, churches, parks, and businesses that foster a sense of community for families to live and work.

Residents of Levittown have worked in our steel mills, built our infrastructure, and served in our military—all while raising their children.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call Levittown my hometown, and I am grateful to represent this close-knit and hardworking community. Congratulations to all who have called Levittown home for the last 65 years.

Happy birthday, Levittown.

RECOGNIZING NETWORK OF VICTIM ASSISTANCE

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Network of Victim Assistance, NOVA, in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

NOVA seeks to support, counsel, and empower victims of sexual assault and abuse in our region through advocacy and community education. By utilizing individual and group counseling, victims of sexual assault and abuse can regain control of their lives, and through education programs, children and communities learn to be advocates for victims of abuse, as well as prevention and personal safety.

Additionally, NOVA Bucks County maintains a 24-hour hotline to be able to support all sexual assault victims to get the assistance that they need, as well as assistance in court and safety programs for those with disabilities. I was pleased to tour their facility earlier this year. I am thankful for the work of Penny Ettinger, Kathy Bennett, Steve Doerner, Keith Kirkner,

Mandy Mundy, Bill Hoblin, and so many of the NOVA staff and volunteers serving Bucks County, including generous volunteers such as Tina Greenwood.

Through its programs and projects, NOVA empowers victims of sexual assault and abuse, providing them with the resources and security they need to live in spaces free from violence. I am proud to stand with them in their mission to stand with victims in the fight to end sexual assault.

SENATE HEALTHCARE REPEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, this week we expect that our colleagues in the Senate will vote on the latest version of TrumpCare. Recently, I voted against a very similar bill because it will be a disaster for Oregonians and Americans. Under the Senate bill, millions of people—up to 22 million people—will lose coverage.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents are rightly worried. One of those is Kalpana. Kalpana is caring for loved ones with cancer. As she put it recently, she is sandwiched by cancer. She manages intravenous chemo treatments for her 7-year-old son who is fighting leukemia. Presently, he is winning that fight. Her father has been through countless therapies in his decade-long battle with prostate cancer, which has now spread to his lymph nodes.

Kalpana is amazing—our own local wonder woman. Fortunately, she can devote time and attention to her family's care without having to choose between paying for healthcare and paying for rent, food, and other basic necessities—for now. But after the House vote on TrumpCare, she said this: I feel like someone had punched me in the gut.

Before the Affordable Care Act, families lived in fear that a cancer diagnosis or a heart attack would leave them in economic ruin and make them ineligible for insurance in the future.

Early in my career, I worked at Legal Aid. I did financial counseling with clients who were struggling—often because they got sick with no insurance or because they had insurance that didn't cover them when they needed it.

We can't go back to the days when medical debt drove too many families into bankruptcy and financial ruin. Oregonians and Americans need the stability of knowing they will have affordable healthcare coverage when they get sick or when they are injured.

With the Affordable Care Act, families across the country have had that peace of mind and security that comes with having affordable health coverage. All of that is in jeopardy this week.

Mr. Speaker, this is the United States of America. Healthcare can and should be available for all, not just the healthy and the wealthy. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to reject TrumpCare, and let's all get back to the table and talk about how we can improve—not take away—access to affordable healthcare for our constituents.

IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, June is Immigrant Heritage Month, and as the son of parents who fled Castro's Cuba, like so many other residents of south Florida, I am especially proud of my district's rich immigrant history and culture. From small-business owners to law enforcement, hundreds of thousands of immigrants and their descendants across south Florida are contributing to our economy, culture, and local communities as living examples of American success.

I know from firsthand experience the great and generous spirit of the American people and the unimaginable opportunities our Nation provides to all who are willing to work for them.

Despite the longstanding tradition of welcoming immigrants to our shores, our Nation continues to have vigorous debate about immigration policy. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the current debate has left thousands of immigrant children, who were brought to this country by their parents, in constant fear of deportation to countries of origin many of them don't even remember.

They have attended school with our own children, graduated high school, sometimes even serving in the military, and today are seeking to contribute to American society and help grow our economy.

Mr. Speaker, the President, the former President, and Members of Congress in both Chambers and from both parties agree that these young people, commonly referred to as DREAMers, should be treated with compassion.

I too agree, which is why I introduced legislation that would give these young people the certainty that they deserve. The Recognizing America's Children Act creates three pathways to legal status for them: academic, military service, or employment. All qualified applicants would be thoroughly vetted, and any individual who has been involved in serious criminal conduct will be disqualified.

Mr. Speaker, immigration reform means strengthening security at our border and modernizing our visa program to keep Americans safe, but it also means offering immigrants who love our country just as much as we do the opportunity to fully participate in the American experience. It is my hope that this Immigrant Heritage Month will lead us to act in this regard.

MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS SEMIPOSTAL STAMP ACT

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, neurological and psychiatric disorders have exacted a tremendous toll on our society. Despite the great scientific strides being made daily in neuroscience research, the underlying causes of conditions like Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, autism, epilepsy, schizophrenia, depression, and traumatic brain injury remain unsolved. For true breakthroughs to occur, researchers require additional data to better treat these conditions.

To address this, the previous administration announced the Brain Research through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies Initiative in 2013. Known as the BRAIN Initiative, this collaborative public-private research will advance our understanding of how the brain functions as researchers work to map the brain and study how individual cells interact in both time and space.

The data generated from this research will help scientists fill in the gaps in our current understanding and provide unprecedented opportunities for exploring how the brain enables us to record, process, utilize, store, and retrieve vast quantities of information. This information will also provide researchers with a better understanding of mental illness and posttraumatic stress disorder in hopes of better treating these diseases and reducing the number of suicides each year.

I was pleased that the 21st Century Cures Act, which I supported here in the House and was signed into law, authorized $1.51 billion for this important research.

Mr. Speaker, to help accelerate this project and raise public attention to this initiative, today I introduced the Mental Health Awareness Semipostal Stamp Act with Representative GRACE NAPOLITANO to raise awareness for this important cause. This would come at no cost to taxpayers.

Revenues generated from the sale of a specialized postage stamp would be directed to the National Institute of Mental Health to further this ambitious program that has the potential to revolutionize neurological and psychiatric care all around the world.

PHILANDO CASTILE

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the death of my former constituent, Philando Castile, whose shocking and completely unnecessary death has now been seen by millions around the world via video.

I mourn not only his death but also the complete failure of local law enforcement and the criminal justice system to protect his most precious right, the right to life.

Philando, like so many other young African Americans before him,

interacted with local law enforcement, responded peacefully, did exactly what he was supposed to do, yet he wound up dead, shot six times at pointblank range by an officer who saw him as something less than human.

He is dead for no good reason except for the color of his skin and the fact that his ethnicity fed into an implicit, sick, and deadly bias held by some police officers that Black people present an imminent threat simply by virtue of who we are. That bias is pervasive, not just among some police officers, but also throughout our criminal justice system.

Anyone who views the video of Philando's police shooting can see that he should not be dead and that the officer who killed him should have been held accountable. But as in far too many other cases, the justice system failed Philando and his family in the most outrageous way. The sad truth is that, in 2017, we continue to suffer under a justice system that provides justice for some but not for all.

As I join with Philando's family and millions of other Americans who were outraged by the complete lack of accountability for his death, I cannot but help remember another tragic case, the death of my 18-year-old constituent, Mike Brown, almost 3 years ago in Ferguson, Missouri. As I watched Philando's family screaming out for justice, they reminded me of something that Mike Brown's mother, Lezley McSpadden, told me. She said: Congressman, I want them to know that he mattered to me.

Well, he mattered to me, too, as well as Philando. So did Tamir Rice, Eric Garner, Sandra Bland, Freddie Gray, and so many others who have died at the hands of local police for no good reason and without any consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported local law enforcement for over 30 years, and I continue to have no doubt that the vast majority of police officers perform a difficult, dangerous, and essential job with honor, bravery, and integrity. But I also know that too many other officers clearly lack the temperament and training to deescalate interactions before they become deadly, and that continues to cost many innocent lives.

That is why I have introduced, along with my good friends, Congressman STEVE COHEN of Tennessee and Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH of Illinois, the Police Training and Independent Review Act of 2017. This legislation has already earned almost 100 cosponsors.

My bill would protect both police officers and the citizens they serve. It would require sensitivity training in the areas of race, ethnic bias, disabilities, and interactions with new immigrants. It would also establish incentives to encourage States to adopt new laws to require an independent prosecutor in all cases when police use deadly force. This legislation deserves a fair hearing and an up-or-down vote in this House.

I will close with this: a brief teaching from the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., on the occasion of another needless tragedy, the police killing of civil rights worker Jimmie Lee Jackson by an Alabama State trooper in 1965. In his eulogy, King said: ''A State trooper pointed the gun, but he did not act alone. He was murdered by the brutality of every sheriff who practices lawlessness in the name of the law.''

□ 1030

IT IS TIME TO GET OUT OF OUR 16-YEAR WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in one of the Capitol Hill newspapers today is this cartoon, a cartoon showing a general with several stars on his shoulder, saying: ''Sixteen years of blood, bombs, bullets, and devastation, and no one's winning,'' talking about our 16-year war in Afghanistan. And then the cartoon shows a very greedy-looking man holding a briefcase called War Incorporated, with all kinds of cash sticking out of both sides and with this greedy smile saying, ''Oh, I wouldn't say that.'' And that is what this war is now all about, this 16-year war. It is being held up and continued only because so many people and companies are making money out of it.

Just yesterday, in The Washington Times, there was this story entitled, ''War and Waste,'' and I would like to read some of that story.

''Those are the basics for outfitting an Afghan soldier. But in that simple uniform combination are the threads of two troubling stories—one about the waste of millions in American taxpayer dollars''—actually, it is many billions—''the other about the perils of propping up a partner army in a seemingly endless war.

''Together these tales help explain why some in Congress''—and it should be everyone in Congress—''why some in Congress question the wisdom of investing even more resources in Afghanistan, nearly 16 years after the United States invaded the Taliban-ruled country in response to the al-Qaida attacks of September 11, 2001. The Army general who runs the U.S. war effort in Afghanistan calls it a stalemate. Defense Secretary Jim Mattis says the U.S. is 'not winning.' ''

And I will continue with this story: And, sadly, the only Americans who are being killed in recent weeks have been killed by the Afghan soldiers who we are paying and who we are there trying to help out.

Continuing this story: ''The long war has generated repeated examples of wasted funds, which may be inevitable in a country such as Afghanistan, where the military has been built from scratch, is plagued with corruption and relies almost completely on U.S. money for even the most basic things, including salaries and uniforms. Among the costs rarely noted publicly: The Pentagon has spent $1 billion over the past 3 years to help recruit and retain Afghan soldiers.''

And then, I continue with the story: ''The Pentagon has not disputed the gist of findings by its Special Inspector General for Afghanistan, John Sopko, that the U.S. spent as much as $28 million more than necessary over 10 years on uniforms for Afghan soldiers with a camouflage 'forest' pattern that'' is totally ''inappropriate for the largely desert battlefield.

''In a report released this past week, Sopko's office said the Pentagon paid to license a propriety camouflage pattern even though it owns patterns it could have used for free.''

The Pentagon spent $28 million to get something that it could have gotten for free.

''The choice,'' it said, was based on the seemingly offhand fashion preference of a single Afghan official.

'' 'This is not an isolated event,' Sopko said in a telephone interview. The U.S., he said, has been 'in a mad rush to spend money like a drunken sailor on a weekend furlough.' It reflects a pattern, he said, of spending too much money, too quickly, with too little oversight and too little accountability.''

And he continues, Mr. Sopko: '' 'This was more than just a bad fashion move,' he said. 'It cost the taxpayer millions of dollars' more than might have been necessary.

''Money is rarely part of the debate over what the United States should do differently or better in Afghanistan, and thus the accumulating costs are often overlooked.

''Since 2002, the U.S. has spent $66 billion on Afghan security forces alone''—in addition to many, many billions more on other things in trying to do nation building in Afghanistan, which we never should have been doing in the first place.

''In recent years, this spending has grown''—listen to that. In recent years, this spending has grown over the $66 billion.

''Stephen Biddle, a professor of political science and international affairs at George Washington University, said the money wasted on camouflage uniforms is symptomatic of a broader problem of official corruption that has sapped the strength and spirit of too many Afghan soldiers.''

And he added this: '' 'The real problem in Afghanistan is not, ''Can we get a rational decision about which camouflage design it should be.'' The real problem in Afghanistan is that cronyism and corruption' ''—that word is in that story several times—'' 'corruption in the government and the security forces saps the combat motivation of the soldiers.' ''

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to end this very wasteful war and get out of Afghanistan.

TRUMPCARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about a young man by the name of Will, who is 34 years old and tells us a story that, if he was a Canadian, there would be a good chance that he could live 17 more years. He has cystic fibrosis, and I imagine there are many families with children who have that, but he is concerned about TrumpCare and the impact.

At age 2, he was diagnosed with cystic fibrosis, a hereditary disease impacting 30,000 Americans. He says:

> Imagine being under water and coming up for air, but instead of breathing, you uncontrollably cough that air out. The harder you try to breathe, the more you cough. At its worst, this disease feels like a long, drawn-out panic attack set to the soundtrack of an endless hacking cough. At 34, statistically, I have 7 more years left before my lungs cease to function.

He mentions that if he were in Canada, statistically, he would have 17 more years because of the healthcare, but he also says this is not an exaggeration:

> The cold data from a recent study by the U.S. Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, the conclusion is that Canada's nationalized single-payer healthcare system that guarantees health insurance for everyone is the primary reason why Canadians with my disease will live longer.

But look what happened to him:

> For the past 4 years, however, my disease has gone into reverse. I have been gradually getting better. It is an extraordinary sensation. A new medication called Kalydeco made by a company in Boston has given me the promise of extending both the length and quality of my life. I have been healthy enough to work abroad as a freelance journalist.

A year and a half ago, Will got married.

> My wife and I hope to one day have kids, but today is a sobering day. The House Republicans replaced the Affordable Care Act, and if the Senate bill goes through, a plan that likely won't allow me to remain on this drug, then my long-term plans go out the window. I have a preexisting condition. My outlook would likely regress back to the one of short-term survival and carpe diem. That is a very different future than the one I plan to have.

That is what TrumpCare represents to millions of Americans: higher costs; less coverage; not 22 million now, but in 2026, 49 million Americans will not be insured.

How can you? Where is the moral standing?

It guts protections for preexisting conditions no matter what kind of smoke and mirrors the Senate is trying to tell us. It does not exist.

It has got a crushing age tax. If you are over 50, more of your income will be used for your insurance premiums, up to $12,000 to $15,000.

And it steals from Medicare. It makes the Medicare trust fund insolvent.

In my own State of Texas, here is a long chart that talks to each Member, including my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, how many people in their district will lose their health insurance.

I would ask the question: Is there any mercy? Is there anyone that understands?

In my district alone, almost 100,000—89,000—individuals will be losing their insurance; almost 20,000 of those will be children. And it goes on in other Members' districts, talks about children: 7,000, 9,000, 8,000, 15,000, 13,000, 12,000, 10,000, 14,000, 18,000, 16,000 children in different districts in the State of Texas will lose their insurance.

And then Will, who would have and has now, because of the Affordable Care Act, a decent life, with a preexisting condition that he described, how would you like to come from under water and try to breathe and that breathing is undermined by the hacking of that cough?

I hope that this bill is derailed. I hope that TrumpCare in the House and the Senate never sees the light of day, not because I don't want to work with my colleagues, but because the chronically ill will suffer and many will die. The statistics show that in the State of Texas, Mr. Speaker.

I conclude with this one sentence, Mr. Speaker. I want to go back to Mr. CLAY, and I ask the Attorney General to investigate the shooting of Mr. Castile, and to do it now.

IMMIGRATION AND SANCTUARY CITIES

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of the great State of Texas, I want to first acknowledge and preface my remarks with the fact that most people that are entering these United States illegally are doing so because they want a better life for their families. That said, it doesn't make it right. As has been said, and I have said it before, we are a nation of immigrants for sure, all of us, but we are also a nation of laws.

When the Federal Government abdicates its responsibility to secure our border and enforce our immigration laws, we not only fail in our sacred duty to uphold the Constitution and the rule of law, but we put American lives at risk. 121, that is the number of lives that have been lost from 2010 to 2014, lives that could have been saved if we had the political courage to enforce our immigration laws regarding criminal aliens.

Here is something even more outrageous. Of the over 36,000 criminal aliens released from Immigration and Customs Enforcement custody over the course of a year, 1,000 of them were reconvicted of another crime.

These avoidable, tragic deaths from violent crimes continue to happen across the country, and many of the criminal aliens who have committed them have found refuge in our Nation's sanctuary cities. These are lawless cities, let's be clear, cities whose actions undermine the basic American tenet that we are a nation of laws, not of men.

Fortunately, we have the opportunity to stop this madness and do the job the American people expect their government to do, their first job, and that is to keep Americans safe.

Passing the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act would impose significant penalties on States and cities that refuse to follow Federal immigration laws and cooperate with authorities. Additionally, it would allow the Secretary of Homeland Security to prohibit law-breaking immigrants in DHS custody from being transferred to sanctuary cities.

The No Sanctuary for Criminals Act only addresses one part of the problem in this area, a problem that we all know will require further reform; but, nonetheless, this is a good, common-sense law, and it will move our country in the right direction towards safer, stronger communities.

In addition to supporting the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act, I have cosponsored the Davis-Oliver Act, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same. In addition to holding these cities accountable for harboring criminal aliens, we need to ensure that our State and local law enforcement officials have the authority to actually do their job, and that is enforce all of our Nation's laws.

Together, I believe the No Sanctuary for Criminals Act and the Davis-Oliver Act will have a major impact on stopping illegal immigration and deterring lawlessness at the hands of criminal aliens who have repeatedly proven that they will break our laws, harm our citizens, and disrespect this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let's empower the President and local law enforcement agencies to do their job. Let's honor the Constitution and respect the rule of law. Mr. Speaker, let's simply put America first.

□ 1045

BROKEN PROMISES

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, as a candidate, Donald Trump made some very big promises on healthcare to the American people. GOP leadership in both the House and Senate have echoed those promises. But the Trump-Ryan healthcare bill and the Senate version of the GOP bill fail to deliver on those promises.

Donald Trump promised healthcare for all of the American people. Even though the ACA expanded health coverage to more than 20 million Americans, Donald Trump said he didn't

think it provided enough people with coverage. He said: ''We're going to have insurance for everybody,'' and, ''I'm not going to leave the lower 20 percent that can't afford insurance.''

The Congressional Budget Office says that 14 million people will immediately lose coverage under the Trump-Ryan plan, and 24 million people will lose coverage by 2027. The Senate version of the bill isn't much different.

Trump also promised that Americans would enjoy cheaper health insurance, with ''much lower deductibles.'' His Health and Human Services Secretary, Tom Price, said that ''nobody will be worse off financially.'' But the GOP healthcare plan would cause an increase in health premiums by 15 to 20 percent in the first 2 years alone, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

During the Republican Presidential primary, Donald Trump bragged that he was ''the first and only potential GOP candidate to state that there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.'' But the GOP health plan guts Medicaid more than ever before. It freezes enrollment and unravels the Medicaid expansion.

Donald Trump and the GOP leadership are breaking their promises to the American people. Their healthcare bills take away coverage from millions. Deductibles will go up. Copays will go up.

TrumpCare would gut essential health benefits, which would mean soaring costs for people with preexisting conditions. It will provide worse coverage to those lucky enough to still be able to afford it. And to what end?

They are stripping healthcare from millions of people in order to give a tax cut to the wealthiest Americans who need it the least. They are lining the pockets of the rich while leaving our families out to dry.

The GOP wants to take away healthcare coverage from millions of hardworking Americans who just want to feel secure and know that they and their families will be able to see a doctor and get treated if they get sick, without putting themselves or their families in financial ruin. They are robbing Peter to give PAUL RYAN and his cronies a tax cut.

In Arizona, we have seen firsthand the damage that Medicaid cuts can wreak. In 2011, Arizona Governor Jan Brewer cut Arizona's Medicaid funding and froze enrollment. Families who were on Medicaid at the time could only continue to receive benefits if their income remained below the Federal poverty level. A family who worked hard to raise their income even the tiniest amount above the poverty line would lose Medicaid coverage permanently, even if their income went down later.

About 150,000 adults in Arizona lost their Medicaid as a result of those changes. People would get sick and be unable to see a doctor just because they couldn't afford it. In some cases, people were forced to decide between paying for lifesaving care or paying their rent.

If Medicaid expansion goes away under the GOP healthcare plan, around 400,000 Arizonans could lose coverage, according to AHCCCS in Arizona. That includes 26,700 cancer patients and about 47,000 who are working to overcome different levels of substance abuse, including opioid treatment. People in other States across the country would experience similar devastating outcomes.

Senators JOHN MCCAIN and JEFF FLAKE witnessed the disastrous effect of taking away healthcare coverage for people in Arizona. They know more than anyone else how many lives can be ruined.

Some Republicans have already voiced strong concerns about this bill's impact on their constituents. If they are serious about these concerns, it will only take three Republican Senators to take a stand and grind this process to a halt. Unfortunately, so far, Senators MCCAIN and FLAKE are not among them.

Senators MCCAIN and FLAKE face a very stark choice: they can do the bidding of Donald Trump and deprive millions of healthcare coverage, or they can take steps to defend the health and financial security of the Arizonans they were elected to represent.

The people of Arizona haven't been shy about letting our Senators know how they feel and why they feel it, but it is time to dial up the pressure. Senators MCCAIN and FLAKE must understand that they owe it to Arizona families to vote ''no'' on TrumpCare. If they don't, Arizona will hold them accountable.

It is time for my colleagues in the House to put pressure on the Senators in their own States to do the right thing and vote ''no'' on this bill. We owe it to our constituents to stand up for them and make sure that this catastrophic plan never sees the light of day.

MONSIGNOR WILLIAM O'NEILL CELEBRATES 50 YEARS WITH SAVANNAH DIOCESE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Monsignor William O'Neill, who celebrated his Golden Jubilee of Ordination on June 4, 2017, marking his 50th year of service with the Catholic Diocese of Savannah.

Irish Catholics have been an important aspect of Savannah's culture and history since their arrival during the mid-19th century. Today, Savannah maintains important aspects of Irish Catholic culture, and is now home to the third largest St. Patrick's Day festival in the world.

A native of Ireland, a newly ordained O'Neill arrived in the heat of a Georgia summer in 1967. His first assignment was to St. Mary on the Hill in Augusta. Later, Father O'Neill would go on to manage the cathedral at Abercorn and Harris, which has become an architectural staple in the city of Savannah.

Father O'Neill's graciousness and love for the Catholic faith and its Savannah followers led him to begin the renovation of the cathedral on Abercorn and Harris in 1998, which involved the removal and cleaning of over 50 stained glass windows, the replacement of the slate roof, and the restoration of the building's interior.

On February 4, 2001, Father O'Neill was made the first priest of the Savannah Diocese in nearly 34 years to be invested with the title of Monsignor, which serves as a recognition of his commitment to the Diocese. Although he has since retired, Father O'Neill remains an active part of the Diocese.

I congratulate Father O'Neill and I thank him for his commitment to the First Congressional District of Georgia.

RETIREMENT OF FLETC DIRECTOR CONNIE L. PATRICK

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Ms. Connie Patrick for her service to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, as she retires as its director this Friday, June 30, 2017.

Director Patrick began her career in law enforcement in 1976, when she was sworn in as a deputy with the Brevard County Sheriff's Office in Titusville, Florida. Her hard work and determination gave her the opportunity for a promotion to serve as a special agent with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement.

After 20 years with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement, she began her work with the FLETC. Director Patrick's impeccable work ethic gained her a promotion to Director of the FLETC in 2002. She has since served in that capacity.

Under Director Patrick's leadership, local, State and, Federal training facility growth has increased by an astonishing 22 percent. The FLETC has also trained more students during her tenure than it did in its first 36 years of existence.

As Director of this division of Homeland Security, Director Patrick oversaw training for a majority of Federal officers and agents from more than 90 Federal organizations on the local, State, and national levels. These facilities graduate approximately 63,000 law enforcement officers annually. To date, Director Patrick is the longest-serving head of any component of the Department of Homeland Security.

Director Patrick has also found the time to serve as a leader among members of the National Sheriffs' Association Education and Awards Committee, as well as the executive committee of the National Law Enforcement Exploring Committee.

I thank Director Patrick for her invaluable dedication to ensuring that

our law enforcement officers are properly trained to protect our loved ones.

ST. MARY MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the St. Mary Missionary Baptist Church on its 87th anniversary this year.

In 1930, God gave a group of dynamic trailblazers, under the leadership of the church's first pastor, Reverend R.D. Cooper, a vision to help establish a permanent place of worship. They purchased land and built the first structure that would become St. Mary Missionary Baptist Church. On that location, the members of St. Mary embraced the church's unified goal of ''Touching Lives for Christ.''

As pastors came and went over the years, each had their own vision on how to improve and enrich the church and its congregation. The church's current leader, Minister Lawrence F. Baker, Sr., joined St. Mary as its pastor in 2005 and made many improvements and purchases that helped the church grow its membership while never losing sight of its vision.

St. Mary is a truly blessed congregation with its kind and charitable members serving the community any way they can. As the church continues to grow, the good people of St. Mary touch more lives every day. On June 11, communities and congregations from all over came together to celebrate St. Mary's history and future.

I congratulate Minister Baker on his impressive leadership of this dynamic organization.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Rabbi Gary Klein, Temple Ahavat Shalom, Palm Harbor, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Religious traditions teach that people and God are to work together to create a better world. Therefore, as we begin this day of work of the House of Representatives, we pray first, O God, that You join with medical professionals to help Congressman SCALISE and others injured with him experience complete recoveries.

We also pray that You bless the efforts of this legislative body so that the collective courage, dedication, compassion, and wisdom of its Members help this country maintain its position as ''a light unto the nations.''

You have also taught us through the Talmud, a work of Jewish religious literature, that trying to improve the world, even if you do not complete the task, is life's most sacred duty. Help us and our legislators to also understand the Talmudic concept that reinforces this when it states: If you save a single life, it is as if you saved the entire world.

O God, help each of us as Americans recognize the significance of the work done by our legislators, and help us to always be grateful to them. God, we also pray that You keep our legislators healthy and safe so that they may continue their work of improving the world.

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.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. HIMES 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.

WELCOMING RABBI GARY KLEIN

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome my great friend, Rabbi Gary Klein, who has led the Temple Ahavat Shalom of Palm Harbor, Florida, for the past 30 years.

Temple Ahavat Shalom is a congregation that serves nearly 500 households in my district. Since coming to Pinellas County in 1987, he served on the board of the St. Leo University Center for Catholic-Jewish studies and currently serves on the National Council of AIPAC.

Rabbi Klein is a long-time advocate on behalf of the U.S.-Israel alliance.

As co-chair of the Congressional Hellenic Israeli Alliance, I welcome his continued advice and counsel, especially as it relates to security in the Eastern Mediterranean.

For several years now, I have joined Rabbi Klein and the congregation for Passover Seder, and I very much look forward to continuing this tradition.

I am thankful for his friendship, and I wish him many more years of blessed leadership.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BMW CREATES JOBS IN SOUTH CAROLINA

(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, 25 years ago, I was grateful to be with Governor Carroll Campbell, Senator John Russell, and Senator Verne Smith when BMW held the groundbreaking for their first American manufacturing facility in the upstate of South Carolina.

Today, with an investment of nearly $8 billion by BMW, South Carolina is the leading exporter of cars of any State, and the Greer plant is the largest BMW manufacturing facility in the world, with $9.5 billion worth of autos exported from the Port of Charleston last year. This fulfills the vision of the legendary industrialist, Roger Milliken.

BMW has excelled by being a leader of apprenticeship training programs, creating over 30,000 jobs with ontime delivery of suppliers, and a total of 120,000 jobs nationwide.

I was grateful to join Governor Henry McMaster; Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM; president of BMW, Knudt Flor; and chairman of the board, Harald Kruger, yesterday as BMW announced an additional expansion of $800 million and 1,000 more jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Congratulations again yesterday on the swearing in of Congressman RALPH NORMAN, who is only the second Republican elected in 125 years from the Fifth District of South Carolina.

SENATE HEALTHCARE BILL DENIES COVERAGE

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning because yesterday the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan organization that we rely on in this Chamber for truth, told us that the Senate healthcare bill—so-called healthcare bill—will throw 22 million Americans off of their insurance. Two-thirds of those, 14 million, are Medicaid patients—the poorest people in America, elderly people in nursing homes.

I don't have a voice in the Senate, Mr. Speaker, but if I did, I would say: I understand how important it is to deliver on the promise you have been making for 7 years to repeal ObamaCare. The Republican base is demanding it, but it can't possibly be demanding the throwing off of their healthcare 22 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I also don't have a voice in the oval office, but if I did, I would ask this President, I would say: Sir, you promised to do three things: you promised to increase coverage, to lower deductibles, and to lower premiums for the American people.

I would say: Mr. President, this bill in the Senate does the exact opposite of all three of those things.

So I would say: Mr. President, if you keep your word, stop this Senate bill from passing.

HONORING JAMES WILDERMUTH

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Indiana's Rural Teacher of the Year, James Wildermuth of North Miami Community Schools.

Mr. Wildermuth is well deserving of this high honor awarded by the Indiana Small and Rural Schools Association. He is truly an exceptional Hoosier educator who has had a profound impact on student achievement and who exemplifies leadership in a way that should inspire all of us.

In addition to his 17 years as a teacher, Mr. Wildermuth also serves as a district adviser for the local Future Farmers of America program.

I am grateful that North Miami's students have Mr. Wildermuth as a role model and a mentor, always keeping them not only engaged in the lesson at hand but focused on using these lessons to succeed in life.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Second District Hoosiers, I want to thank Mr. Wildermuth for all he does to educate, support, and guide his students on the path to achievement and to make our community stronger.

POSTTRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about posttraumatic stress disorder, otherwise referred to as PTSD. Roughly, 5.2 million adults in the United States have been diagnosed in a given year with posttraumatic stress disorder.

Many of these individuals are men and women who have bravely served our Nation's military.

The Department of Veterans Affairs indicates that between 15 and 30 percent of Vietnam veterans have had PTSD in their lifetime; about 12 percent of Desert Storm veterans have been diagnosed with PTSD in a given year; and between 11 and 20 percent of those serving in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom have also been diagnosed with PTSD in a given year.

So today, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day, I call on all of us to do more to help our fellow Americans. We can do more, and we must do more.

We must be able to look at those Americans with PTSD in their eyes and say: You are not alone, and we are with you, and we are going to continue to give you the same service that you have given our country.

HONORING SERGEANT DILLON BALDRIDGE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sergeant Dillon Baldridge, who was killed in action on June 10, 2017, from wounds sustained in Nangarhar province, Afghanistan, while supporting Operation Freedom's Sentinel.

He was posthumously awarded the Bronze Star Medal, Purple Heart, Combat Infantry Badge, and the Army Commendation Medal with one oak leaf cluster. His prior awards and decorations included the Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal with three oak clusters, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, Military Outstanding Volunteer Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon, the NATO Medal, and the Expert Infantry Badge.

Last week, hundreds of North Carolina residents gathered in Ashe County to pay tribute to Sergeant Baldridge as he was laid to rest. We should all take time to pause, reflect, and honor the sacrifices of those like this young man from Youngsville, North Carolina, who have given their lives in the pursuit of a more prosperous and free America. May we endeavor to live worthy of their legacy and guard vigilantly the history and stories of our fallen.

FLIGHT SAFETY LEGISLATION

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago, Western New Yorkers witnessed tragedy due to inadequate pilot training. A poorly trained pilot crashed a commercial jet into a neighborhood in our community, ending the lives of those on board and one on the ground.

Since then, the victims' families of Flight 3407, who suffered unimaginable loss on that day, have turned their grief into a powerful citizens' fight to strengthen pilot training and flight safety rules.

The families of Flight 3407, who are here today, led the charge urging Congress to pass landmark flight safety legislation in 2010, including rules that could have prevented the tragedy that they all suffered. Since then, there have been 7 years of no fatal commercial crashes on domestic U.S. airlines.

Now the Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization is nearing and some want to beat back this tremendous progress. Let's be clear, what is being proposed is a rule change that will allow less experienced pilots to fly commercial jets again.

The safety of the flying public should never be compromised again. I am prepared, along with the Western New York delegation and with the 3407 families, to protect these reforms once again, because we know the painful lessons of accepting anything less.

MAINTAINING GREAT LAKES' ECOSYSTEM

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes are a national treasure, and nobody knows this better than the people in my home State of Michigan.

Our environment, economy, and quality of life depend upon maintaining a healthy Great Lakes ecosystem. One of the most harmful threats are invasive species like Asian carp that decimate every ecosystem in their path.

Last week, we learned some alarming news when a live Asian carp was found just nine miles from Lake Michigan beyond the electric barrier. If Asian carp are able to infiltrate the Great Lakes, it would be devastating for Michigan's fishing, boating, and tourism industries and all the jobs they support.

The Army Corps of Engineers has completed a report called the ''Brandon Road Study'' that provides a roadmap of how to best prevent Asian carp from entering the Great Lakes. They should release it immediately.

We must take bipartisan action before it is too late. We simply cannot allow, Mr. Speaker, Asian carp to wreak havoc on the Great Lakes.

□ 1215

OPPOSING TRUMPCARE

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose TrumpCare, a bill that

will cause at least 22 million Americans to lose healthcare.

Senate Republicans and House Republicans drafted their bill in secret, behind closed doors, and without a single hearing. But after seeing the bill, Mr. Speaker, I know why they kept it a secret.

TrumpCare will allow States to eliminate essential healthcare benefits like emergency room visits, preventative screenings, and prescription drug coverage. TrumpCare will gut Medicaid $772 billion and allow insurers to charge hardworking Americans more money for less coverage.

It will cost the State of Ohio, my State, more than $25 billion, giving 400 of the richest families a massive tax break.

Hardworking Americans should not have to choose between going to the doctor and putting food on their table. Republicans should work with Democrats to create a healthcare system that gives all Americans fair health coverage.

NATIONAL POSTTRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS DAY

(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, today is National PTSD Awareness Day. Today and during the month of June, we raise awareness for those suffering from posttraumatic stress disorder.

After a trauma or life-threatening event, it is common to have reactions such as upsetting memories of the event, increased jumpiness, or trouble sleeping. If these reactions do not go away or if they get worse, you might suffer from PTSD.

There are organizations and resources that can help both individuals and professionals to discover ways to identify and manage PTSD symptoms and explore effective treatments.

PTSD is especially prevalent for those who have served in the military, though not all of our military servicemembers suffer from PTSD. A nonservicemember may be exposed to a single trauma—for example, a car accident—that can also cause the symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I worked as a rehabilitation therapist, and I have seen incredible strides that people with injuries can make with access to appropriate rehabilitation. There is help and support for those who have posttraumatic stress disorder. As a nation, we must stand ready to support them.

VOTER RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, with the Shelby County v. Holder decision, the Supreme Court effectively gutted the Voting Rights Act.

At the time, Chief Justice John Roberts said that the key protections the Court removed from the act were, as he put it: ''extraordinary measures to address an extraordinary problem.''

Sadly and extraordinarily, many of those problems still exist. I would argue that the Voting Rights Act was extraordinarily successful.

Since that decision, the Federal Court commented that a voter ID law in North Carolina didn't stop fraud. Instead, the provisions that were struck down ''target African Americans with almost surgical precision.''

Courts found significant disenfranchisement caused by new laws in Wisconsin as well.

Mr. Speaker, every American has a right and the freedom to cast their vote without interference. People have fought and bled for that right. We are in danger of going back to a time when those rights were cast aside.

That is why it is time for Congress to pass the Voting Rights Advancement Act to modernize the law, to put back in place provisions stripped from the Voting Rights Act, and to ensure that no State can discriminate by creating barriers to the ballot box.

If we want to remain a nation that empowers its citizens, we need swift action on this bill.

PATRIOT WEEK

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

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we need to get back to the core values that our Nation embraced 241 years ago. That is why this year I have reintroduced my Patriot Week resolution, H. Con. Res. 12, which creates a national week of appreciation for the brave individuals, documents, and values that define our Nation's history to be taught in schools and honored in workplaces across America.

Patriot Week would begin on the solemn anniversary of September 11 and end with Constitution Day on September 17.

Mr. Speaker, our founding principles have been ignored and eroded. Society has seemingly lost interest in the longstanding history that made our country great.

As we approach Independence Day, we must reflect on who we are as a nation and how we can improve what is good for generations to come. America has become too divided, and we must get back to the core values that make our country great.

Just as immigrants learn the history of our country, high school seniors should be able to pass, at minimum, the same citizenship exam upon graduation. Ronald Reagan once said that ''freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction.'' His words must serve as a wake-up call to every one of us today.

I urge my colleagues to support Patriot Week, and I would like to take this opportunity to wish our Nation a happy and safe Independence Day. We are grateful for all those who serve to keep us safe at home, in our Nation's Capital, and all over the world.

OPPOSING TRUMPCARE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office confirmed that the Senate version of the Republican healthcare bill, TrumpCare, is even meaner and more heartless than the House-passed version. It is so mean that already some Republican Senators have come out opposing even bringing this bill to the floor for debate. But, of course, that won't be the end of it. We should beware of the backroom deals that will be attempted to get Republican Senators on board to move this terrible bill forward.

But any amount of window dressing or backroom deals won't change the basics. This bill will require Americans to pay higher costs. Don't just look at premiums. Look at the out-of-pocket expenses that Americans will have to pay. It will go up for worse care and for less coverage.

If you are age 50 to 65, get ready, because you will see an age tax. You will have to pay up to five times what younger, healthy Americans will pay.

Of course, this bill, because it rewards those at the very top, steals from Medicare. It makes Medicare less sustainable. We ought to reject this legislation. We ought to do it now, and we ought to send that message to every Member of the U.S. Senate.

RECOGNIZING LEXMARK'S EXCITING NEW PROGRAM TO TRAIN VETERANS

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to proudly recognize Lexmark International, a global leader in printing solutions headquartered in Lexington, Kentucky, for its development of an innovative program for training U.S. veterans and soon-to-be-separated Active Duty personnel with the goal that they can become certified service technicians of Lexmark printers.

The program, called the Lexmark Printer Service Training Partnership, is under the auspices of VALORR, the Veterans Association of Lexmark: Organized to Recognize and Respect.

We all recognize that our veterans bring with them tremendous know-how and a can-do attitude, the ability to step into new fields and master them quickly. By completing the printer

service training program, these veterans will be certified to service Lexmark printers worldwide.

I am proud that my constituents at Lexmark have developed such a thoughtful program for veterans. I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing those companies and organizations going the extra mile for those who have served our Nation in uniform.

MEDICAID CUTS

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

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep misgivings about the recent healthcare proposals put forth by the Senate. This bill, like the American Health Care Act, proposes drastic cuts to Medicaid and would saddle my constituents and Americans with skyrocketing premiums and deductibles.

We are placing our hardworking families and young children, our elderly, veterans, and Native Americans in harm's way by making coverage unaffordable and unattainable.

The cost of this legislation will be paid by those who can least afford it. Recent reports show that the cost of Medicaid cuts in this bill would cost Arizonans more than $7 billion. This means hundreds of thousands of people, including nursing home patients who rely on affordable, lifesaving coverage, will be kicked off their Medicaid coverage.

From the beginning, these pieces of legislation have been crafted behind closed doors without input from doctors, nurses, and healthcare leaders.

While we play partisan games, the health and well-being of our families, friends, and neighbors are at risk. If we want to get serious about fixing our healthcare system and bringing down costs, we must work together on bipartisan legislation.

TRUMPCARE

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, this week, Senate Republicans are very likely to vote on a bill that would take away health insurance from 22 million Americans, people like Marcia and Grace Kohler in Boulder, Colorado. The Kohlers, like many other families, were able to have access to healthcare through the Affordable Care Act.

At the age of 8½, Marcia's youngest daughter, Grace, was diagnosed with childhood leukemia. She endured 26 months of extensive treatments and several chemotherapy sessions per week. In Marcia's own words: ''Going through this process without the assistance of healthcare is unimaginable. It brings tears back to my own eyes.''

We are simply not a nation that turns its back on our most vulnerable citizens. 39 percent of all children in this country are supported on Medicaid, 64 percent of nursing home residents, and 30 percent of adults with disabilities.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate right now think of Grace and all those like her. I hope that they think about the millions of Americans that will have the rug pulled out from underneath them if they pass their cruel bill. For some it is a matter of debt or taxes, but for many it is simply a matter of life or death.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 26, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Respectfully, I write to tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Homeland Security. It has been an honor to serve in this capacity.

Sincerely,

TOM MARINO,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 26, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee. It has been an honor to serve on the Committee under the leadership of Chairman Smith.

Sincerely,

GARY PALMER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY AND COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I write to inform you that I hereby resign my seats on the House Judiciary Committee and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform effective immediately.

Sincerely,

JASON E. CHAFFETZ,
U.S. Representative,
Utah Third Congressional District.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I write you today to respectfully resign my seat on the House Committee on Small Business, with the intention to join the House Committee on Homeland Security. It has been an honor to serve in this position.

Sincerely,

RON ESTES.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Natural Resources:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Respectfully, I write to tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Natural Resources. It has been an honor to serve in this capacity.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

DAVID ROUZER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 410

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

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mrs. Handel.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. Estes of Kansas.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mrs. Handel.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Gianforte.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Gianforte.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY: Mr. Norman.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Norman.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1215, PROTECTING ACCESS TO CARE ACT OF 2017

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 382 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 382

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. 1215) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system. 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-10. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my friend, 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. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

House Resolution 382 will ultimately drive down healthcare costs and make care more affordable to millions of Americans across the country.

In 2017, we have had a conversation in America about how health insurance costs have drastically increased in the past 7 years. We need to fix our health insurance market, a task that House Members and Senators have been working hard on for the past few months, but if we are truly going to address out-of-control health insurance costs, we need to start looking at the cost of supplying care itself. That is where H.R. 1215, the Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017, plays a vital role. H.R. 1215 focuses on lowering the cost of care by placing checks and balances on the excessive and frivolous lawsuits faced by doctors and other healthcare providers.

A GAO report found that rising litigation awards are responsible for skyrocketing medical professional liability premiums. Unfortunately, these premium costs are passed on to the patient and, in many cases, are passed on to American taxpayers. The reforms in H.R. 1215 will make care more affordable for patients and will improve access to care, especially for rural America.

Over time, unending and excessive lawsuits have limited the amount of doctors nationwide, particularly in States that have not instituted their own reforms. With a string of frivolous lawsuits levied against our medical community, many Americans who would become doctors and practice in certain parts of the Nation simply decided against it.

The reforms in H.R. 1215 will especially help rural and underserved urban communities, where quality healthcare can be difficult to access. Incentivizing medical professionals to serve in communities that might otherwise be overlooked should be one goal of our healthcare reform efforts.

I know the healthcare challenges faced by so many in eastern Colorado, where access to quality care is sometimes limited. We need doctors who are willing to invest in these communities, but we need to empower these doctors by freeing them of frivolous and excessive lawsuits.

Beyond just access to care, the growth of frivolous malpractice lawsuits has led to a change in the way care is provided. Many providers are forced to practice defensive medicine. In doing so, doctors order unnecessary, excessive diagnostics not because the patient needs them, but because the doctor attempts to avoid a frivolous lawsuit. The practice of defensive medicine increases costs for the patient without providing any discernible benefit.

The legislation we are considering is key to increasing the affordability of care and the access to care for all Americans.

This bill is supported by the American Hospital Association and the American Academy of Family Physicians. The American Medical Association has also voiced their support.

But let me be clear: The bill before the House today does not limit access to justice for legitimately wronged or injured patients. It does not hamper a wronged patient from recovering damages for their injuries.

The bill simply imposes a $250,000 cap on noneconomic damages, a provision that has worked well in California, where this legislation has already been successfully implemented and modeled for decades. But there is no cap on economic damages that a patient may incur in a malpractice situation, and the bill's cap does not preempt any State law that otherwise caps any form of damages at amounts either higher or lower than the cap in H.R. 1215.

The legislation also limits the contingency fees that lawyers can charge when bringing a malpractice case on behalf of a client. In other words, we don't want to incentivize lawyers to push forward with illegitimate cases. We want patients who have been wronged to have access to a fair trial, where they walk home with the winnings in their own pocket, not their lawyer's.

H.R. 1215 builds on the successes of medical malpractice reforms in States like California and Texas. In these States, similar laws have increased access to affordable medical care. They have created an environment where doctors can focus on helping patients rather than spending time in endless litigation and dealing with threats from the trial bar.

The legislation before us, while creating a uniform national playing field, protects State laws by allowing flexible reforms to be used at the discretion of States. State courts will still hear medical lawsuits as always.

The reforms at hand today deal with care that was provided or subsidized by the Federal Government, including through a tax benefit.

We must pass this legislation for the American taxpayer. The taxpayer doesn't deserve to have their hard-earned dollars simply end up in the pockets of trial lawyers due to frivolous lawsuits. That is why H.R. 1215 is a critically needed reform.

Unlimited and opportunistic lawsuits help no one except trial lawyers. Consequently, our doctors have to increase their costs and practice expensive defensive medicine, costing patients and taxpayers. And when our physicians are impacted, so are we.

Trial lawyers too often stand between patients and their doctors. With the looming threat of excessive, unending lawsuits, healthcare providers have to worry more about the trial lawyer at their door than the patient in their office. H.R. 1215 places important limits on these lawsuits so that the truly wronged are compensated without enriching trial lawyers at the same time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule today, one that provides for consideration of the Protecting Access to Care Act. This bill would significantly alter how families and patients that are injured as a result of medical error are able to hold healthcare providers, facilities, or device makers accountable to make sure that that same thing doesn't happen to other people.

This bill decreases patient safety. It undermines the ability of people who are wrongfully injured by medical malpractice or faulty medical devices to be compensated for their injuries, and it violates the 10th Amendment to our Constitution, the rights reserved to the States.

Before I turn to the merits, or lack thereof, of this bill, I want to discuss the process under which this bill came to the floor.

The Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over this bill, had zero hearings on this legislation, heard from zero experts, and went straight to markup. Despite the overwhelming opposition to this legislation, the Judiciary Committee did not want to hear from groups like the American Bar Association, Patient Safety America, the National Disability Rights Network, or the National Protection Alliance.

When I see the American Bar Association, who the committee refused to hear from—I know my colleague from Colorado is an attorney. I just want to inquire of my colleague from Colorado if he is a member of the American Bar Association, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BUCK. Proudly, no.

Mr. POLIS. Okay. Well, that is the association which many attorneys, excepting, of course, my friend from Colorado, are a member of.

The supporters of this bill point to its consideration in previous Congresses for hearings, but we have over 50 new Members who didn't hear a word about this bill from any experts before it was rushed to the floor.

We are considering this bill under a very restrictive rule. That means there were 24 amendments filed. This rule only allows the House to debate and vote on five of them. That means 19 of them, amendments offered by Democrats and Republicans, were simply just tossed out in the Rules Committee. That is what this rule does.

If this rule were to pass, it would mean that the efforts of 19 Members to offer ideas to improve healthcare wouldn't even be allowed to be debated or voted upon here on the floor of this House. It is no coincidence that eight amendments filed by Democrats, and not one Democratic amendment was made in order. Only 5 out of 24 ideas from Democrats and Republicans were made in order.

One amendment filed by my colleague, Representative JACKSON LEE, would have provided an exception to the bill for any medical-related injury to a child, which seems like common sense. At least have a debate about it. If people disagree, let them disagree. Let's have a vote.

This rule continues this very closed process, where Democrats and Republicans are shut out of participating in the bills that appear fully formed without the opportunity for us to represent our districts and offer amendments to improve and make these bills better, to reduce costs, to improve the quality of care.

What I wonder, Mr. Speaker, is: Where is the open process promised by Speaker RYAN? This Congress hasn't even considered a single piece of legislation under an open rule, and we have had many, many bills brought to the floor under closed rules and without any committee hearings. But, you know, I am beginning to not be surprised so much anymore because secretiveness seems to be the standard that Republicans are setting in this Congress.

How the Republicans have handled their healthcare bill from start through now is a perfect example of the closed-door, secretive process that has become, tragically, the standard operating procedure for this Congress.

The Republican healthcare bill will increase healthcare costs, provide less coverage—22 million fewer people will be covered—increase costs for those who are lucky enough to keep their current coverage, and reduce access to healthcare for the American people. It puts a burden on small businesses, on the middle class, on rural healthcare providers, while handing hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to big corporations and special interests.

TrumpCare is a billionaire's tax cut disguised as a healthcare bill, and it will be one of the largest transfers of wealth from the middle class and the working families to the top 1 percent of Americans. Effectively, it is removing benefits from people in rural counties and cities across our country and giving those tax cuts mostly to people in New York and Hollywood. That is what Republicans are delivering with this bill.

When the American people were finally given the chance to see the Senate's healthcare legislation, the American people overwhelmingly rejected it. Only 16 percent of the American people approve of the plan. Democrats oppose it; Republicans oppose it; independents oppose it.

The Congressional Budget Office's recent score of the bill says that coverage will significantly decrease under this bill and that the costs of deductibles for patients will go up. Patients will have to spend more out of pocket, those that are lucky enough to even have insurance after this cruel bill.

But there is still time to stop it, and I call upon my colleagues to prevent this bill from moving forward.

The bill that Republicans are trying to ram through Congress is not truly meant to make improvements to our healthcare system but to take money away from the middle class and working families and put it into the pockets of a very few people who benefit from the tax cuts under this bill: for people making millions of dollars a year.

This bill makes it harder for middle-income families and for low-income families to access quality, affordable healthcare, makes it harder for individuals who have preexisting conditions or have genetic disorders or long-term diseases from accessing lifesaving medical attention, and cuts critical healthcare services for disabled children in schools that many of our school districts rely on. And they want to do this all with a closed process.

I offered three amendments to improve healthcare in our Education and the Workforce Committee. All were defeated on a partisan vote.

□ 1245

Every Republican voted not to allow those. No Democrat, as far as I know—certainly not me—has been invited to present our ideas to Republican leadership or President Trump.

Democrats have lots of ideas to improve the Affordable Care Act. I am sure many Republicans do, too. Those ideas are not reflected whatsoever in this bill or in the closed process that prohibits Republicans and Democrats from even offering our suggestions to improve this bill.

So, here we are, debating another piece of healthcare legislation that did not go through an open process. Democrats were shut out of the amendment process completely.

This bill would make it more difficult for victims of medical malpractice to seek or receive compensation for their injuries. It is inconsistent with the 10th Amendment, which reserves these rights to the States that are not enumerated in the

Constitution, and unlike the Democrats' approach to medical malpractice reform in the Affordable Care Act, which provided funding for pilot programs in the States to reduce the risk of medical malpractice liability consistent with the 10th Amendment. Many constitutional experts—I would add, many conservative constitutional experts—believe that this approach is unconstitutional because of the 10th Amendment.

We have learned that this bill does not actually protect access to healthcare but, instead, undermines a State-based tort system, making it more difficult for patients to be compensated from bad actors.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by over 60 national and State organizations opposed to H.R. 1215.

JUNE 12, 2017.

Re Groups Urge You to Vote NO on H.R. 1215.

Hon. Paul Ryan,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned consumer, health, labor, legal and public interest groups strongly oppose H.R. 1215: The ''Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017.'' This bill would limit the legal rights of injured patients and families of those killed by negligent health care. The bill's sweeping scope covers not only cases involving medical malpractice, but also cases involving unsafe drugs and nursing home abuse and neglect.

Even if H.R. 1215 applied only to doctors and hospitals, recent studies clearly establish that its provisions would lead to more deaths and injuries, and increased health care costs due to a ''broad relaxation of care.'' Add to this nursing home and pharmaceutical industry liability limitations, significantly weakening incentives for these industries to act safely, and untold numbers of additional death, injuries and costs are inevitable, and unacceptable.

The latest statistics show that medical errors, most of which are preventable, are the third leading cause of death in America. This intolerable situation is perhaps all the more shocking because we already know about how to fix much of this problem. Congress should focus on improving patient safety and reducing deaths and injuries, not insulating negligent providers from accountability, harming patients and saddling taxpayers with the cost, as H.R. 1215 would do.

For example, this bill would establish a permanent across-the-board $250,000 ''cap'' on compensation for ''non-economic damages'' in medical malpractice cases. Such caps are unfair and discriminatory. For example, University of Buffalo Law Professor Lucinda Finley has written, ''certain injuries that happen primarily to women are compensated predominantly or almost exclusively through noneconomic loss damages. These injuries include sexual or reproductive harm, pregnancy loss, and sexual assault injuries.'' Also, ''[J]uries consistently award women more in noneconomic loss damages than men . . . [A]ny cap on noneconomic loss damages will deprive women of a much greater proportion and amount of a jury award than men. Noneconomic loss damage caps therefore amount to a form of discrimination against women and contribute to unequal access to justice or fair compensation for women.''

Other provisions in H.R. 1215 are just as problematic. The proposed federal statute of limitations, more restrictive than a majority of state laws, lacks complete logic from a deficit reduction angle since its only impact would be to cut off meritorious claims, forcing patients to turn to the government for care. The bill would repeal joint and several liability even though the Congressional Budget Office says this could increase, not lower, costs.

H.R. 1215 would overturn traditional state common law and would be an unprecedented interference with the work of state court judges and juries in civil cases. Its one-way preemption of state law provisions that protect patients (there are some exceptions) makes clear that the intent of this legislation is not to make laws uniform in the 50 states. Rather, it is a carefully crafted bill to provide relief and protections for the insurance, medical and drug industries, at the expense of patient safety. We urge you to oppose H.R. 1215: The ''Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017.'' Thank you.

Very sincerely,

NATIONAL GROUPS

AFL–CIO; American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME); American Federation of Teachers; Aging Life Care Association; Alliance for Justice; Alliance for Retired Americans; American Association for Justice; American Association of Directors of Nursing Services; American Association of Nurse Assessment Coordination; Annie Appleseed Project; Autistic Self Advocacy Network; Brain Injury Association of America; Center for Independence; Center for Justice & Democracy; Center for Medicare Advocacy; Christopher & Dana Reeve Foundation; Communication Workers of America; Consumer Action; Consumer Federation of America; Consumer Watchdog.

Daily Kos; Families for Better Care; Gerontological Advanced Practice Nurses Association; Hartford Institute for Geriatric Nursing; Homeowners Against Deficient Dwellings; Justice in Aging; Leahslegacy.org; Long Term Care Community Coalition; Mothers Against Medical Error; NALLTCO, National Association of Local Long Term Care Ombudsman; National Association of Consumer Advocates; National Association of Directors of Nursing Administration in Long Term Care; National Center for Health Research (NCHR); National Consumer Voice for Quality Long-Term Care; National Consumers League; National Disability Rights Network; National Education Association.

National Gerontological Nursing Association; National Medical Malpractice Advocacy Association; National Women's Health Network; Nursing Home Victim Coalition, Inc.; Our Mother's Voice; Patient Safety America; Public Citizen; Public Justice; Public Justice Center; Public Law Center; Quinolone Vigilance Foundation; The Empowered Patient Coalition; The Impact Fund; United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America International Union; United Spinal Association; Women's Institute for a Secure Retirement (WISER).

STATE GROUPS

Arkansas State Independent Living Council; California Advocates for Nursing Home Reform; Center for Advocacy for the Rights & Interests of the Elderly (PA); Chatham Advisory Committee for Long Term Care Adult Care Homes and Family Care Homes (NC); Citizen Action/Illinois; Connecticut Center for Patient Safety; Disability Rights Center of Kansas; Elder Justice Committee of Metro Justice of Rochester (NY); Friends of Residents in Long Term Care (NC); Greater Boston Legal Services, on behalf of our clients (MA); Idaho Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health; InterHab, Inc. (KS).

Iowa Statewide Independence Living Council (SILC); Kansas ADAPT; Kansas Advocates for Better Care; LTC Ombudsman Services of San Luis Obispo County (CA); Massachusetts Advocates for Nursing Home Reform; Michigan Long Term Care Ombudsman Program; Montana Independent Living Project, Inc.; NYPIRG; PULSE of Colorado; Residential Facilities Advisory Committee, State of Oregon; Rhode Island Long Term Care Ombudsman Office; Texas Watch; Voices for Quality Care (LTC) (MD & DC); Washington Advocates for Patient Safety; Washington Civil & Disability Advocate; WISE & Health Aging (CA).

Mr. POLIS. Some of the groups are the Gerontological Advanced Practice Nurses Association, Justice in Aging, Long Term Care Community Coalition, National Education Association, National Consumers League, National Disability Rights Network, Public Citizen, Public Justice, and many, many other great organizations.

I hope my friend from Colorado is a member of at least two or three of these wonderful organizations. I will furnish the entire list to him.

This bill preempts State tort law that has been developed over the last 200 years and is contrary to the 10th Amendment of our Constitution. It imposes an arbitrary cap on the amount of noneconomic damages a victim can collect under a Federal law coopting the ability of States to do their own medical malpractice laws and hamstringing them with regard to the reforms that they can undertake.

In fact, capping damages also increases taxpayer spending. According to a joint study by Northwestern University and the University of Illinois, they found that capping economic damages actually increases Medicare part B spending.

I would point out another horrible feature of the cruel Republican healthcare bill is that it guts the Medicare trust fund and would lead to Medicare becoming insolvent sooner rather than later by draining the Medicare trust fund of over $100 billion. That is another aspect of this bill.

No wonder they didn't want us to see it, Mr. Speaker. No wonder they kept it in a locked closet from even Republicans who were allegedly writing it, like KEN BUCK and my friend, Senator GARDNER, who was on the committee writing it and who later said he hadn't seen it. No wonder it was hidden, when you find out it actually leads to Medicare insolvency sooner, when you find that it throws 22 million people off the insurance that they already have, when you find out it raises rates for those who are lucky enough to maintain their insurance, when you find it takes money out of our schools, when you find that it risks throwing our elderly out of their nursing homes who rely on Medicaid.

This bill is a symptom of a problem. I am not a doctor; my friend from Colorado is not a doctor; but when I ask my doctor what you do when there are

symptoms, it is treat the underlying cause.

Let's do that. This bill doesn't do that. This Republican Senate bill that throws people off insurance doesn't do that. Let's begin a process where we get ideas from Democrats and Republicans to work together to reduce costs in healthcare, to expand coverage in healthcare, and to improve the quality of healthcare for American families.

This bill is not focused on protecting patients. It increases the risk to patients. It drains Medicare of additional money. This bill will not reduce costs to patients. In fact, no healthcare bill being debated in Congress right now actually improves patient care or reduces costs to patients.

Those should be two pillars, two goals of healthcare reform: Can we reduce costs, and can we improve patient care?

This bill risks making patient care worse in an unconstitutional way. The Senate bill actually will increase costs to patients, increase deductibles, make more people lose their insurance, make you pay more for insurance you already have if you are one of the people who is lucky enough not to lose it under the cruel Republican bill.

Instead of politicizing and polarizing access to healthcare—literally a life-and-death issue for American families—let's work together to find solutions that reduce costs, increase coverage, and improve care. The Senate Republican healthcare bill meets none of those three critical criteria that the American people demand in healthcare reform: reducing costs, increasing coverage, and improving the quality of care for ourselves and for our loved ones.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I know my friend from Colorado did not mean to insult me when he referred to me as a lawyer, but I want to make a quick distinction.

I spent 25 years as a prosecutor, not a lawyer. Prosecutors put people in prison and make the world safe for all of us; lawyers get people out of prison and make the world less safe for all of us. I want to make that distinction.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Prosecutors are lawyers as well. So I just wanted to be clear that it is not an insult. Being an attorney is a fine profession. There are some attorneys on both sides, both defending as well prosecuting criminals, but they are both attorneys. I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. BUCK. Reclaiming my time, do not tell prosecutors that they are merely lawyers. To be a prosecutor is a higher standard.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

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

I am not an attorney either, Mr. Speaker. I am a physician. As a matter of fact, I am an obstetrician. I think, of all the professions impacted by malpractice issues, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, obstetricians have been the most impacted.

I remember going back as a medical student and trying to figure out what type of doctor I wanted to become. My wife and I were blessed somewhere in there to have our first child. I remember when that little girl was given to me and I heard her cry, it was maybe the greatest single moment of my life.

As a young medical student, I was very impressed and said: That is what I want to do. I want to bring babies into the world and have that moment when I get to give a baby to a mom and she looks at that baby and it is just a very special moment. It is just the most agape love I have ever seen, a mom with a perfect heart towards that little baby. I wanted to do that.

So I started telling my professors I wanted to be an obstetrician. Every professor I met said: Don't do it. You are going to get sued. Malpractice prices are screaming. You are not going to like that job anymore. No one wants to go into obstetrics.

Well, guess what? My professors were right. I did it anyway.

The average obstetrician gets sued between three and four times in their career. Malpractice remains the biggest deterrent of physicians choosing to go into obstetrics. The average obstetrician has to spend 2 to 3 months every year just to pay for their malpractice insurance.

I am very blessed. Over 20 years ago, Kansas undertook similar tort reform as this, and our malpractice costs have stabilized. My malpractice insurance was pretty much the same 20 years after we enacted the legislation to curb some of these costs.

I think it will be true for me to say that my friends that are obstetricians in other States without malpractice tort reform, their premiums are often three times higher than ours in Kansas. We have seen this work very, very well in Kansas. The good news is that this legislation will not impact any of that work as well.

I very much am in favor of this malpractice tort reform and how it is going to impact healthcare. I predict that this will help lower premium costs some 3 to 4 percent when enacted.

Malpractice is a huge cost of the current cost of healthcare. This is a first step of many that Republicans are encouraging or want to implement to start lowering those costs of premiums.

Small Business Association members were here in D.C. just 2 months ago. When they walked out of that meeting, I was expecting them to come back and tell me their concerns were mostly regulatory concerns, but their number one concern was the cost of healthcare premiums.

This is a small step. If we can lower their healthcare costs 3 to 4 percent, this is a great, great opportunity for us to help them out.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill. I encourage Members on both sides of the aisle to support this bill. It should be bipartisan support for this legislation that will help drive healthcare costs down.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN).

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think a couple of points, before I get to the main portion of my remarks, that the manager of the bill threw out need to be addressed.

First of all, my wife is a prosecutor. I like prosecutors, but they are lawyers. I was a trial lawyer until December 31 of last year. Guess what? We sue drunk drivers. We sue for people who get hurt when it is not their own fault. I come from a State where contributory negligence is the law. So I appreciate the reverence you hold prosecutors in—I do, as well—but we are all lawyers.

I also want to point out that, while there may be people on the floor who are not lawyers, you can't honestly believe this bill gives you equal access to justice, and here is why: You have a cap on noneconomic damages. So a person who is injured by a doctor and a person who receives the exact same injuries from some other tort have two different recoveries that they can reach. One is capped; one is not. That is not equal justice, in my judgment, under the law.

In addition, you all are the pro-business party, yet you all want to get into how people contract with one another. I would suggest that is inconsistent with your pro-business approach.

Mr. Speaker, what this bill really underlies is a fundamental mistrust for our constituents. Think about it. Juries are made up of our constituents. What you are really worried about is that your constituents are not going to get it right when they are sitting in that jury box and making decisions.

Your constituents are wise enough to send me and 435 of us here to the Congress to make decisions about trillion-dollar budgets, yet you don't trust them to sit in the jury box and make the very important decisions for their fellow citizens when they are injured.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that this bill clearly violates the spirit of the Seventh Amendment, the right to trial by jury, by putting these limitations on the jury, by putting limitations on access to justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded that Members are to direct all remarks to the Chair.

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

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

I was glad my colleague pointed out that it violates the Seventh Amendment. Now we add that to the 10th

Amendment. So there are actually two Amendments. I am not even an attorney, but I know this violates two Amendments to our Constitution. That is pretty impressive for one bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1215.

My Republican colleagues seem to have a fixation with caps. In their healthcare bill, they slash Medicaid and, for the first time in its history, cap Federal funding. The result: hospital closures, reimbursement and staffing cuts, reduced access, and lower quality. Now, in this bill, they want to impose another cap, a cap on non-economic damages for injured healthcare consumers.

So who will be hurt?

It will be people like the 76-year-old woman whose tailbone had to be removed because her bed sores went untreated for 12 days or an 81-year-old resident who died because her ventilator was dislodged, alarms sounded, and no one responded.

How about the family of a 92-year-old man who died after suffering from malnutrition and dehydration and was found with live insects in his eyes and mouth?

How do we put a $250,000 value on those injured?

Besides, this is a solution looking for a problem. There is no medical malpractice lawsuit crisis. Between 2000 and 2015, the number of claims dropped more than 40 percent and the amount paid fell 23 percent.

But we do face a medical crisis. Nearly half a million Americans die every year from preventable medical errors, and many more are permanently injured. This bill does nothing to solve that problem. Instead, it just takes away the right of the injured consumers.

□ 1300

And if you believe that average Americans should not be barred from the justice system as they seek to hold wrongdoers accountable, then you must oppose this bill.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one point.

I have heard a number of times now that this bill is a solution searching for a problem or it does nothing to help our underlying cost.

The Congressional Budget Office, the very office that my friend relies on for the most recent estimate of those that will decide not to seek insurance under the Senate healthcare bill, has estimated that this bill will save taxpayers $50 billion over 10 years and reduce medical malpractice insurance premiums by 25 percent to 30 percent.

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

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

I would like to inquire of my friend from Colorado whether recognizing those savings is in fact a Federal responsibility or a State responsibility.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I will remind my friend from Colorado that the very $250,000 cap that we are talking about in this bill is the same cap that has been adopted by the Colorado State Legislature.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, exactly. What I would further add, then, is whose prerogative is it to institute this kind of cap: States like our own State of Colorado, which has that cap? Or Washington, D.C. insiders behind closed doors?

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my friend again that the States that have adopted any cap—it could be $250,000, it could be $500,000, it could be $1 million in non-economic damage caps—will not be affected by this bill. This bill only affects those States that have no caps, and it is Federal money that is being used to pay for these.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, this effectively co-ops States and forces other States to do the same thing that my colleague's and my State of Colorado has already done. It goes beyond that as well. Under the 10th Amendment of the Constitution, this should be a power reserved for the States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to shed light on a serious issue facing millions of students nationally and in my home State of Colorado. Every day, 50 million students and 3 million teachers face significant health and safety threats due to inadequate school facilities. I have heard about many in Colorado, school gyms that are closed down because their roofs are falling in, staggering statistics that disproportionately affect high-poverty schools, particularly urban and rural schools, and many schools serving a high percentage of minority students.

Today we have a chance to address this rampant inequality throughout our school districts and to create jobs in the process.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative BOBBY SCOTT's Rebuild America's Schools Act, H.R. 2475, which I am also a proud co-sponsor of. Mr. SCOTT's legislation would invest $100 billion in the physical and digital infrastructure needs of our schools, creating nearly 2 million jobs and creating the education infrastructure we need for the 21st century.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the distinguished ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, to discuss our proposal.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for proposing this amendment.

The Rebuild America's Schools Act would help ensure that each of our Nation's 50 million public school students, taught by 3 million teachers, will have access to safe, healthy, and high-quality learning facilities and internet access sufficient for digital learning in the classroom.

This bold proposal would create nearly 2 million jobs, improve student learning, and revitalize under-resourced communities.

The Rebuild America's Schools Act is a win for students, families, workers, and the economy; and any responsible infrastructure proposal put forth by Congress should include a bold investment in our Nation's public schools.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced on the 63rd anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education because, despite the promise of Brown, our public school facilities remain largely separate and woefully unequal.

Last year, on the 62nd anniversary of Brown, Ranking Member CONYERS and I unveiled the findings of a GAO report that found that more students are attending schools highly segregated by race and class.

Now, that most recent GAO report examining the state of our public schools' infrastructure saw that low-income and minority students are served by poor and inadequate school facilities.

If we are to fully achieve the promise of Brown, then no child should remain in a classroom with a leaking roof or a broken heating system. All students should have equitable access to science labs or spaces for high-quality career and technical educational programs.

Mr. Speaker, 12 States do not invest any money in capital construction projects in public schools, leaving responsibility of ensuring high-quality classrooms up to localities and local property taxes, which virtually guarantees inequitable funding between high- and low-income districts.

This bill targets Federal funding for school infrastructure to districts and school buildings with the greatest need for improvement to their physical and digital infrastructure, which would be an important step in fulfilling the promise of Brown.

All too often, when Congress talks about infrastructure investment, we speak only about investments in roads, bridges, and other public buildings. Public schools are often left out of the conversation, but schools must be part of that conversation on infrastructure.

The Rebuild America's Schools Act will ensure safe drinking water in schools, prevent instructional materials like textbooks from being ruined

as a result of broken heating and air-conditioning systems, and improve air quality that students breathe in the schools. It will bring access to digital learning for more than 11 million students in nearly 20,000 schools who do not already have it. Finally, the bill would mean high-quality jobs for nearly 2 million pipefitters, construction workers, and other hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to defeat the previous question so we can debate and pass the Rebuild America's Schools Act. We owe it to America's students and hardworking families.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to inquire of my friend from Colorado, he mentioned when he was introducing the gentleman from Virginia that there are schools that are closing because gym roofs are falling in. I know a number of very generous individuals that would like to contribute.

Does the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) have the names of any of those schools for us?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to supply those. To be clear, the entire school doesn't close, just the gym closes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I do have further speakers.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. KIHUEN).

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Rebuilding America's Schools Act. Every day, students attend schools that put their health and safety at risk. The average school building is nearly 50 years old, and teachers and children struggle to learn in classrooms without heat, leaking ceilings, and no working internet.

Mr. Speaker, our children deserve better. Research shows that poor school facility conditions impact teaching and learning, and disproportionately plague schools that serve low-income and minority students all throughout America. Regardless of their ZIP Code, all children should have access to a quality education, and no child should have to learn in an unsafe or dilapidated environment.

The Rebuilding America's Schools Act would provide critically needed investments in Las Vegas and rural Nevada to improve our school infrastructure, helping teachers teach and children learn.

President Trump has repeatedly promised to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure. Passing the Rebuilding America's Schools Act would be the first step in making this happen. We must make an investment in our future generation to guarantee their shot at success.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, when we think about healthcare, we all think about, of course, first and foremost, ourselves and our loved ones and our families. As Representatives of 750,000 people, we also think about constituents that we know, that we have met, for whom healthcare is literally a life-and-death situation.

I think of my friend Debbie and her son Sam. Debbie's son Sam was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes when he was 4 years old. He is now 20 or 21 or so. He was a healthy kid, he ate healthy food, an active young child. As Debbie pointed out to me, it is not that anybody chooses an illness or a condition, the illness chooses you. Through the luck of the draw, her son Sam is afflicted with type 1 diabetes. Like many people with autoimmune diseases, it was not poor choices, it was not lifestyle decisions that gave him the disease or even increased his risk of the disease. He was dealt a bad hand with an autoimmune gene that his family didn't even know that they had.

Because of that, Sam has a costly disease. Thankfully, one that can be treated, if not cured, but he has a costly disease for the rest of his life. There is no cure, and the cost of insulin and other lifesaving technologies is very high.

Sam has what here in Washington people call a preexisting condition. That is what we are talking about. Without insurance, the cost per month would go from about $400, which Debbie and her husband are able to afford and put together for Sam, to $2,500 a month, which they could not possibly afford to do.

Sam is now 20, and because of the Affordable Care Act, he will be on the family's health insurance until he is 26. That is, if the family can keep their health insurance. The family worries, like so many others, that they might be one of those 22 million families that loses coverage under this Republican healthcare bill. It is a lot of families.

It is not going to be any of my colleagues' families. My colleagues have a government health insurance plan from serving in the House of Representatives. Their congressional staff has access to the exchanges, just like we do, to buy insurance. But 22 million people in each and every one of our districts, 435 districts in this country, in each and every one of our districts, not dozens of people, not hundreds of people, but thousands of real people like Deb and Sam, like a story I shared earlier of Marcia and Grace, will actually lose their healthcare. They will be forced to give up their home, become insolvent, go bankrupt, or die. A choice that no American should have to face.

Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration today is one of many that didn't go through regular order. There were no hearings. Closed process. They cut out all the Democratic amendments that we had to improve the bill. That is how the Republicans have been handling healthcare legislation this Congress. That is why this approach isn't working. It is why this approach is so unpopular. No hearings, shut Members out of the legislative process, bring a bill to the floor that was hidden in some closet, written in secret, widely unpopular, throwing people off healthcare insurance, raising rates for those who are luckily enough to keep their insurance.

This bill is not aimed at protecting patients. This bill before us and the Senate Republican healthcare bill make it more difficult for Americans to deal with real-life healthcare issues that were dealt over the course of life for ourselves and our families.

We need a reset, Mr. Speaker. We need to reset and start real discussions about improving healthcare.

How could Democrats or Republicans work together to reduce costs?

Democrats and Republicans should work together to expand coverage. We shouldn't be talking about whether 22 million people lose coverage or 10 million people lose coverage or 5 million people lose coverage. Let's talk about 5 million people gaining coverage, 10 million people gaining coverage. Let's reset and frame the discussion about how more people can have access to healthcare.

The problem we are trying to solve is not how can we get less Americans to have access to healthcare. That is why this bill is so unpopular. If that is the problem Republicans are trying to solve, they solved it in this bill. Less Americans will have healthcare. But that is not the problem that the American people want us to address in Congress.

More people with healthcare, and people want to save money. They want their insurance rates to be lower, their deductibles to be lower. They want to save money. There are some low-hanging fruit in terms of costs in healthcare, administrative overhead, wasteful and duplicative spending, that we can go after together. These are good ideas, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican.

One of the amendments that I proposed was pricing transparency. One of the problems in the healthcare marketplace is nobody knows how much anybody charges. Different insurers and private payers pay widely different amounts for the exact same procedure. Let's at least disclose the pricing and have transparency so market mechanisms will work to pull down rates by promoting competition.

□ 1315

By not allowing the market into healthcare, we are creating inefficiencies and raising rates. Let's come together on that. Let's come together around a lot of good ideas that Democrats and Republicans have bills on and have amendments on. But, no, they are not even allowed to be debated and not even allowed to be voted on either on

this bill, in which every Democratic amendment was shut down, or in the Republican healthcare bill, in which no process was allowed for Democrats to improve the bill.

We have never even been invited into the secret backroom to figure out what was being debated. We didn't even see the bill until it was presented fully formed days before it had to be voted on, affecting the lives of 22 million Americans, one-eighth of our entire economy, without any hearings, without any expert testimony, and only days to digest this hundred-page bill.

So look, let's reset, let's work together to bring down costs, expanding coverage and improving quality, and create a work product in healthcare reform that we can be proud of as Republicans, as Democrats, and as Americans; one in which Debbie and her son, Sam, don't have to worry about giving up their home or facing death; or one in which Grace and her mother are able to live out their lives without worrying about their preexisting condition.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to reject this closed rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend's newfound sense of bipartisanship. The Affordable Care Act was passed without a single Republican vote in the House, without a single Republican vote in the Senate, and without any concern of Republican thoughts about how healthcare should be run in this country. Now that the Affordable Care Act is, in fact, failing; now that we have over 90 counties in America that have zero health insurers to choose from in the individual market; and now that we see the Affordable Care Act in a death spiral, all of a sudden, we are concerned about the bipartisanship and how to fix the problem.

We have heard zero amendments in the past 6 years to the Affordable Care Act that would have, in fact, improved the Affordable Care Act from the other side of the aisle while they had the President in the White House, and now, all of a sudden, we are looking for bipartisanship and solutions. We will find that bipartisanship and those solutions in the future.

Mr. Speaker, if we truly want affordable healthcare in this country, then we need to address the cost of supplying care. H.R. 1215 strikes at the heart of skyrocketing medical care. By limiting frivolous and unending lawsuits, doctors can focus less on the courtroom and more on the patient in the operating room.

The reforms made by H.R. 1215 will be especially important for rural America and underserved urban America. Doctors will be able to afford to live and practice in these communities, providing the attentive and responsive care that all Americans deserve, not just Americans who live a few miles from a major hospital.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation. I know Democrats and Republicans have different policy approaches to reforming our healthcare system, but this legislation has already been implemented by Democrats in the State of California, where it has proven successful. Now we have the chance to apply this approach more broadly, in a way that will help millions of Americans. This effort has been bipartisan in the past and should be bipartisan today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the sponsor of this bill, Representative STEVE KING.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the resolution, and I urge a ''yes'' vote on the underlying bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule governing debate of H.R. 1215, the "Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017" and the underlying bill.

I oppose the rule for H.R. 1215, the "Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017" for the following reasons:

There were twenty-five amendments proposed by colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

Only five of those amendments were made in order.

What did all five of those amendments have in common?

These amendments were all submitted by my Republican counterparts.

The rule for this bill incorporates none of the amendments offered by my Democratic colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, that exclusion is problematic.

The amendments not made in order reflect the crippling partisanship of the House majority.

I also oppose the underlying bill on the merits, because it limits noneconomic damages to a mere $250,000, which if enacted, would have a disproportionately adverse impact on women, the poor, and other vulnerable groups.

When given the opportunity, members refused to incorporate an amendment that would increase that cap to reflect the cost of inflation and a concern for the humane treatment of those individuals affected by medical malpractice.

H.R. 1215 provides immunity for health care providers who dispense defective or dangerous pharmaceuticals or medical devices.

Finally, I oppose the bill, because it creates an excessively short statute of limitations period, makes it harder for victims to obtain adequate legal representation, and imposes the risk of loss on victims rather than wrongdoers.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous examples of people who have suffered at the hands of medical providers and whose lives will never be the same.

Consider the case of Olivia, an exceptionally bright high school senior from Santa Monica, California, who had gained early acceptance to Smith College in Massachusetts.

She never made it to Smith College, because after a medical procedure was completed and while Olivia was still under anesthesia, a fellow-in-training pulled the catheter causing Olivia's vital signs to plummet.

Hospital staff waited more than ten minutes to resuscitate her, but it was far too late for Olivia.

She passed away, and her promising future disappeared.

This tragedy never should have happened.

Mr. Speaker, instead of wasting time on this giveaway to special interests, we should be improving the Affordable Care Act, and opposing any bill that would leave over twenty million Americans uninsured, and investigating Russian involvement in our democratic processes.

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

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 382 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, 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. 2475) to provide for the long-term improvement of public school facilities, and for other purposes. 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 chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill 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. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 2475.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 184, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

YEAS—234

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
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)
Collins (NY)
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
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
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
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
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
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
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—184

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
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
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
Nolan
Norcross
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
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
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)

NOT VOTING—15

Cummings
DeLauro
Flores
Granger
Jayapal
Loebsack
Long
Napolitano
Neal
O'Halleran
Renacci
Scalise
Sewell (AL)
Stivers
Yarmuth

□ 1340

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Messrs. VELA, and BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 325.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 325.

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. POLIS. 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 235, noes 186, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

AYES—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
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)
Collins (NY)
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
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
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
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
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
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—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
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
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
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
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
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—12

Cummings
DeLauro
Hice, Jody B.
Himes
Long
Napolitano
Neal
Pelosi
Renacci
Scalise
Stivers
Vela

□ 1348

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 323, No. 324, No. 325, and No. 326 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 2547—Veterans Expanded Trucking Opportunities Act of 2017. I would have also voted "yea" on H.R. 2258—ADVANCE Act. I would have also voted "nay" on the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1215. I would have also voted "nay" on H. Res. 382—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1215—Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 178, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

YEAS—238

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barton
Bergman
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DelBene
Demings
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Engel
Eshoo
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Green, Al
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hollingsworth
Huffman
Hultgren
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Marino
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Quigley
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Suozzi
Takano
Taylor
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Wagner
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—178

Aguilar
Amash
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Clarke (NY)
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crist
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Doyle, Michael F.
Emmer
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hoyer

Hudson	Marchant	Rutherford
Huizenga	Marshall	Ryan (OH)
Hurd	Matsui	Sánchez
Issa	McGovern	Sanford
Jackson Lee	McKinley	Sarbanes
Jayapal	McSally	Schakowsky
Jenkins (KS)	Mitchell	Schiff
Jenkins (WV)	Moore	Schrader
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (PA)	Sewell (AL)
Jordan	Nolan	Sires
Joyce (OH)	Norcross	Slaughter
Katko	O'Halleran	Smith (MO)
Keating	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Paulsen	Tenney
Khanna	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Kihuen	Pearce	Thompson (MS)
Kilmer	Perry	Thompson (PA)
Kind	Peters	Tipton
Kinzinger	Peterson	Turner
LaHood	Pittenger	Upton
Lance	Poe (TX)	Valadao
Langevin	Price (NC)	Vargas
Lawrence	Raskin	Veasey
Lawson (FL)	Ratcliffe	Vela
Lee	Reed	Velázquez
Levin	Reichert	Visclosky
Lewis (GA)	Rice (NY)	Walberg
Lieu, Ted	Richmond	Walden
LoBiondo	Roe (TN)	Waters, Maxine
Loebsack	Rogers (AL)	Watson Coleman
Lofgren	Rokita	Weber (TX)
Love	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (FL)
Lowenthal	Rosen	Wittman
Lynch	Rouzer	Woodall
MacArthur	Roybal-Allard	Yoder
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Ellison	Tonko

NOT VOTING—15

Black	Hunter	Pelosi
Burgess	Long	Renacci
Cummings	Lowey	Scalise
DeLauro	Napolitano	Sessions
Gohmert	Neal	Stivers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1355

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote No. 325 regarding "On Ordering the Previous Question" (H. Res. 382). Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

I missed rollcall vote No. 326 regarding "Providing for consideration of H.R. 1215" (H. Res. 382). Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

I missed rollcall vote No. 327 "On Approving the Journal." Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

ADJUSTING THE AMOUNT OF THE MEMBERS' REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCE

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 411

Whereas on June 14, 2017, an armed gunman opened fire at a practice for the annual Congressional Baseball Game for Charity, wounding five individuals;

Whereas Members of the House are understandably concerned about the security of their staff and the constituents they serve, as well as their personal security;

Whereas the Members' Representational Allowance (MRA) is available for ordinary and necessary expenses associated with security measures; and

Whereas heightened security concerns necessitate an adjustment in the MRA to provide Members with additional resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That pursuant to section 1(b) of House Resolution 1372, Ninety-fourth Congress, agreed to July 1, 1976, as enacted into permanent law by section 101 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1977 (2 U.S.C. 4314), the Members' Representational Allowance applicable as of the date of the adoption of this resolution for each Member of the House of Representatives (including the Delegates and Resident Commissioner to the Congress) is increased by $25,000, to be available through January 2, 2018.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. 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. 412

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Mr. Walz.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

SANTA ANA RIVER WASH PLAN LAND EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 497) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain exchanged non-public lands, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 497

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 ''Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONSERVATION DISTRICT.—The term ''Conservation District'' means the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, a political subdivision of the State of California.

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''non-Federal Land'' means the approximately 310 acres of land owned by the Conservation District generally depicted as ''SBVWCD to BLM'' on the Map.

(3) MAP.—The term ''Map'' means the map titled ''Santa Ana River Wash Land Exchange'' and dated September 3, 2015.

(4) NON-FEDERAL EXCHANGE PARCEL.—The term ''non-Federal exchange parcel'' means the approximately 59 acres of land owned by the Conservation District generally depicted as ''SBVWCD Equalization Land'' on the Map and is to be conveyed to the United States if necessary to equalize the fair market values of the lands otherwise to be exchanged.

(5) FEDERAL EXCHANGE PARCEL.—The term ''Federal exchange parcel'' means the approximately 90 acres of Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management generally depicted as ''BLM Equalization Land to SBVWCD'' on the Map and is to be conveyed to the Conservation District if necessary to equalize the fair market values of the lands otherwise to be exchanged.

(6) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 327 acres of Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management generally depicted as ''BLM Land to SBVWCD'' on the Map.

(7) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. EXCHANGE OF LAND; EQUALIZATION OF VALUE.

(a) EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.—Notwithstanding the land use planning requirements of sections 202, 210, and 211 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1720–21), subject to valid existing rights, and conditioned upon any equalization payment necessary under section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)), and subsection (b) of this Act, as soon as practicable, but not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, if the Conservation District offers to convey the exchange land to the United States, the Secretary shall—

(1) convey to the Conservation District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land, and any such portion of the Federal exchange parcel as may be required to equalize the values of the lands exchanged; and

(2) accept from the Conservation District a conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the Conservation District in and to the non-Federal land, and any such portion of the non-Federal exchange parcel as may be required to equalize the values of the lands exchanged.

(b) EQUALIZATION PAYMENT.—To the extent an equalization payment is necessary under section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716), the amount of such equalization payment shall first be made by way of in-kind transfer of such portion of the Federal exchange parcel to the Conservation District, or transfer of such portion of the non-Federal exchange parcel to the United States, as the case may be, as may be necessary to equalize the fair market values of the exchanged properties. The fair market value of the Federal exchange parcel or non-Federal exchange parcel,

as the case may be, shall be credited against any required equalization payment. To the extent such credit is not sufficient to offset the entire amount of equalization payment so indicated, any remaining amount of equalization payment shall be treated as follows:

(1) If the equalization payment is to equalize values by which the Federal land exceeds the non-Federal land and the credited value of the non-Federal exchange parcel, Conservation District may make the equalization payment to the United States, notwithstanding any limitation regarding the amount of the equalization payment under section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716). In the event Conservation District opts not to make the indicated equalization payment, the exchange shall not proceed.

(2) If the equalization payment is to equalize values by which the non-Federal land exceeds the Federal land and the credited value of the Federal exchange parcel, the Secretary shall order the exchange without requirement of any additional equalization payment by the United States to the Conservation District.

(c) APPRAISALS.—

(1) The value of the land to be exchanged under this Act shall be determined by appraisals conducted by 1 or more independent and qualified appraisers.

(2) The appraisals shall be conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including, as appropriate, the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(d) TITLE APPROVAL.—Title to the land to be exchanged under this Act shall be in a format acceptable to the Secretary and the Conservation District

(e) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize a map and legal descriptions of all land to be conveyed under this Act. The Secretary may correct any minor errors in the map or in the legal descriptions. The map and legal descriptions shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(f) COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—As a condition of conveyance, any costs related to the conveyance under this section shall be paid by the Conservation District.

SEC. 4. APPLICABLE LAW.

(a) ACT OF FEBRUARY 20, 1909.—

(1) The Act of February 20, 1909 (35 Stat. 641), shall not apply to the Federal land and any public exchange land transferred under this Act.

(2) The exchange of lands under this section shall be subject to continuing rights of the Conservation District under the Act of February 20, 1909 (35 Stat. 641), on the non-Federal land and any exchanged portion of the non-Federal exchange parcel for the continued use, maintenance, operation, construction, or relocation of, or expansion of, groundwater recharge facilities on the non-Federal land, to accommodate groundwater recharge of the Bunker Hill Basin to the extent that such activities are not in conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plan or Habitat Management Plan under which such non-Federal land or non-Federal exchange parcel may be held or managed.

(b) FLPMA.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701, et seq.), shall apply to the exchange of land under this Act.

SEC. 5. CANCELLATION OF SECRETARIAL ORDER 241.

Secretarial Order 241, dated November 11, 1929 (withdrawing a portion of the Federal land for an unconstructed transmission line), is terminated and the withdrawal thereby effected is revoked.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I am proud to sponsor this bipartisan, commonsense piece of legislation, the Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act. This bill reflects a compromise negotiated at the grassroots level among the cities, county, mining companies, wildlife agencies, and water organizations for over two decades in the Upper Santa Ana Wash area.

The bill simply authorizes a land exchange of 327 acres of Bureau of Land Management land for 310 acres of land currently owned by the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District. This exchange facilitates the implementation of the broader Upper Santa Ana Wash Land Management and Habitat Conservation Plan, which identifies opportunities to expand existing aggregate mining operations to support new infrastructure developments; enhance water storage for the surrounding communities; and establish protected habitat for certain threatened and endangered plants and species.

After the exchange, the Bureau of Land Management will use the land to protect critical habitat and will enhance the region's water conservation and storage efforts by recharging more than 77 water basins. The land acquired by the Water Conservation District, which is currently adjacent to two aggregate mines, will allow local mining companies to expand and create greater efficiency in their current mining operations.

The companies estimate that this small exchange will result in approximately $8.5 million in new infrastructure projects and a $36 million increase in annual payrolls from the new sites.

This bill is supported by a wide variety of stakeholders in my district, including the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, the San Bernardino Valley Municipal Water District, San Bernardino County, the city of Highland, California, the city of Redlands, California, CEMEX, the Endangered Habitats League, Robertson's Ready Mix, and Inland Action.

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

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

H.R. 497 authorizes a land exchange in California between the San Bernardino Valley Conservation District and the Bureau of Land Management. After 15 years, stakeholders have finalized the habitat conservation plan for the Santa Ana River Wash that balances the needs of endangered wildlife with regional economic development.

This is a stellar example of the Endangered Species Act at work, and I commend Representative COOK for his work on this bill.

This land exchange is a key component of the Habitat Conservation Plan and a win-win for all parties. It will help protect important wildlife habitat while allowing the conservation district to increase water storage capacity and direct mining activity into the appropriate areas.

So again, this is exactly how the Endangered Species Act should work. It is something we should all support. This is a good bill, and I urge swift adoption by the House.

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

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR).

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act introduced by my Republican colleague and regional partner, Colonel PAUL COOK. The Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act is the final step, as he mentioned, to complete the transfer of land between the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District and the Bureau of Land Management, known as the BLM.

This legislation allows the BLM and the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District to trade parcels of land which will benefit both the BLM and the conservation district.

This land exchange will empower mining companies, Robertson's Ready Mix, and CEMEX, which sit on land managed by the BLM, to increase efficiency. And as the gentleman mentioned, by increasing that efficiency, these local mining companies will produce aggregate that will support numerous infrastructure projects and approximately $36 million in annual payroll from this site alone.

Additionally, the land exchange creates 59 acres of land for the conservation district to use for conservation purposes to protect endangered plants and species and for recharging water in more than 70 basins.

The wash plan has been an ongoing project since the late 1980s, when it was a proposal from the cities of Highland and Redlands. As the former mayor of Redlands, I worked on this project at the local level. Years, and actually decades, of studies and committee reports have culminated in this final presentation of the Upper Santa Ana River Wash Plan.

The Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act moves this decades-long process forward, which will

allow San Bernardino County to take advantage of critical economic and environmental benefits.

After years of working on this project at the local level and listening to constituents and local stakeholders' comments and questions, I can confidently say that this land exchange is widely supported.

I have received letters of support from two mining companies affected by the transfer, the County of San Bernardino, the city of Highland, the city of Redlands, the San Bernardino Valley Conservation District, a local chapter of the Habitat League, and Inland Action, which is an organization of regional stakeholders that promote economic growth in the Inland Empire.

This bill is a smart bipartisan plan that will help us support our local economy and protect the environment. It is a victory for all involved, and I offer my complete support and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act.

I want to commend Representative COOK again. He has been a regional leader on this issue. He has been a colleague. We have worked on many of these issues that border our two districts. He has been incredibly thoughtful in his approach to this. He has done a yeoman's work with his staff in carrying forward this bill, and it is always a pleasure to work with my colleague.

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

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, obviously, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 497, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

TERROR LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT UPPER HIDDEN BASIN DIVERSION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 220) to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 220

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

SECTION 1. TERROR LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT UPPER HIDDEN BASIN DIVERSION AUTHORIZATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

(2) TERROR LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT.—The term ''Terror Lake Hydroelectric Project'' means the project identified in section 1325 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3212), and which is Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project number 2743.

(3) UPPER HIDDEN BASIN DIVERSION EXPANSION.—The term ''Upper Hidden Basin Diversion Expansion'' means the expansion of the Terror Lake Hydroelectric Project as generally described in Exhibit E to the Upper Hidden Basin Grant Application dated July 2, 2014, and submitted to the Alaska Energy Authority Renewable Energy Fund Round VIII by Kodiak Electric Association, Inc.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The licensee for the Terror Lake Hydroelectric Project may occupy not more than 20 acres of Federal land to construct, operate, and maintain the Upper Hidden Basin Diversion Expansion without further authorization of the Secretary of the Interior or under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.).

(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—The Upper Hidden Basin Diversion Expansion shall be subject to appropriate terms and conditions included in an amendment to a license issued by the Commission pursuant to the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), including section 4(e) of that Act (16 U.S.C. 797(e)), following an environmental review by the Commission under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, H.R. 220, allows for the expansion of the Terror Lake Hydroelectric Project on Kodiak Island, Alaska—by the way, which is larger than New Jersey.

The Terror Lake Hydroelectric project provides 31 megawatts of hydropower capacity to the Island's approximately 13,789 residents and, of course, the largest Coast Guard station in the United States.

Kodiak Island is roughly the size, as I mentioned, of New Jersey. This means it is reliant upon the electric generation on the Island mostly by hydro at this time, some diesel.

With the growing electrical demands of the residents of Kodiak, the Kodiak Electric Association will not be able to meet their needs without requiring additional resources or will be forced back to increasing the use of diesel. There is no reason why a hydro-rich community like Kodiak should ever have to rely on diesel fuel for power generation. They wish to expand their operation by increasing their water resources, and I agree.

My legislation allows the Kodiak Electric Company to divert small flows of additional water from Upper Hidden Basin into Terror Lake by digging a 1.5 mile underground tunnel.

This diversion will increase the water resources at Terror Lake by 25 percent, resulting in an additional 33,000 megawatt-hours of generation each year and totalling an estimated output in the project of approximately 168 million megawatt-hours annually.

The issue at hand is the tunnel would need to go through Kodiak Island National Wildlife Refuge, which is Federal land, to the State land where the water diversion would be located.

My legislation authorizes the Kodiak Electric Association to occupy not more than 20 acres of Federal land to construct, operate, and maintain the Upper Hidden Basin Division expansion without further authorization of the Secretary of the Interior under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.

Alaska has tremendous hydroelectric potential, and I look forward to moving additional commonsense reforms to provide our rural and remote communities for new opportunities to obtain reliable and affordable hydropower.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that the Fish and Wildlife Service supports this, there is no objection to it, it is a solution waiting to happen, so we are going to dig a tunnel. This is really about a tunnel.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 220 would authorize an expansion of the existing Terror Lake Hydropower project in Alaska to meet increased powder demands from Kodiak Island.

The expansion would have to comply with environmental protections required under the Federal Power Act and National Environmental Policy Act.

This bill unanimously passed both the House Natural Resources Committee and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

I want to thank Mr. YOUNG for his persuasive presentation both in committee and on the House floor. I fully support the sensible bipartisan legislation and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

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

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I was going to say a few words about this bill here, but I would be in fear of my life if I changed anything on Congressman YOUNG's statement.

So with that, I think he did an outstanding job presenting, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr.

COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 220, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1415

ROBERT EMMET PARK ACT OF 2017

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1500) to redesignate the small triangular property located in Washington, DC, and designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302 as ''Robert Emmet Park'', and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1500

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 ''Robert Emmet Park Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Robert Emmet was one of Ireland's most prominent historical figures, having led an effort to secure Irish independence in 1803.

(2) Although Emmet's efforts initially failed, they succeeded in inspiring new generations of Irish men and women to struggle for independence.

(3) For his efforts to gain Irish independence, Emmet was found guilty of treason and sentenced to death by hanging.

(4) Robert Emmet's ''Speech from the Dock'' motivated many of the efforts that led to an independent Ireland following 1916's Easter Rising; (Emmet famously said that ''To [Ireland] I sacrificed every selfish, every lasting sentiment . . . I wished to place her independence beyond the reach of any power of earth . . . to procure for my country the guarantee which Washington procured for America . . . to exalt her to that proud station in the world.''). Emmet was strongly influenced by American democracy and the American Revolution.

(5) Emmet had family members similarly admiring of the United States and dedicated to the cause of Irish independence, including his brother Thomas Addis Emmet who went on to become a prominent Attorney General of New York.

(6) Emmet has been revered by generations of Irish-Americans for his leadership, courage, and sacrifice.

(7) Fifty years ago on April 22, 1966, the Robert Emmet Statue was dedicated on a small parcel of National Park Service land (reservation 302) at the corner of 24th Street NW and Massachusetts Avenue NW in Washington, DC.

(8) Robert Emmet's statue is the central feature of reservation 302.

(9) Many leading Members of Congress, including Speaker of the House John W. McCormack and Senators Everett Dirksen and Mike Mansfield served on the Robert Emmet Statue Dedication Committee.

(10) Other members of that committee and participants in the dedication ceremony included Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, Representative Michael Kirwan, Ambassador of Ireland William P. Fay, and Rector of St. Matthews Cathedral John K. Cartwright.

SEC. 3. REDESIGNATION OF ROBERT EMMET PARK.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The small triangular property designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302, shall be known as ''Robert Emmet Park''.

(b) REFERENCE.—Any reference in any law, regulation, document, record, map, paper, or other record of the United States to the property referred to in subsection (a) is deemed to be a reference to ''Robert Emmet Park''.

(c) SIGNAGE.—The Secretary of the Interior may post signs on or near Robert Emmet Park that include one or more of the following:

(1) Information on Robert Emmet, his contribution to Irish Independence, and his respect for the United States and the American Revolution.

(2) Information on the history of the statue of Robert Emmet located in Robert Emmet Park.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1500, offered by our colleague, Representative JOSEPH CROWLEY of New York, renames a small triangular property owned by the National Park Service in Washington, D.C., as Robert Emmet Park.

Robert Emmet, sometimes referred to as the George Washington of Ireland, was a prominent historical figure known for his role in the Irish rebellion of 1803 and for his classic ''Speech from the Dock'' that inspired future efforts to gain Irish independence.

The small National Park Service reservation that is redesignated by this bill includes a statue of Robert Emmet, originally cast in 1916 by Irish-American artist Jerome Connor. In April of last year, the statue was rededicated at a ceremony that also jointly marked the centennial of the 1916 Easter Rising. The statue and park, located just a few blocks from the Irish Embassy, are a source of pride to the Irish community.

I wish to thank Representative CROWLEY for his sponsorship of this bill, and also Mr. Jack O'Brien of the Ancient Order of Hibernians for his tireless work in support of this legislation and his lifelong dedication to Irish cultural projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as my friend, Mr. COOK, just pointed out, H.R. 1500 designates a small triangle of land in Washington, D.C., as Robert Emmet Park. The parcel is home to a statue of Robert Emmet, a seminal figure in Ireland's quest for independence. The bill also authorizes the National Park Service, which manages the area, to add interpretive displays and signage to the area.

Emmet admired the independence we achieved in this country and only wanted the same freedom and liberty for his compatriots in Ireland. Designating this small plot of land and the accompanying statue as Robert Emmet Park will stand as a constant reminder of the call to liberty and freedom that binds our Nation together.

I would like to thank my friend, Representative CROWLEY from New York City, who is also a proud son of St. Patrick, for his work on this bill, and I urge its swift passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time.

I also want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee here in the House of Representatives for moving this bill and helping to put this bill on the floor today in a bipartisan spirit. I would also like to acknowledge the majority and minority staff who have been very helpful to my office in this effort.

True, this is not the first time this measure has been considered. It passed the House during the last Congress, but the session ended before it could be moved forward in the Senate and into law. It was then, as it is now, a bipartisan bill. I would like to acknowledge all of the Members who are cosponsors. In substance, the bill would, as has been said, name a small parcel of the land in Washington, D.C., as Robert Emmet Park.

Emmet was honored by the United States over 100 years ago when a statue of his likeness was donated to the Smithsonian Institution. That statue was welcomed by no less than President Woodrow Wilson himself.

After 50 years, the museum moved the statue to the land where it rests now, an unnamed parcel of land. The rededication committee counted many key leaders, including then-Speaker of the House John McCormack, Senator Everett Dirksen, and Senator Mike Mansfield. Even President Lyndon Johnson conveyed his pride in Emmet, stating: ''We Americans are proud to accord a place of honor here in the Nation's Capital to Robert Emmet, whose struggles and sacrifices bespeak the yearnings of mankind throughout the ages.''

So it is clear that, on a bipartisan basis, Congress has long recognized the significance of this statue and its role in keeping alive not only the memory of Robert Emmet, but the ideals for which he stood.

At present, the statue of Emmet is the only statue on this small piece of land. This bill would take the next logical step by naming the land for Emmet. It is a fitting tribute since, for generations, many American schoolchildren learned the words of Emmet's famous speech, which became known as the ''Speech from the Dock.''

I often wonder what Abraham Lincoln was taught as a boy. We all learned the Gettysburg Address, but, in fact, Abraham Lincoln could recite the ''Speech from the Dock'' by memory. It couldn't have been an easy speech for Emmet to give when one considers that he was expected to be executed after giving that speech.

Emmet had been an Irish independence leader who was deeply influenced by George Washington and the struggle for American independence. He was inspired by the American fight for democracy and self-determination. But after a failed effort to achieve independence, he was captured by the British, as were many others over centuries of struggle.

In his speech, Emmet said:

> Let no man write my epitaph; for as no man who knows my motives dare now vindicate them, let not prejudice or ignorance asperse them. Let them and me rest in obscurity and peace, and my tomb remain uninscribed, and my memory in oblivion, until other times and other men can do justice to my character. When my country takes her place among the nations of the Earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph be written.

Shortly after giving that speech on September 20, 1803, Robert Emmet was hanged, drawn, and quartered. But Emmet's words lived on. In fact, groups named the Emmet Monument Association were founded in the United States. Their stated purpose was to build a burial monument to Emmet, one that would, of course, include an epitaph.

But because Emmet called for Ireland to be free before his epitaph was written, these groups were actually Fenian freedom organizations. They and other American groups were quite active in the United States for many years all across our Nation. They came before subsequent American roles in the struggle for Irish independence, and their presence played a major role in American political life for many decades.

So I respectfully urge the passage of this bill. It does not require spending funds, and it does not alter the park or the park system. It would basically include the name Robert Emmet Park to a small piece of land where the Emmet statue rests.

Many Americans, as well as our government, have long recognized the significance of the park and statue in keeping alive not just the history of Robert Emmet, but what he stood for. I am glad that continues today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again thank the majority and the minority members of the Natural Resources Committee as well as their staffs. Their support made it possible for this measure to once again be on the floor today.

I would like to thank the hardworking staffs of the Smithsonian Institution and the National Park Service who have taken care of the Emmet statue and park for these many, many years.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1500.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ESTABLISHING A VISITOR SERVICES FACILITY ON THE ARLINGTON RIDGE TRACT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1073) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a structure for visitor services on the Arlington Ridge tract, in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1073

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

SECTION 1. DEFINITION.

In this Act, the term ''Arlington Ridge tract'' means the parcel of Federal land located in Arlington County, Virginia, known as the Nevius Tract and transferred to the Department of the Interior in 1953, that is bounded generally by—

(1) Arlington Boulevard (United States Route 50) to the north;

(2) Jefferson Davis Highway (Virginia Route 110) to the east;

(3) Marshall Drive to the south; and

(4) North Meade Street to the west.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF A VISITOR SERVICES FACILITY ON THE ARLINGTON RIDGE TRACT.

Notwithstanding section 2863(g) of Public Law 107–107, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct a structure for visitor services to include a public restroom facility on the Arlington Ridge tract in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1073, brought to us by our Natural Resources Committee colleague Congressman DON BEYER of Virginia, authorizes the National Park Service to construct a visitor services center at the United States Marine Corps Memorial in Arlington, Virginia.

The United States Marine Corps Memorial is one of the emblematic sites of our Nation's Capital. As a marine, the memorial is especially near and dear to my heart. It represents our Nation's gratitude and esteem for the Marines and those who have fought beside them.

While the statue depicts the flag raising on Iwo Jima—one of the most iconic events in World War II—the memorial is dedicated to all marines who have given their lives in defense of the United States since 1775.

Each year, the memorial attracts over 1 million visitors and hosts several popular events, including Summer Sunset Parades and the Marine Corps Marathon.

Despite this popularity, the memorial lacks basic visitor services such as permanent restroom facilities. The bill before us authorizes the construction of a visitor services center that includes permanent restroom facilities, thus allowing those visiting our Nation's Capital to visit and appreciate this grand memorial with increased comfort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, H.R. 1073, authorizes the National Park Service to construct a visitor services facility that includes a restroom at the U.S. Marine Corps Memorial, also known as the Iwo Jima Memorial. The memorial is located in Arlington, Virginia, adjacent to Arlington National Cemetery, and a short drive from the Pentagon and from here.

This iconic statue of marines raising the flag over Iwo Jima is one of the country's most recognized memorials—the most recognized memorial in the whole world—and receives a tremendous amount of visitation. Unfortunately, there are no permanent restroom facilities at the site. It goes without saying that this is a major hurdle to visitor comfort, especially given that this is a popular destination of our veterans, not all of whom are able-bodied.

However, once this bill becomes law, the National Park Service will be able

to construct a restroom with funds that have already been donated for this purpose. This is in keeping with a broad policy of improving accessibility of all the memorials on and around The National Mall.

This bill is a long time coming. I want to thank my bill cosponsors for their support, Mr. COOK of California and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

I understand that our good friends from the Park Service are watching with excitement and pleasure this afternoon as we take this up on the floor. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1073.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAUTHORIZING THE HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1135) to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1135

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

SECTION 1. HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM REAUTHORIZED.

Section 507(d)(2) of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (54 U.S.C. 302101 note) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting ''and each of fiscal years 2018 through 2024.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1430

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

H.R. 295, introduced by Congressman JAMES CLYBURN from South Carolina, reauthorizes the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

Since 1988, the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program has awarded over $60 million in grants to assist Historically Black Colleges and Universities with needed maintenance and rehabilitation of historic buildings on their campuses. These projects may include repairing damaged masonry, upgrading electrical and plumbing systems, or fixing leaking roofs.

Although the needs of our Nation's Historically Black Colleges and Universities exceed the amounts authorized by this legislation, future funding provided to this program will help to ensure that the rich history of these campuses remains preserved for future generations.

I urge adoption of this measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1135 reauthorizes the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program. This program provides grants to revitalize and conserve historic structures at Historically Black Colleges and Universities in Virginia.

I am very proud and grateful of the five HBCUs we have in Virginia: Virginia State, Norfolk State, Hampton University, Virginia Union University, and Virginia University of Lynchburg.

I point out that the Nation's first elected African-American Governor, Douglas L. Wilder, was a graduate of Virginia Union University.

Since the program was first authorized in 1988, as Mr. COOK has said, there has been over $60 million in grants to help restore iconic structures on many of these college campuses, and two-thirds of this money appropriated has been leveraged to generate matching funds to maximize the impacts of taxpayer dollars. But despite all the progress made with respect to revitalizing these campuses, there is still a lot of work that remains to be done in all 107 HBCUs.

Reauthorization and sustained support for this program is long overdue. So I would like to thank my esteemed colleague from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for all of his hard work and relentlessness to bring this bill to the attention of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this good bill.

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

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, as a student and former teacher of history, I have worked during my tenure in Congress to preserve and protect our Nation's historic treasures.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities, commonly called HBCUs, are some of the most important historic educational institutions in our country. There are over 100 HBCUs in the country, and eight of them are in South Carolina. I proudly represent seven of them and I am a graduate of one.

Many of them have buildings and sites on their campuses that have existed for over a century and are of great historical significance. Unfortunately, many of the historic buildings and sites on these campuses have deteriorated over the years and are at risk of being lost if not preserved and protected.

In 1998, at the behest of the Congressional Black Caucus, the United States Government Accountability Office, the GAO, surveyed 103 HBCU campuses to identify the historically significant sites on these campuses and project the cost of restoring and preserving these properties. The GAO identified 712 historic buildings and sites, and projected a cost of $755 million to restore and preserve them. Each of these sites has national significance to American history, and I believe we have an obligation to be stewards of these historic treasures.

In 2003, working with our former colleague Jim Hansen of Utah and our current colleague and my dear friend JIMMY DUNCAN of Tennessee, Congress expanded the program and authorized expenditures of $10 million annually for 5 years. I have seen the results firsthand. Last year, Allen University rededicated the historic Chappelle Auditorium on its campus in Columbia, South Carolina, which was painstakingly restored thanks to funding from this program. Originally built in 1925, this building was central to the cultural life of African Americans in South Carolina for generations.

In 1947, Reverend Joseph A. DeLaine attended an NAACP event at Chappelle Auditorium that inspired him to organize Black families in Clarendon County to petition their school district to provide buses for Black students who, at the time, were forced to make a daily walk of 9.4 miles to school. That was 9.4 miles to school and 9.4 miles back home.

The legal case that grew from this petition, Briggs v. Elliott, precipitated the frontal attack on segregation in the country and was later combined with four other cases that became Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, at the Supreme Court. Overturning the separate-but-equal fallacy, Brown ended legal segregation throughout America.

This is just a singular example of the history living on HBCU campuses. Because of our past efforts, historic buildings and sites at 59 HBCUs in 20 States have received funding from this program. However, many historic structures are still endangered.

Consequently, in the omnibus appropriations bill for 2017, which passed earlier this year, Congress included $4 million for HBCU Historic Preservation so that we could continue this progress.

Last year, the House passed this bill unanimously, but it was not taken up by the Senate. I thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA for supporting it again today. This bill is supported by the United Negro College Fund, the Thurgood Marshall College Fund, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

The HBCU Historic Preservation program serves as an essential purpose to HBCUs, which have a special place in the fabric of American history, culture, and education. Countless individuals have worked tirelessly to cultivate HBCUs, and their legacy is seen in graduates whose achievements adorn the pages of American history. From Booker T. Washington, to Mary McLeod Bethune, W.E.B. DuBois, to Martin Luther King, Jr., HBCU visionaries and graduates have set powerful examples of leadership.

The legacy of HBCUs is one of significant courage and steadfast determination. The structures on these campuses across the country are living testaments to African-American history, and they deserve to be stabilized and restored. HBCUs are among America's national treasures that must be preserved and protected for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this needed legislation.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a distinguished Member of Congress.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the reauthorization of the HBCU Historic Preservation program. There are ten HBCUs in North Carolina. The Johnson C. Smith University is in my district.

I am pleased to see strong bipartisan support that recognizes how integral Historically Black Colleges and Universities are to our Nation.

I am a proud graduate twice of North Carolina A&T, a retired 40-year professor at Bennett College—both HBCUs in Greensboro.

Most of the structures that this program will help preserve date back to the founding of these schools, most founded in the 19th century. These structures teach us about the lengths that African Americans went through to be educated and to fight for their place in American society.

They also provide important lessons for today, reminding us of how far we have come as a society and how these structures were once built to cope with Jim Crow America but now are used to educate our future lawyers, doctors, and politicians.

They also remind us of how far we have to go, how we must continue to address the numerous inequities HBCUs face compared to other universities when it comes to educating the next generation.

Funding from this program finances repairs that schools with large endowments take for granted, repairs from water damage, asbestos, lead paint, improvements to heating and ventilation systems, and increased physical accessibility for the disabled.

The program helps modernize HBCU campuses, creating a suitable environment for learning and achievement, while allowing these institutions to attract prospective students who deserve an education.

W.E.B. DuBois reminded us: Of all of the civil rights for which the world has struggled and fought for for 500 years, but the right to learn is undoubtedly the most fundamental.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this program is necessary to update HBCU infrastructure and maintain their competitive edge as institutions of higher learning supporting that fundamental right.

The President has said these schools are a priority for his administration. They are absolutely a priority for me as well as for my colleagues of the CBC and the bipartisan HBCU Caucus. So passing it proves that Congress can come together to achieve something substantial for these schools and continue the conversation surrounding HBCUs.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my good friend Congressman JIM CLYBURN's bill to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

I have known JIM CLYBURN for more than 35 years, and this has been his passion ever since I first met him many years ago. I thank Mr. CLYBURN for his passion and his leadership on this issue.

Since 1988, the HBCU Historic Preservation program has provided more than $60 million to HBCUs all across the country to support infrastructure and facilitate learning.

Both my undergraduate and law school alma mater, North Carolina Central University in Durham, an institution that I am now proud to represent in Congress, has greatly benefited from the program.

And I might say that my father graduated from Shaw University, which is an HBCU, and later from Meharry Medical College. My mother attended high school at Shaw University and graduated from college at Hampton Institute, now called Hampton University.

Mr. Speaker, HBCUs fill a unique and important role in our Nation's higher education system and in our country's narrative. Not only do HBCUs train our workforce of the future by producing the most African-American students who can earn science and engineering doctoral degrees, they are integral parts of our national identity.

The more than 100 HBCUs spread across the country house the books and the memorabilia from freedmen and former slaves dating back many years.

Many of the historic buildings on the campuses of HBCUs were used as meeting places during reconstruction and during the civil rights movement.

HBCUs represent the past, the here and the now, and the future of our country. By reauthorizing this important program through 2024, we can honor the many important faculty and students that have helped HBCUs endure, support people at those institutions today, and prepare our workforce for the future.

I strongly support this bill. I commend my dear colleague, Congressman JIM CLYBURN, for his enormous leadership on this important issue. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this legislation.

□ 1445

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1135, to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program.

I am so grateful to Congressman CLYBURN for his leadership over the years to strengthen and protect the Historic Preservation program on behalf of our Nation's HBCUs. He has been a tireless advocate on behalf of historic preservation of HBCUs, and I am honored today to join him in this effort. Mr. CLYBURN has worked tirelessly during his time in Congress to preserve and protect our Nation's historic treasures and the legacies of those who came before us.

Many of us have HBCUs in our district. They represent a steep history of student activism in the civil rights movement. Many of the buildings, sites, and historic records that exist on these campuses have existed for over a century and a half. In 1998, as a matter of fact, the GAO found that there were 712 historic buildings and sites on HBCU campuses. If we do not do more to protect and preserve the vestiges that remain, we will surely lose this important history.

Tuskegee University is one university in my home State of Alabama, where Booker T. Washington, George Washington Carver, and the Tuskegee Airmen all made their place in our Nation's history.

Stillman College; Selma University; Concordia College; Miles College;

Talladega College; Alabama A&M University; and Alabama State University, where my mother and father graduated, are Historically Black Colleges in the State of Alabama.

At Talladega College, these funds were used to restore Foster Hall, which was erected for girls and teachers in 1869, and is the oldest dorm on that campus. This program has helped so many HBCUs in my State. The buildings were nearly destroyed 5 years ago, but the funds from the historic program were used to restore the buildings on Talladega's campus.

When I think about my own district, the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, at Miles College in Birmingham, students were leaders in the civil rights movement and led a selective buying campaign at local department stores and major retailers in 1963.

Congress has recognized that we have a responsibility to be stewards of these great national resources since we first enacted grants to HBCUs for historic preservation in 1996. The program was then expanded in 2003, thanks to Mr. CLYBURN and others. Historical buildings and sites at more than 60 HBCUs have benefited.

If we continue making investments in this program, we can meet the dire historic preservation and restoration needs that remain at these threatened sites. We must not only know our history, but we must also protect our history.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to continue this important work by voting for this bill today to reauthorize the HBCU Historic Preservation program through 2024.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a graduate of the University of Virginia School of Law.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the manager of this legislation, the cosponsors, Mr. CLYBURN, and so many others who have been part of this historic legislation for their leadership on it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the bipartisan Congressional HBCU Caucus and as an original cosponsor of H.R. 1135.

H.R. 1135 would authorize the appropriation of millions of dollars from 2018 through 2024 to the Historic Preservation Fund to provide assistance for the restoration and preservation of historic structures at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Let me indicate that this has been a long journey. The reauthorization is very special and emotional to many of us. As many of us know, Historically Black Colleges and Universities came at the wake of the ending of slavery and were a place of refuge for so many students.

I am reminded of those individuals who, as freed slaves, told stories of walking miles to be able to get to a school like Fisk University or to a school for so many in North Carolina and South Carolina or all throughout the South. They were great refuges for individuals who wanted a better life.

It is important to note that in the 1980s, the National Park Service awarded more than $65 million. These grants require you to cover 30 percent of the project. So it is not a handout. It is a hand-up. It is preserving the history of this great Nation.

I am very grateful to the Congressional Black Caucus. When the question is asked, ''What is the Congressional Black Caucus and what do we do,'' I will say without shame that we are the conscience of this Nation and we recognize that we have a responsibility to protect the vulnerable things of this Nation, whether it be people or things.

So the idea was to make sure that not only students have a brilliant education, but those who would seek knowledge will be able to come to the campuses of these Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

I happen to represent two State schools: Texas Southern University and Prairie View A&M. There are many HBCUs throughout the State of Texas. We are grateful for the leadership that they have given. They have history.

Soon I will be establishing what we call the Emancipation Trail, which chronicles the announcement of freedom in Texas. It was called Juneteenth. It was 2 years that some learned about their freedom after everyone else was free.

Those stories are being told at the HBCUs, but at the same time, STEM education is being taught. Oakwood College, a historically Black college of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, educates huge numbers of doctors. I am told it has the largest number of African Americans that go into medical school.

STEM is very important to our HBCUs. Texas Southern University has a renowned homeland security program.

This is a good bill, and I thank my colleagues for voting for this very right and positive bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Bipartisan Congressional HBCU Caucus and an original co-sponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1135, which reauthorizes the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation Program.

H.R. 1135 would authorize the appropriation of $10 million annually from 2018 through 2024 for the Historic Preservation Fund to provide assistance for the restoration and preservation of historic structures at Historical Black Colleges (HBCUs).

Specifically, H.R. 1135, reauthorizes $10 million in annual appropriations for the National Park Service grant program supporting the preservation of historic buildings on the campuses of historically black colleges and universities.

Since the 1980s, the National Park Service (NPS) has awarded more than $65 million to more than 80 HBCUs to repair historic buildings on their campuses.

To be eligible for grants under the program, recipients have to cover 30 percent of the cost of a project.

Eligible projects include stabilization, masonry repair, removing lead paint or other hazards, and the improvement of access for the disabled.

Mr. Speaker, the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Preservation Program exists to preserve, and stabilize historic structures on HBCU campuses through projects such as structural stabilization, masonry repair, replacement of antiquated electrical and plumbing systems, abating environmental hazards such as asbestos, ameliorating termite damage, and replacing leaking roofs.

The HBCU preservation project is critically important because much of the history of African Americans has been lost due to it not being considered important enough by historians to study and the fact that many of the repositories of that history—black churches—have been destroyed by arson.

I thank and my colleague, Assistant Democratic Leader JAMES CLYBURN for his work in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that one of the greatest HBCUs in the country, Texas Southern University, is located in my congressional district.

Texas Southern University has a rich history with nine academic units, 1,000 dedicated staff members, and over 9,200 esteemed students.

Like most of my HBCU Caucus colleagues, I have worked closely with my local HBCU to provide funding and resources needed to enable them to fulfill their mission of educating the next generation of social engineers and conducting research programs addressing issues of major concern to the African American community.

I was proud to spearhead the initiative that brought more than $13 million in financial aid relief for the students and campus of Texas Southern University.

I also worked with TSU administrators to initiate digital archive projects to preserve the records of two of its most distinguished alumni, the legendary Barbara Jordan and Mickey Leland, both of whom preceded me as the Member of Congress for the Eighteenth Congressional District of Texas.

I was pleased to facilitate a partnership between Comcast and TSU's School of Communication to provide scholarships and internships to TSU students and in-kind marketing services to the university.

I helped secure funding needed to establish the Center for Transportation, Training and Research in the TSU College of Science, Engineering, and Technology.

HBCU's have played a critical role in American history.

As the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. stated:

> The function of education is to teach one to think intensively and to think critically. Intelligence plus character—that is the goal of true education.

HBCUs do not just educate—HBCUs have and will continue to fill an important role in education opportunity and engagement for millions of young people from diverse backgrounds.

I ask my colleagues to support reauthorization of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation Program by joining me in voting to pass H.R. 1135.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1135.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PUMPED STORAGE HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1967) to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1967

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 ''Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY FOR PUMPED STORAGE HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT UTILIZING MULTIPLE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION RESERVOIRS.

Section 9(c)(1) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (43 U.S.C. 485h(c)(1)) is amended by inserting ''and pumped storage hydropower development exclusively utilizing Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs'' after ''including small conduit hydropower development''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK), a valuable member of the Committee on Natural Resources, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are here to consider a bill that aims to remove barriers to improve our Nation's water and power infrastructure.

Just last Thursday, the House passed a bill designating the Bureau of Reclamation as the lead agency when it comes to permitting new and expanded water storage projects. Today, the bill before us seeks to clear up regulatory confusion over the development of new pumped storage hydropower.

Hydropower can and should be part of an all-of-the-above energy strategy now and well into the future. It is a reliable and emissions-free source of electricity that accounts for a majority of the Nation's total renewable electricity generation.

In my home State of Colorado, we have over 60 operating hydropower facilities that generate more than 1,100 megawatts, including new projects such as Carter Lake, South Canal, and Ridgway Reservoir. However, as is the case nationwide, there is potential for new hydropower generation in Colorado.

My bill, the Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act, H.R. 1967, looks to pave the way for additional clean hydropower generation by clearing up regulatory permitting confusion at existing Bureau of Reclamation facilities.

We worked with our colleague from central Washington State, Mr. NEWHOUSE, on this bill. His interest stems from a real-life example of where it is unclear whether the Bureau of Reclamation or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission have permitting jurisdiction on pumped storage hydropower projects at the Columbia Basin Project.

The project's proponents want to build a project that pumps water to and from two of the project's reservoirs for hydroelectric generation. But because of potential dual permitting requirements, there have been serious delays in bringing this potential 500 megawatt project online.

Similar to a public law authored in 2013 by our committee colleague and fellow Coloradan, SCOTT TIPTON, that cleared up confusion on the Bureau of Reclamation's pipes and canals, my bill makes it clear that the Bureau of Reclamation is the lead agency that will oversee pumped storage development for projects exclusively utilizing the agency's facilities.

The regulatory clarification in my bill will help pave the way for more pumped storage by incentivizing developers who will, in turn, pay the American taxpayers for the use of Federal facilities.

In a hearing earlier this spring of the Water, Power, and Oceans Subcommittee, which I chair, even our friends on the other side of the aisle agreed that we should be doing all we can to incentivize clean, renewable hydropower generation at existing Federal facilities. That is why this bill was passed by the House Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent in April.

I urge my House colleagues to join me in promoting clean, renewable hydropower generation as part of our Nation's all-of-the-above energy strategy by supporting this bill, the Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1967 would amend the permitting process for pumped storage hydropower projects utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs.

Currently, hydropower projects involving Reclamation facilities are subject to either the FERC permitting process or the Reclamation permitting process, based on whether a Reclamation facility was originally authorized for hydropower development.

The unique nature of pumped storage projects, which require the use of multiple separate reservoirs, can mean that a single proposed project can be subject to both Reclamation and FERC's permitting processes, since different reservoirs are under different agency jurisdiction.

If enacted, H.R. 1967 would subject pumped storage projects using multiple Reclamation reservoirs to just the Reclamation permitting process instead of the process for both Reclamation and FERC.

Like FERC, Reclamation's permitting project requires authorized pumped storage projects to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, and other statutory requirements.

While I believe that H.R. 1967 is a commonsense bill and I support its passage, I also support ongoing efforts to incorporate feedback from the Colville Tribe in Washington State as this bill advances to the Senate and proceeds through the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I had the remarkable opportunity to live in Switzerland for 4 years, and hiked and climbed many of the Alps. It was fascinating to see the high-altitude dams that made hydropower the dominant form of power in the country. Eighty percent of all electricity was hydropower or nuclear.

I thank my good friend, Congressman LAMBORN from Colorado Springs, for his leadership on this issue. I encourage unanimous passage of this bill.

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

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, as this Chamber considers H.R. 1967, the "Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act," I would like to provide some brief remarks regarding issues raised by the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has been participating in a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission proceeding related a proposed pumped storage project on Lake Roosevelt and Banks Lake in north central Washington. A portion of Lake Roosevelt is within the boundaries of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has raised several questions about the project's potential impacts to culturally and economically important fisheries in Lake Roosevelt, water quality, and to revenues the Tribe receives from the Bonneville Power Administration from the operation of the Grand Coulee Dam.

Because of these questions, the Colville Tribe and the project proponents have been involved in ongoing discussions in hopes of reaching an agreement on how to proceed with the project review process. As those discussions proceed, I would like to provide my commitment to work with the Colville Tribe and the project proponents as the legislative process moves forward.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, as this chamber considers H.R. 1967, the "Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act," I would like to provide some brief remarks regarding issues raised by the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has been participating in a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission proceeding related to a proposed pumped storage project on Lake Roosevelt and Banks Lake in north central Washington. A portion of Lake Roosevelt is within the boundaries of the Colville Reservation.

The Colville Tribe has raised several questions about the project's potential impacts to culturally and economically important fisheries in Lake Roosevelt, water quality, and to revenues the Tribe receives from the Bonneville Power Administration from the operation of the Grand Coulee Dam.

Because of these questions, the Colville Tribe and the project proponents have been involved in ongoing discussions in hopes of reaching an agreement on how to proceed with the project review process. As those discussions proceed, I would like to provide my commitment to work with the Colville Tribe and the project proponents as the legislative process moves forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COOK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1967, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1500

REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION'S PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE DEFENSE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res 397) solemnly reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 397

Whereas more than 250,000 Americans died in the Second World War to liberate Europe from the scourge of genocidal fascism;

Whereas in the wake of the cataclysm of the Second World War, the United States, Canada, and European partners founded the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Washington in 1949;

Whereas the foundation of NATO is collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty which states that, ''The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.'';

Whereas NATO is one of the most successful military alliances in history, deterring the outbreak of another world war, protecting the territorial integrity of its members, and seeing the Cold War through to a peaceful conclusion;

Whereas Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty has only been invoked once in history when alliance members came to the aid of the United States following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas NATO allies and partners, including Canada and countries in Central, Eastern, and Northern Europe, including countries of the Western Balkans, and the former Soviet Union have stood alongside the United States in joint operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the globe;

Whereas NATO remains the foundation of United States foreign policy of promoting a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace;

Whereas at the Wales Summit in 2014, NATO leaders agreed that each alliance member would spend at least two percent of its nation's gross domestic product on defense by 2024;

Whereas multiple Presidents have reaffirmed the commitment of the United States to the collective defense guarantees in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the sole power to declare war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) solemnly reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty;

(2) strongly supports the decision at the NATO Wales Summit in 2014 that each alliance member would spend at least two percent of its nation's gross domestic product on defense by 2024;

(3) condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of any NATO ally; and

(4) welcomes the Republic of Montenegro as the 29th member of the NATO Alliance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on this measure.

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 myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Speaker RYAN and Minority Leader PELOSI. I want to thank Leader MCCARTHY and Minority Whip HOYER for their leadership on this important resolution and, of course, Ranking Member ENGEL, who has also been a strong supporter of the NATO alliance.

Mr. Speaker, in 1949, 12 free, democratic nations bound themselves together in an unprecedented defense alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These founding members acted in the aftermath of the Second World War to promote peace in Europe, to promote their freedom, and to face the threats they saw emerging on the horizon. Now, more than six decades later, this alliance has been the cornerstone of transatlantic security, and it has attracted other freedom-loving democratic nations to join its ranks.

Of course, article 5's principle of collective defense has been key to the success of the alliance, and we will not forget how the United States has benefited from that principle as NATO members unanimously elected to come to our support after the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, cyber attacks, nonconventional attacks by terrorist groups against our people, these are threats that NATO's founders could not have anticipated, yet they are the challenges that we must act now to address. We are stronger, no question, when we act together.

Now, Moscow's strategic objective is to break apart the NATO alliance to boost Russian geopolitical influence in Western Europe. In light of this, it is even more important that NATO members meet the standard of investing 2 percent of their GDP on defense. We appreciate the few who already meet the minimum requirement: Estonia, Greece, Poland, and the U.K. At the administration's urging, others have stepped up their game, such as Latvia, Lithuania, and Romania, but others have further to go.

This resolution calls on NATO members to meet these commitments while also reaffirming our commitment to NATO and to the article 5 provision for collective defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure. Let me start by thanking the leaders on both sides of the aisle who worked to bring this measure forward: Speaker RYAN and Leader PELOSI; the majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY; the minority whip, Mr. HOYER; and my friend from California (Mr. ROYCE), our chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, NATO has been the most effective alliance of the 20th and 21st centuries. It stood as a bulwark against communist aggression during the Cold War. Since the fall of the Soviet Union, it has played a critical role in building an integrated Europe that is whole, free, and at peace.

At the heart of the alliance is the value enshrined in article 5: An attack on any ally is an attack on all allies. That commitment has been so strong across the decades, that the alliance never once invoked article 5 during the long standoff between East and West during the Cold War.

In fact, article 5 has only been invoked one time in NATO's history, when the ruins of the World Trade Center were smouldering in New York City as the world rallied around the United States. After the attacks of September 11, 2001, NATO allies did what we always knew they would: they said the attack on us was an attack on all of them as well. Since then, for nearly 16 years, American troops have fought and shed blood and died alongside men and women serving in the uniforms of our NATO allies.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't a commitment we as Americans can take lightly. While I am glad President Trump finally affirmed the commitment of the United States to article 5, I think it is important for Congress to do it as well.

The administration's hot-and-cold approach to the alliance caused a lot of unneeded heartburn for our allies and caused even the best of friends to question our commitment.

NATO is not a thing that can just be thrown in with everything else. It is very important to us, and we should allow our allies to meet their commitments laid out at the NATO summit in Wales. It is very important that we do that.

Right now, especially, we need to be clear on our commitment to NATO. The danger that Russia poses to the alliance, to Western democracy and an integrated, unified Europe, is the greatest test in a generation. If there are cracks in the surface, you can bet that Vladimir Putin will do all he can to exploit them. Fracturing Western unity is his top goal, and the United States needs to be strong in our commitment to NATO.

Today, the House is saying we will not waver. We are sending a message to our allies and partners and to Moscow that a wager against NATO is a losing bet. I would like to see the House take an even tougher stance against Moscow and immediately pass the Senate's Russia sanctions bill. This legislation won overwhelmingly bipartisan support in the other body, and I am confident we could act on it swiftly in the House.

With this measure today, we are saying with one voice that article 5 is sacred, that NATO is strong, and the resolve of the United States and our allies won't be weakened by a bully sitting in Moscow.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our esteemed chairman as well as the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Speaker RYAN's measure which reaffirms America's commitment to NATO, article 5 and the principle of collective defense.

Like my colleagues, I believe that NATO has been indispensable in deterring another world war and in protecting our values and ideals. It is our commitment to each other and to those ideals that have made our alliance so strong, so effective. It is that commitment to each other that has enhanced the territorial security and stability of each one of us.

Let us not forget that it was following the terrorist attacks of 9/11 that NATO invoked article 5 for the only time in its history, coming to the defense of us, the United States. This was a signal of unity, of strength, and that is what makes article 5 so special.

I also appreciate the pledges of our alliance members to share the burden of the cost of our mutual defense by aiming to spend at least 2 percent of their GDP on defense by the year 2024. That is so important, Mr. Speaker, because NATO's role over the years has evolved. We are no longer facing just the threat of communist aggression; we are facing a multitude of threats against our mutual national security interests around the globe, and we need to be prepared for whatever comes our way.

I am pleased to reiterate my support for Speaker RYAN's resolution. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their commitment to NATO and to the principle of collective defense. It is ever so important in these dangerous times.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently, I was in Brussels, and we met with NATO officials on a codel led by the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his extraordinary leadership on the committee, as well as the bipartisan nature of this legislation that Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL are bringing to the floor. I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished former chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan resolution reassures our friends, it rebuffs our foes, and it reminds the world that America's commitment to NATO's common defense pledge is ironclad.

When President Truman signed the NATO Treaty nearly 70 years ago, he called the alliance, ''a long step toward permanent peace in the whole world.''

NATO has guaranteed the security of the American people and our allies for decades. Now some people don't remember what those decades were like, fighting the threat of communism. Article 5, the collective defense provision, is the core of that security guarantee.

Article 5, as the gentlewoman just mentioned, was invoked only once: when America's allies joined in the fight against al-Qaida after the September 11 terrorist attacks on our country.

I, like many of my colleagues, have traveled to Afghanistan, Iraq, and other places and seen that our NATO partners have shed blood in the name of article 5 in our common fight against terrorism.

Our commitment to article 5 is a commitment to brave men and women across the world who risk and give their lives for the NATO alliance. Previous administrations, both Democratic and Republican, have strongly and unambiguously stood by NATO and article 5.

I was very sad, I will be very honest with you, my colleagues, when meeting with NATO leaders at the alliance's headquarters in Brussels, a building dedicated to the victims of the 9/11 attacks, President Trump refused to clearly and unequivocally reassure our NATO partners that he would honor article 5.

We in this Congress of the United States, acting in a bipartisan way, want to remove all doubt that the U.S. commitment to the principles of a mutual defense embodied by NATO are ironclad. I keep using that word. Every day, Putin searches for cracks in our NATO alliance. We must convey to him that this alliance is ironclad.

And now, just on another related subject, it is about our national security. While we are glad to be passing this resolution affirming America's commitment to article 5, the bipartisan bill sanctioning Russia languishes in the House. While the White House caters to Putin, Congress must hold Russia accountable for its actions by passing the Iran-Russia sanctions bill. It passed the Senate 98–2—98–2—strong bipartisan support for a bill that contained the Iran and Russia sanctions.

We can't go home for the Fourth of July without passing that legislation. It is my understanding it was just a blue slip problem that could be easily resolved. That is how it was characterized when the President of Ukraine said to us that they really need the Russian sanctions enforced and strengthened.

Let us have the courage to stand up to those who menace the free world and stand by our partners in support of a peaceful, democratic, and free future for all.

What we are doing today is very important. It is not just about a bill. It is not just about an agreement. It is about values. It is about security as a value, something we take an oath to protect and defend. This NATO agreement helps us do that, but we must also do what flows from it and say to the Russians, who are the point of NATO, you are going to have sanctions because of your aggression in Eastern Europe, and at the same time send that message to the Iranians.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a very strong unanimous vote for this. This is something so bipartisan, so wonderful. It is a good day. It is a good bill. It gives us all hope.

I urge our colleagues to vote ''aye'' and call upon the Speaker to bring the other bill to the floor. I hope our distinguished chair and ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee will be able to be part of bringing it to the floor very soon.

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

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the distinguished ranking member, and I thank my friend Mr. ROYCE, the chairman of the committee, for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 397, reaffirming the commitment of the United States to NATO's principle of collective defense as enumerated in article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

□ 1515

As the head of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, and as rapporteur for the Transatlantic Subcommittee, I can attest to the anxiety within NATO regarding the administration's commitment to the alliance.

Case in point, one cannot talk about the U.S. commitment to article 5 in 2017 without mentioning President Trump's failure to embrace it in full view of our NATO allies when he was in Brussels earlier this year. It has been widely reported that even the President's own national security team was blindsided by the omission.

I welcome this resolution, but it would have made a stronger statement to bring it to the floor immediately after the President's disconcerting speech in Brussels. This resolution maybe is less a profile in courage as it is a sigh of relief.

Since the House failed the leadership test on this account, let's redeem ourselves by taking up the Engel-Connolly bill on Russian's sanctions, and the Iran-Russia sanctions package recently passed in the Senate by 98–2, and send it to the President's desk for signature.

Any delay only furthers the trend of obsequiousness to the executive branch and enables this administration's disastrous retreat from global leadership.

I am proud to support this resolution, I am glad it is on the floor, and I hope it is an auger of things to come.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ENGEL and Chairman ROYCE for their leadership.

Like my colleague, who just spoke, over the last 4 years, I have been privileged to help represent the United States at the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to borrow a line from a very well-known poet who said, ''No man is an island,'' recognizing that human beings do not thrive when isolated from others, a concept that is recognized by all religions.

This is more true than ever as our world becomes increasingly dangerous. And, more than ever, the United States of America needs friends to stand strong and stand up for our mutual democratic values.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan resolution, committing the United States to NATO article 5 collective defense.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip, who is an original cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL for their leadership. I also want to thank Mr. MCCARTHY, Speaker RYAN, and Leader PELOSI for their strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I went to Brussels over the Memorial Day break. We met in Brussels with the NATO leaders. The Deputy Secretary General was there, and we spoke about the confidence that our European allies had, and needed, for the continuing viability of NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and our commitment to the mutual defense of the members of NATO.

That has been for 70 years the critical—over 70 years, really—the critical stability that we have seen in the European Plain, and it needs to continue to be.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor this resolution, which reaffirms our Nation's commitment to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's article 5 and the common defense among our NATO allies.

For 70 years, as I said, NATO has kept the peace in Europe and around the world. Now, that does not mean that we have had peace everywhere in the world, but it does mean that we have not had world conflagration, as we saw in the last century.

From the Cuban Missile Crisis to the fall of the Iron Curtain, NATO's unity in the face of common threats has helped prevent a direct Soviet attack against America and against our allies.

Since the end of the Cold War, NATO has been adapting to meet threats new and old. Together, NATO members have served on the ground in Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and enlargement has made the allegiance even stronger.

Now, with Russia once again putting forward an aggressive posture to its neighbors and the world—in addition to visiting Bosnia, we also went to Lithuania and to Estonia, and I visited Denmark, as well—there is no doubt that the neighbors of Russia feel a pressure that has, over the last 15 years, not been as present. NATO's common defense commitment is as vital to global security and America's security as it has ever been.

We know that Russia interfered with our elections and has used cyber attacks against our NATO allies to subvert their democratic institutions as well. Estonia, in particular, has developed, and is developing, defenses to cyber attacks.

We, the United States, the leader of the free world, must make it clear, unequivocally so, both to Vladimir Putin and to our NATO allies, that the United States stands firmly by its commitment to the alliance and its collective defense.

It has only been once that article 5 has been implicated, and that was after 9/11, when all of our European allies in NATO said that an attack on the United States was perceived as an attack on them, and they pledged their unity and alliance and action. An attack on one is an attack on all—an attack on democracy, on freedom, on the values that this country and our NATO allies stand for.

It is in that context, Mr. Speaker, that I urge my colleagues to join us in giving this resolution—it says here on this text—a strong vote of passage. More than that, I hope this is a unanimous vote of passage. This is the oppression of the leader of the free world that we will not only lead, but we will act.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, we should be clear that Vladimir Putin is testing us. He attacked our democracy in last year's election, he is working to create divisions among our allies, and he would love nothing more than to see NATO fail.

If the United States offers anything less than our full-throated support for the alliance, and our ironclad commitments to article 5, Moscow will see that as an invitation to undercut transatlantic unity and fracture our critical bond with Europe.

I am glad the House is coming together to ensure that it doesn't happen. I hope we can continue to work in a bipartisan way to shore up our alliances and push back on Russian aggregation. This is a real threat. Russia is not our ally.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this measure, and I urge all Members to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, as a coauthor of this resolution, I also want to thank the other coauthors, including STEVE COHEN of Tennessee, who has been a leader on NATO issues.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say, for the advancement of our own security, the promotion of our values, and

a strong statement of support for our friends and allies, I urge my colleagues to support passage of this resolution.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 397, a resolution that reaffirms the United States' commitment to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty and its principle of collective defense.

In the aftermath of World War II, the greatest conflict in human history, the United States, Canada, and their Western Europe allies founded the North American Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949 in Washington.

Founded on the principle of collective defense, Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty states that, "The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all."

In the 68 years since the Treaty's ratification, Article 5 has only been invoked once, following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, when NATO members came to the aid of the United States.

NATO sent seven planes with 830 crewmen from 13 countries to protect American skies until May 2002, marking the first time in American history that the continental United States was protected by foreign forces.

NATO allies and partners have stood with the United States in joint operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the world.

Until this year, every American president since the treaty's signing in 1949—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama—has publicly reaffirmed the American commitment to Article 5.

American presidents have affirmed this nation's commitment to come to the aid of any NATO member that is under attack.

That is the symbolic meaning of the immortal words spoken by President Kennedy in West Berlin at the Brandenburg Gate in 1963: "Ich bin ein Berliner."

Mr. Speaker, the principle of collective defense is the core of NATO's founding treaty and the NATO alliance has been the backbone of American national security and foreign policy for nearly 70 years.

The strength and solidarity of this western alliance kept Western Europe whole, prosperous, and free and paved the way for the collapse of the Soviet Union and the liberation of the nations of Eastern and Central Europe, many of which have now been integrated into NATO.

The Constitution of the United States grants Congress the sole power to declare war, but Article 5 does not increase the chance of war.

Rather, NATO is a bulwark against the outbreak of war because it deters aggression by any adversary.

As a result, NATO is the most successful military alliance in world history, successfully deterring the outbreak of a third world war, seeing the Cold War to a victorious conclusion, and protecting the principle of territorial integrity.

This is why I strongly support H. Res. 397, which reaffirms the commitment of the People's House to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The resolution also expresses support for the agreement reached at the 2014 NATO Wales Summit calling upon each NATO member nation to allocate at least two percent of its gross domestic product to defense by 2024.

The resolution also condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of any NATO ally and welcomes the Republic of Montenegro as the 29th member of the NATO alliance.

I urge all Members to join me in affirming the commitment of the United States to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty for this important resolution by voting for H. Res. 397.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 397.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONDEMNING THE VIOLENCE AND PERSECUTION IN CHECHNYA

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 351) condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 351

Whereas, on April 1, 2017, the Russian newspaper Novaya Gazeta reported that authorities in Chechnya, a republic of the Russian Federation, had abducted, detained, and tortured over 100 men due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas multiple independent and first-hand accounts have subsequently corroborated the Novaya Gazeta report, and describe a campaign of persecution by Chechen officials against men due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas, as a result of this persecution, at least three deaths have been reported and many individuals have been forced to flee Chechnya;

Whereas Chechen officials have denied the existence of such persecution, including through a statement by the spokesman for Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov that "You cannot arrest or repress people who don't exist in the republic.";

Whereas the same spokesman for Ramzan Kadyrov has also stated that "If such people existed in Chechnya, law enforcement would not have to worry about them, as their own relatives would have sent them to where they could never return," and credible reports indicate that Chechen authorities have encouraged families to carry out so-called "honor killings" of relatives due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas Chechnya is a constituent republic of the Russian Federation and subject to its laws, and Ramzan Kadyrov was installed as the leader of Chechnya by Russian President Vladimir Putin;

Whereas Chechen authorities have a long history of violating the fundamental human rights of their citizens, including through extrajudicial executions, forced disappearances, and torture of government critics;

Whereas Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov dismissed reports of persecution in Chechnya and termed them "phantom complaints";

Whereas Russia's Human Rights Ombudsman, Tatyana Moskalkova, has also claimed that such reports should not be believed because formal complaints have not been registered with the appropriate authorities;

Whereas the Russian Federation is a participating State of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and thus has agreed to guarantee the fundamental human rights of all of its citizens;

Whereas, on April 7, 2017, the United States Department of State issued a statement saying "We categorically condemn the persecution of individuals based on their sexual orientation" and urging the Government of the Russian Federation to take steps to ensure the release of all those wrongfully detained in Chechnya, and to conduct a credible investigation of the reports; and

Whereas, on April 17, 2017, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley issued a statement saying "Chechen authorities must immediately investigate these allegations, hold anyone involved accountable, and take steps to prevent future abuses. We are against all forms of discrimination, including against people based on sexual orientation. When left unchecked, discrimination and human rights abuses can lead to destabilization and conflict.": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the violence and persecution in Chechnya and calls on Chechen officials to immediately cease the abduction, detention, and torture of individuals on the basis of their actual or suspected sexual orientation, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses;

(2) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to protect the human rights of all its citizens, condemn the violence and persecution, investigate these crimes in Chechnya, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses;

(3) calls on the United States Government to continue to condemn the violence and persecution in Chechnya, demand the release of individuals wrongfully detained, and identify those individuals whose involvement in this violence qualifies for the imposition of sanctions under the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–208; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) or the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Public Law 114–328); and

(4) affirms that the rights to freedom of assembly, association, and expression and freedom from extrajudicial detention and violence are universal human rights that apply to all persons, and that countries that fail to respect these rights jeopardize the security and prosperity of all their citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

include 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 myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the ruler of Chechnya, Ramzan Kadyrov, rules a dictatorship of medieval brutality. Those who challenge or simply displease him often disappear in that country, or they are murdered outright.

His latest campaign of persecution is aimed at gay men and women, and those perceived to be gay, who have been abducted, tortured, and even killed, with many others that are forced to flee the country. When the Russian newspaper, Novaya Gazeta, reported these atrocities, his spokesmen dismissed the accusations, saying that such people ''don't even exist in the republic,'' and then threatened the journalists who brought the story to light.

Caught unaware by the unexpected publicity, Chechen authorities have choked off independent sources of information. We do not know the exact status of this campaign or its many victims, but there is no doubt that the situation there for sexual minorities in general has long been, and remains, oppressive.

Disturbing reports indicate that Kadyrov has now turned his focus from abducting and torturing gay men and women to pressuring their families to murder them through so-called honor killings of these men and women. This is despicable.

Vladimir Putin deserves some of the blame here. Chechnya is a constituent republic of the Russian Federation, of which he is the President. As such, he has a sworn responsibility to ensure that the Russian Constitution is fully implemented, which, at least on paper, professes to guarantee basic rights for all citizens. Russia is also a signatory to many international agreements that formally commit it to protecting a broad array of human rights.

Yet the Russian Government's response has been largely dismissive, if not two-faced. Kremlin spokesmen have called the reports phantom complaints, yet also recommended that victims report grievances to the Chechen authorities accused of carrying out the attacks. And, of course, there has been no criticism of Kadyrov in the Russian state-controlled media—barely even a mention of the issue.

That is why this resolution is of such importance. By shining a light on these crimes in this dark corner, we seek to give hope to those who otherwise may have none at all. And we say unequivocally, to Kadyrov, and to Putin, that these atrocities are in plain view, and that their cowardly and evasive responses are not fooling anyone.

I want to thank Chairman Emeritus ROS-LEHTINEN, the author of this resolution, and Ranking Member ENGEL for their leadership on this resolution.

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

□ 1530

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. Let me first thank my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee, particularly Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN from Florida, and Mr. CICILLINE from Rhode Island, for their work on this measure, and for their leadership supporting LGBT communities around the world. I also thank Chairman ROYCE for support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, day after day, we hear new reports of abuse of LGBT individuals in Chechnya. This spring, authorities rounded up hundreds of gay men. Some were tortured, some were murdered. Reports from civil society and activists tell us that Chechen authorities have rounded up LGBT individuals, beaten them, tortured them with electric shocks, and outed them to their families in the perverse hope of provoking so-called ''honor killings.'' This is horrific.

Let's not forget that Chechnya is part of Russia, as the chairman said. These crimes—this disregard for human rights and human dignity lie at the feet of Vladimir Putin and his crony in Chechnya, Ramzan Kadyrov.

No one anywhere should face violence, persecution, or death because of who they love. ''Gay rights are human rights, and human rights are gay rights,'' as Hillary Clinton said when she was Secretary of State. But under Putin's rule, those rights are a myth.

So I was disappointed when Secretary Tillerson testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee about whether those atrocities were on the agenda with his Russian counterparts. ''These are on the pending list,'' he told us.

The United States should never put basic human rights on the ''pending list.'' Unless we shed a light on these abuses and demand that they be stopped, we are betraying our most fundamental values. So today I am glad the House, in a bipartisan way, is speaking out to condemn this violence and persecution, to stand up for the freedoms of assembly and expression, and to say that we believe that LGBT rights are human rights that must be protected around the world.

I am glad to support this measure. Again, I thank Chairman ED ROYCE, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and DAVID CICILLINE.

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

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and, of course, the author of this measure.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank, as always, our esteemed chairman, Mr. ROYCE from California, as well as Mr. ENGEL from New York, who really run our committee in the most fair, bipartisan way possible.

I think that our committee is an example for the rest of the House. But I am so grateful to have worked alongside my chairman and ranking member, and all of the colleagues in the House Foreign Affairs Committee in a bipartisan manner; particularly, Mr. ISSA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. LOWENTHAL, in introducing and bringing to the floor this important resolution, H. Res. 351, Condemning the Violence and Persecution in Chechnya.

Since early April, there have been credible reports that gay or perceived-to-be-gay men in the Russian republic of Chechnya have been rounded up, have been detained, have been put into prison camps by the authorities of Chechnya. And according to international human rights groups and activists on the ground, the situation has rapidly escalated. Despite the international attention and the rage, the beatings and torture did not stop. Men continued to be tortured on a daily basis, and, allegedly, at least 20 men have been killed.

The latest reports indicate that lesbians are also being targeted now. This government campaign targeting LGBT individuals is also inciting ''honor killings.'' Families are being threatened and act out of fear of also being persecuted. This is appalling.

Putin has given free rein to the Chechen leader and has significant influence over what goes on in Chechnya. Let's not forget Russia's deplorable human rights record of silencing religious minorities, of prohibiting freedom of expression, of restricting free association of LGBT individuals. This is Russia's record. It is Chechnya's as well.

Nothing has been done. No perpetrators have been brought to justice. This is why it is up to us in the United States to not sit idly by while this state-sponsored persecution is ongoing. This bipartisan resolution, Mr. Speaker, does not only shed light on this dreadful human rights disaster, but it also calls on the officials of Chechnya to immediately put an end to the abduction and violence of individuals based on their real or perceived sexual orientation.

It calls on Putin to uphold the international commitments and protect the human rights of all people upon which Russia has entered. They have signed these commitments, yet they don't fulfill them. It holds accountable those individuals in the attacks who will also be sanctioned under two existing U.S. sanctions laws that we have passed: Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act and the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act.

Today, this body has the ability to once again be that strong voice for human rights of all individuals and to send a clear message to any oppressor that the United States will not turn a blind eye against violence, harassment,

and discrimination, no matter where it happens.

As a country, we have the responsibility to promote our deeply cherished American values and reaffirm our commitment to fundamental freedom, especially for those who live under the shadow of oppression and tyranny. We stand in solidarity with the persecuted, with the religious minorities, with the ethnic groups, with the suppressed women, and, in this case, with the LGBT community, because the respect of human rights of all people remains a U.S. foreign policy priority.

I thank my colleagues for their overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle who have supported this important resolution, which sends a unified message that the United States is committed to promoting human rights and that this crisis must end now because this matter is not just an LGBT issue—as important as it is—it is a human life matter and it deserves support from all of us.

Everyone deserves dignity. Everyone deserves respect in the place they call home, no matter where that is around the world. It is time to put an end to Chechnya's barbaric LGBT purge.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time and I thank the ranking member as well.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a coauthor of this resolution and someone who is fighting for human rights all the time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 351, which condemns the violence and persecution against LGBT or perceived-to-be LGBT individuals in Chechnya.

This resolution is an example of the strong bipartisanship of the House Foreign Affairs Committee under the leadership of Chairman ED ROYCE and Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL. I thank my good friend, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, who has long been a champion of the dignity of all people around the world, for introducing H. Res. 351. I also thank the chairman and ranking member for working with us to ensure this resolution was passed without delay and with the support of the full committee.

On April 1 of this year, the Novaya Gazeta, one of the few independent Russian newspapers, posted a chilling report detailing a concerted campaign by Chechen authorities to identify, round up, torture, and murder gay or perceived-to-be-gay men and women in the Chechen region of Russia.

Dozens of suspected LGBT men and some women have been rounded up with estimates of more than 100 people being detained, and at least three murdered, maybe many more. Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov has denied the reports. When confronted with accusations, his spokesman denied there were any gay people in Chechnya, and explained that, ''If there were such people in Chechnya, law enforcement agencies wouldn't need to have anything to do with them because their relatives would send them somewhere from which there is no returning.''

In fact, there have been credible reports that Chechen authorities have forced family members of those detained or those suspected of being gay to commit ''honor killings'' or face violence and retaliation against their entire families.

Chechnya is a small, conservative region of Russia, and LGBT people there face a level of isolation and danger that is unthinkable to those of us living in the freedom of the United States. Even those who have managed to escape Chechnya continue to face danger from extended family members or Chechen authorities within Russia and even parts of Europe.

That is why it is so important that the United States work with our partners in Europe and assist in making sure that those fleeing the violence in Chechnya are relocated somewhere they can be safe. H. Res. 351 condemns the violence and persecution against LGBT individuals in Chechnya and calls on Chechen officials to immediately cease the abduction, detention, and torture of individuals on the basis of their actual or suspected sexual orientation, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses.

Furthermore, this resolution calls on the government of the Russian Federation to protect the human rights of all its citizens, condemn the violence and persecution, investigate these crimes in Chechnya, and hold accountable all of those involved in perpetrating such abuses.

We must remember that President Kadyrov is a close ally of President Putin, and that the Russian Government has essentially sanctioned the atrocities that are being carried out on its soil. That is why it is so important that representatives of the United States Government, at the highest levels, raise this issue with President Putin and other Russian officials.

I was extremely disappointed when Secretary of State Tillerson appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee earlier this month and admitted that neither he nor the President had raised this issue with anyone in the Russian Government. The United States must make it clear that human rights abuses will not be tolerated.

The President, the Secretary of State, and other senior officials must raise this issue consistently with the Russian Government and make it clear that they must protect the lives and safety of all Russian citizens.

Additionally, the Trump administration must take steps to ensure that any Russian officials involved in these atrocities are being sanctioned under the Sergei Magnitsky Act and the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, which we passed last year. Events like these are exactly why these bills were passed, to ensure that government officials involved in gross human rights abuses do not have the privilege of accessing American markets or traveling to the United States.

Furthermore, the administration should be working in concert with our European allies to ensure that Russia is being held to its international obligations and treaties. The lives of vulnerable men and women are at stake, and every day that we remain silent, we condemn more to a dark fate.

I am pleased that the House is considering this resolution tonight. I urge my colleagues to support it. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a valued member of the committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

I rise to remind us that Martin Luther King once said: ''Injustice anywhere threatens justice everywhere.''

We are all in this together. The idea that we can cherry-pick whose rights we will proclaim and defend is a mistaken notion. It is also un-American. So the future rights of LGBT members in Chechnya are important to Americans, and we need to stand up for their security, their safety, and their fundamental human rights.

This resolution is important. I congratulate the chairman and ranking member for bringing it before us. I congratulate my good friend, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and DAVID CICILLINE for their leadership. I am proud to support this resolution today.

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

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

Let me, first of all, again thank Representative ROS-LEHTINEN, who is always working really hard and is on top of issues that are so important. We really appreciate her leadership and everything she does in the committee; Mr. CICILLINE, who has fought for LGBT rights; and, of course, my partner on the committee, Chairman ROYCE. Things like this show the bipartisanship of our committee, which I think is really important.

Occasionally we hear talk about Vladimir Putin that implies some sort of moral equivalency between the way he runs Russia and American policies. If you want to know how false that comparison is, take a look at what is happening in Chechnya. Take a look at the violence that Putin's thugs are waging against innocent citizens. That is how Putin regards the rights of his own people. That is what we are here to condemn today.

The United States should continue to make advancing and protecting human rights a foreign policy priority, including the rights of LGBT communities.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this measure. I thank Chairman ROYCE, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this bill, I, again, thank Chairman Emeritus ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank Ranking Member ENGEL, as well as Representatives DARRELL ISSA, DAVID CICILLINE, CHRIS SMITH, and GERRY CONNOLLY for their important work on this resolution.

The abduction, torture, and targeted killings that we are seeing in Chechnya are an affront to the core universal values that all nation-states must strive to protect. The U.S. has a long history of speaking out on behalf of persecuted minorities, and that is what we are doing here today.

We cannot end injustice everywhere, but we can expose it. We can bring it to the world's attention and, in so doing, give hope to its innocent victims.

I ask all Members to speak clearly and to speak unanimously in condemning this violence.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 351, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1545

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 397, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 497, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 220, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION'S PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 397) solemnly reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 4, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

YEAS—423

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
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
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—4

Biggs
Duncan (TN)
Jones
Massie

NOT VOTING—6

Cummings
Long
Napolitano
Renacci
Scalise
Stivers

□ 1614

Mr. BIGGS changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WITTMAN and ELLISON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTA ANA RIVER WASH PLAN LAND EXCHANGE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 497) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in San

Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain exchanged non-public lands, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

YEAS—424

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
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
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

Cummings
Engel
Long
Napolitano
Raskin
Renacci
Rouzer
Scalise
Stivers

□ 1620

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain non-Federal lands, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 329.

TERROR LAKE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT UPPER HIDDEN BASIN DIVERSION AUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 220) to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

YEAS—424

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

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

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—8

Cummings
Engel
Himes
Long
Napolitano
Renacci
Scalise
Stivers

□ 1630

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during rollcall votes No. 328, No. 329, and No. 330 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H. Res. 397—Solemnly reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty. I would have also voted "yea" on H.R. 497—Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act. I would have also voted "yea" on H.R. 220—To authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, and for other purposes.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 60

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor for H.R. 60.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

HONORING FRANK KUSH

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a legendary Arizonan, Frank Kush, who passed away last week at age 88.

Frank is best known for his career as coach of the Arizona State University Sun Devils football program. He won 176 games over 21½ seasons, the most ever in Sun Devil history. He was named national Coach of the Year after the 1975 season and was elected to the College Football Hall of Fame in 1995.

Coach Frank Kush was not only concerned with wins and losses, he was a mentor for young men and ensured that their professional and academic development rose above their athletic prowess. Coach Kush influenced hundreds of young men during his career at Arizona State. His impact is ever-present in the lives of his former players, and his legacy will never be forgotten.

TRUMPCARE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today a number of us were able to go to the children's hospital here in Washington, D.C., and met two miraculous families, children with complex, chronic diseases. With the love of their parents, one could not tell they were different from any other child, yet they had horrific and difficult medical conditions.

Those parents were middle class working families, and said that, without Medicaid, the half a million dollars of healthcare that keeps those beautiful children alive and leads them to a pathway of a life of love would not be possible.

I am glad that the Senate TrumpCare bill has been stopped in its tracks, the same bill that the CBO has said will cause 49 million Americans to lose their insurance in 2026.

There is no pathway to reform this bill. There is no White House meeting, no Presidential cajoling and shooting deals back and forth. These are lives of Americans, and as long as it takes, we will fight to the end to stop the demolition of the Affordable Care Act, which most Americans, over 50 percent, want the Affordable Care Act.

Stop the foolishness.

CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS ASSOCIATION

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, also known as NATCA, on its 30th anniversary.

Since its foundation, NATCA has worked to guide aviation policies and improve working conditions for its members with one goal in mind: to ensure that passengers arrive safely to our destinations.

I would also like to recognize three remarkable individuals—Billy, Jim, and Mitch—whom I have met through NATCA's advocacy efforts. These men are committed to public service, first through their service in our Armed Forces, and then later as air traffic controllers ensuring that Miami's skies remain safe for all. Though Mitch has now retired, I know that his contributions to our Nation have not stopped.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating NATCA and its members on 30 years of outstanding public service.

UKRAINE MILITARY OFFICIAL KILLED

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as co-chair of the Ukrainian Caucus, and I will include in the RECORD an article reporting on an act of violence that has taken place in Ukraine.

Yesterday, a bomb exploded in the car of a high-ranking Ukrainian special forces official, Colonel Maksim Shapoval, in Kiev, in what Ukrainian authorities are calling an act of terrorism.

Shapoval's heroic unit fought in eastern Ukraine, where a conflict between Ukraine and Russia has been raging since 2014, with mainly citizens being

killed, over 10,000 innocents in that country.

Shapoval's death comes almost a year after prominent Ukraine journalist Pavel Sheremet was killed by a similar explosion in Kiev as he drove to work. No one has been brought to justice in that murder case.

A number of other public figures have also been killed under shady circumstances in and around Kiev in recent years.

Denis Voronerkov, a former Russian member of Parliament who fled to Ukraine, was shot dead in central Kiev in March 2017.

Lawyer Yuri Grabovsky, who had represented a Russian soldier captured in Ukraine, was found dead with a gunshot wound in 2016.

This has all the fingerprints of Putin's Russia, who will stop at nothing to blunt liberty. America must be a friend to liberty and an enemy to tyranny. I call on this administration to help Ukraine defend itself against these hostile acts of war against liberty.

[From theguardian, June 27, 2017]

UKRAINIAN MILITARY INTELLIGENCE OFFICER KILLED BY CAR BOMB IN KIEV

(By Alec Luhn)

A high-ranking Ukrainian military intelligence official has been killed by a car bomb in Kiev in what authorities are calling an act of terrorism.

An explosive device destroyed the Mercedes being driven by Col Maksim Shapoval at 8.15am local time, police said.

The car's bonnet was blown open and its roof and driver side door almost completely destroyed, video footage from the scene showed.

''The picture of the crime looks like it was a planned act of terrorism,'' interior ministry spokesman Artem Shevchenko told local media. The military prosecutor said his office would lead an investigation.

Police said a female passerby with shrapnel wounds to her legs received medical treatment after the explosion, as did an elderly man who suffered shrapnel wounds to his neck.

According to the defence ministry, Shapoval was a colonel in military intelligence. The Ukrainian Pravda newspaper quoted law enforcement sources saying he had headed a special forces unit.

Yury Butusov, editor of the Censor.net news website, said in a Facebook post that Shapoval's unit had fought in eastern Ukraine, where a conflict with Russia-backed separatists that broke out in 2014 has killed more than 10,000 people. He claimed Russian intelligence could have killed Shapoval.

Shapoval's death comes almost a year after prominent journalist Pavel Sheremet was killed by a similar explosion in Kiev as he drove to work. A documentary film released last month revealed evidence suggesting that Ukraine's spy agency may have witnessed the planting of the car bomb that killed Sheremet. No one has been brought to justice in the murder case.

A number of other public figures have also been assassinated in and around Kiev in recent years. Denis Voronenkov, a former Russian MP who fled to Ukraine, was shot dead in central Kiev in March. Pro-Russian journalist Oles Buzina was shot in a drive-by in 2015, and lawyer Yuri Grabovsky, who had represented a Russian soldier captured in Ukraine, was found dead with a gunshot wound in 2016.

CONGRATULATING THE EDEN PRAIRIE EAGLES

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Eden Prairie High School girls lacrosse team for recently winning their third consecutive State title.

The Eagles showed perseverance and grit by overcoming an early deficit to The Blake School in the championship game. It was the ninth meeting between these two schools in the State's final in a 10-year period. Eden Prairie rallied back to win 16–10, giving them the State title.

The girls' drive for another championship led them to have a 20–1 overall record, the number one ranking in the State, finishing 19th in the country.

Senior Naomi Rogge and sophomore Abby Johnson both carried the team by scoring four and six goals, respectively.

These student athletes work extremely hard, Mr. Speaker, not only on the lacrosse field, but also in the classroom. Our community is very proud of their hard work and dedication, and I am delighted to share that these young women rose to the occasion and claimed yet another championship.

Congratulations to the Eden Prairie Eagles on their win.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HERKIMER COLLEGE

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of Herkimer College. Established in 1966 as New York State's 29th community college, Herkimer College opened its doors for classes in 1967.

The inaugural class consisted of 221 freshmen, and for the first 4 years, Herkimer College held classes on the upper floors of the old Remington Arms factory in Ilion, New York. In 1971, the college moved to its present-day location in the Village of Herkimer.

Like the Village of Herkimer and Herkimer County, Herkimer College is proud to share its name with a Revolutionary War hero, General Nicholas Herkimer. As commander of the Tryon County Militia, General Herkimer valiantly fought at the Battle of Oriskany. To honor General Herkimer and Herkimer County's rich history, Herkimer College's athletic teams are nicknamed the Generals.

Today, Herkimer College currently enrolls over 3,000 students and boasts more than 20,000 graduates. The college offers over 40 degree programs and is consistently ranked as a top 100 community college in the Nation.

Over the course of five decades, Herkimer College's benefit to the local community is evidenced by over $75 million in economic impact in Herkimer County, annually.

Today I recognize Herkimer College for an exceptional 50 years and offer my best wishes for many, many successful decades to come.

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED FUNDING TO VETTED WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

(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, today I rise to talk about something called congressionally directed spending when it comes to Army Corps projects.

I have a bill, which is called the REPAIR Act, which would make a limited change to the House rules definition to allow Congress to direct funding to vetted water resource development projects of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The REPAIR Act does not authorize or appropriate any new funds for these projects, which comprises just one-half of 1 percent of our overall annual discretionary spending, and stays exclusively within the budget cap set by Congress.

After several years of divided government, almost every Member of Congress here has experienced the direct correlation between our inability to provide for these projects over the executive agencies, especially as it pertains to these essential public works projects.

The REPAIR Act is a zero-cost solution to this problem that will simply allow Congress to respond to the water resource infrastructure needs of their communities rather than waiting for an unelected, faceless bureaucrat in the executive branch to move on these projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the REPAIR Act.

RECOGNIZING CONGREGATION MICKVE ISRAEL

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Congregation Mickve Israel in Savannah, Georgia, as it celebrates its incredible 284th anniversary on July 11, 2017.

Just 5 months after General James Oglethorpe settled the colony, Jewish settlers fleeing persecution in Europe arrived in Georgia. They sought refuge in Savannah, where they were free to practice their beliefs. This brave group soon founded the Congregation Mickve Israel.

Predating our country by several decades as the first congregation in the South, Mickve Israel set an important precedent for the Jewish people. As such, wars, plagues, and religious struggles each challenged the congregation over the years, yet Mickve

Israel has withstood the test of time. It continues to be a beacon for the faithful and now welcomes 380 families inside its walls.

The story of Mickve Israel is special to the people and has been recognized for its achievement since its early years. President George Washington sent a personal letter to the congregation to honor its members and wish them well.

Since then, numerous Presidents over the years have made similar gestures, each one acknowledging the congregation's longevity and importance to the Jewish community.

I would also like to acknowledge the congregation's importance and congratulate Congregation Mickve Israel in reaching this impressive milestone. I know this religious community will continue to serve a caring, faithful, and integral role in Savannah, Georgia.

□ 1645

OPIOID ADDICTION CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tonight, I am joined by a number of Members here to talk about one of the most insidious problems our Nation has faced in a long time. It is the problem of opioid abuse. We are in a crisis mode.

We have now reached a point where we will have more deaths from drug overdoses this year than there are names on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall in Washington. That is a frightening concept.

There is almost no county, no State in America, that is not affected by this. Some areas have much more. Places in eastern Kentucky, southern West Virginia and up the Ohio Valley, and places in New England and out West have seen this as a growing problem as death rates rise.

There are things we can do about this. But in order to have some discussion of what we can do about this, we are going to talk about how we got to this problem and then what we can do to go beyond that.

I want to start off by yielding to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, to talk about what this means in one State alone, the State of Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. I thank the gentleman, who chairs our Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee and is so passionate in not only finding a solution to the opioid epidemic, but also his great work on mental health reform as well, as was passed into law in the 21st Century Cures legislation.

As you know, the year before, the Energy and Commerce Committee also passed legislation to begin to address this issue. We will be doing a lot of work, going forward, to look at what is working on the ground and what is not.

Addiction, as you well know from your clinical experience, is an equal opportunity destroyer. It is a crisis that doesn't pick parties. It doesn't pick people because of their race, age, or socioeconomic status. We all know someone impacted by the opioid epidemic. It has literally touched every corner of our country and every community in our States.

The epidemic has hit close to home in my home State of Oregon, where more people now die from drug overdoses than from deaths in automobile accidents. I have met with community leaders, first responders, doctors, police officers, patients, and those on the front lines of this fight against opioid addiction.

At roundtables throughout the Second District of Oregon, I have heard firsthand accounts of the impact of the opioid epidemic. It didn't matter if I was in a rural eastern Oregon community or a more populated city in southern Oregon. The tragic stories were all too similar and all too familiar.

Medical professionals across Oregon told me about the rapid acceleration of the opioid epidemic over the last 20 years. They have witnessed patient after patient fall into the traps of addiction.

I heard from Oregonians who have struggled with the epidemic themselves. At our roundtable, a woman in Hermiston talked about how she became addicted to painkillers. After a minor foot injury, she got a prescription for an opioid-based painkiller. In her decades-long battle with this addiction—trying to get off of this addiction—she was forced to travel more than 5 hours into Washington State just to find a provider who could help her with Suboxone and get off of her addiction. There was nobody locally who could help her.

I heard from a father whose son was a high school athlete. He was prescribed opioids after a sports injury. Tragically, he became addicted. Soon, he transitioned to what we know as a cheaper and more deadly version of the drug known as heroin.

Sadly, this young man would not survive his addiction. He died from heroin. It devastated the family and stole another American in the prime of his life. This story is repeated all too often.

Combating the opioid epidemic in Oregon and every State of the union is going to require a real bipartisan team effort to continue, from elected officials with the input from healthcare experts and those on the front line of this fight in our local communities.

In the Energy and Commerce Committee, we stand shoulder-to-shoulder, all of us together, saying: What can we do more to help in this crisis; to seize the opportunity before us; to look at the legislation that was enacted in the last Congress to make sure that the grants are getting to the ground, as they are in my State; and that we are getting the help and that it is actually working?

It is one thing to pass a bill. It is another to make sure it is implemented correctly and that it actually works effectively.

I commend my colleague from Pennsylvania, Chairman MURPHY, for the work that he is doing on this and the compassion he has for those families who are tragically caught up in this addiction. Together, we are going to find our way through it.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman for his passion and hard work on the Energy and Commerce Committee. We know this is a life-and-death issue. This is one of those things where Members are coming together from both sides of the aisle to deal with.

Let me lay out the background here. How did we get here?

About 80 percent of addictions begin with a prescription. When we see what has happened here on this chart of heroin increased use and prescription opioids, there is something that occurred at the beginning of this millennium where things really began to take off.

On this next poster, seeing here how this is increasing at such a rate—about 9 or 10 percent—it is understandable you are looking at some of these rates increasing severalfold just in the last decade, with increasing jumps. As fentanyl has gotten here, it is even worse.

Back in 1980, Dr. Hershel Jick, a Boston doctor, wrote a letter in The New England Journal of Medicine, and he said this: ''Out of nearly 40,000 patients given powerful pain drugs in a Boston hospital, only four addictions were documented.'' Since he published that letter, it has been cited again about 600 times. Doctors, academics, pharmaceutical companies, and others use it as evidence of the unlikeliness of developing addiction.

But it has been criticized soundly, saying that never should have been said. In fact, The New England Journal of Medicine took the unusual step of posting a one-sentence warning over the so-called Porter and Jick letter to the editor that the Journal published in 1980, and it says: ''For reasons of public health, readers should be aware that this letter has been heavily and uncritically cited as evidence that addiction is rare with opioid therapy.''

Accompanying this note was an analysis from Canadian researchers exploring the frequency the letter had been cited, which was almost 600 times.

Here is the tragedy of this. Many physicians and many pharmaceutical companies said: See, prescribe these opioids; people will be okay. That was found not to be the case.

Jump ahead to 2001, when The Joint Commission released their pain management standards, and then shortly after that the American Medical Association said: let's make pain one of the

vital signs. The other vital signs being blood pressure, heart rate, respiratory rate, and temperature. But when pain was also made one of those as well, doctors began asking questions about that, and basically screening people along the lines of: On a scale of 1 to 10, what is your pain level?

Everything else is measured with an instrument objectively, but pain is subjective. In fact, it is so subjective that it was found that 51 percent of people who are on an opioid have a mood disorder, such as depression or anxiety. There is a huge amount there.

The thing about this, if a person fails to screen for presence of a mood disorder, along with other aspects, you really increase their risk for addiction.

About 50 million Americans, for example, have low back pain. Twenty-five million of those are on an opioid. Of that group, about 40 percent have been found to have depression. If you combine depression and opioid use, you could triple or quadruple your risk for misuse, abuse, and addiction. It would make sense that before a doctor prescribes in these cases, concurrently they would also be screening for mood disorders. That does not appear to be the case.

Here is another part of the problem. Under the Affordable Care Act, hospital payments are tied to patient pain satisfaction surveys, which reward hospitals financially when patients give them a high rating for managing pain. In turn, the hospitals get less money if the patient says: my pain was not handled.

That is actually question 14 of the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems survey. It asks the question: How often did the hospital or provider do everything in their power to control your pain? Doctors feared negative responses, as did many hospitals, and it was found that probably had an impact on increasing prescriptions.

Another part of the problem is treatment access. Quite frankly, if you want to get help, you can't find it. Unfortunately, getting access to high-quality treatment is unlikely in the United States. Of the 27 million Americans suffering from addiction, less than 1 percent receive evidence-based treatment.

We have a shortage of trained providers, and half the counties in America have no psychologists, no psychiatrists, and no clinical social workers.

Let me add to this also that medication-assisted treatment is one of those things put up here as a treatment method. If I show you here, medication-assisted treatment is when a person is replacing their illegal drug with something like methadone or Suboxone, which Chairman WALDEN just referred to.

But here is part of the problem. It is supposed to be the doctor writing the prescription and then the patient is getting other treatment. But as is found with medication-assisted treatment, just in Pennsylvania alone, nearly 60 percent had no counseling in the year they received the buprenorphine. Forty percent were not drug-tested in the year they received the buprenorphine.

This is important because a person may receive a prescription but still remain on heroin or another drug. Thirty-three percent have between two to five different prescribers writing them a prescription for this. Where do all those prescriptions go?

This is one of the top diverted drugs. Many times, the patients simply take those drugs, sell them, and buy the street drugs. Twenty-four percent of those buprenorphine prescriptions didn't see a physician in the prior 30 days.

In other words, with medication-assisted treatment, we simply have a failure to provide other treatment and a low expectation for improvement, in many cases thinking we will replace one addiction with another.

Another part is in the area of hospital care. When treating opioid and heroin addiction, inpatient and residential treatment is crucial for full recovery, but there are simply not enough treatment centers and beds. Today, our Nation suffers a shortage of 100,000 inpatient treatment beds.

Further, we don't have enough providers. When we do have providers, many times they end up overprescribing.

There was a law in the United States back in the Nixon era called 42 C.F.R., consolidated federal registry. Basically, it made it so that physicians could not find out in the record if a patient was on other opioids, in treatment for that, or taking buprenorphine or methadone.

So what happened? Someone shows up in the emergency room, they are in pain, perhaps a doctor looks in the record and doesn't see anything there, and writes a prescription. If that person was in treatment and was recovering from an addiction, and at that point not taking other drugs, look at what just happened. The doctor may prescribe some opioids for that patient who was used to taking quite a few at any given time to have an effect. Now they have this, and they are no longer thinking: I will take just one or two. They may take more. So you risk overdose.

The second thing you do is risk a relapse. That person was perhaps clean for months or years. Now they have OxyContin or some other opioid, they take it, and they have a relapse.

But there is a third problem that goes with that, and that is the person may be on other drugs, such as benzodiazepines or other respiratory suppressants, and that becomes a problem because then the doctor doesn't know about drug interactions.

So we have this law in place which prohibits sharing of information about substance abuse treatment between doctors. Doctors unknowingly prescribe these for people. It causes more problems. We need to deal with this.

Another level here is fentanyl. Fentanyl is a synthetic opioid which is a staggering 50 times more potent than heroin and 100 times more potent than morphine. It has a high potential for abuse. A mere 2 milligrams is fatal. A single packet of sweetener for your coffee is 1,000 milligrams. Take two of those and that is enough to kill you.

Since last 2013, fentanyl has contributed to at least 5,000 overdose deaths in the U.S., and that is soaring. However, due to gaps in the data collections, it is likely the number of overdose deaths in the U.S. is actually much higher.

A low-cost, high-profit, hard-to-detect profile of fentanyl is increasingly more trafficked to traffickers and relatively easy to manufacture. China is a major part of this, in that the illegally manufactured fentanyl shipped to the U.S. via labs in Mexico, smuggled across the border, then hits our streets.

One other thing I want to point out here, in terms of this problem. If we look at what some have analyzed in terms of areas that are hotspots for substance abuse, you can see in here for persons on disability, look at the sections in Kentucky, West Virginia, Virginia, along the Mississippi Valley, up the Ohio Valley, and parts out West. This isn't the only causal factor. Many times you have people on disability and pain, and what happens is they may be prescribed opioids as part of that.

When you look here, where age-adjusted death rates occur for drug poisoning—those overdose deaths—look at the hotspots in America. It is just about the same out here in the Mississippi-Ohio Valley, portions out West, where you have these problems.

All of these come together in terms of crime, in terms of drug cartels, in terms of fentanyl, in terms of poor access to treatment.

I mentioned the hospital beds. By the way, over half the counties in America have no psychiatrist, no psychologist, no social worker, and no licensed drug treatment provider.

□ 1700

It is no wonder we are in this mess. We will talk more about some solutions here, but I wanted to recognize a number of Members who might want to talk about this.

Let me first go to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER). Representative CARTER is also a pharmacist. Let's hear some of his perspective.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for hosting this Special Order.

This is certainly a very important subject, one that I am very familiar with. It is indeed an epidemic in our country. There is not a State nor a district that hasn't been touched by this problem. Countless people have succumbed to this issue. That issue is the

use of opioids and the devastating impact on our communities.

Recent data showed that overdose deaths have jumped by over 50 percent in the decade leading up to 2015. In addition, nearly 1,300 people died in Georgia in 2015 from drug overdoses. These are statistics that need to be urgently addressed. We have made great progress with the passage of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, but we have an opportunity to do more.

One staggering statistic is that last year it is estimated that roughly 60,000 people died from drug overdoses—a number that is far too high. Just earlier this month, four people in central Georgia died in a matter of 2 days due to opioid overdoses from falsely labeled drugs. That instance is not only troubling because it reflects growing painkiller use in the rural parts of my State, but because it also represents another problem: counterfeit and fake drugs.

An issue that I have been working on is the growing trend of drugs and drug ingredients being ordered abroad and delivered through the mail to addresses around the country.

A recent Wall Street Journal article mentioned the synthetic opioids that are being brought into this country and the methods by which they are doing it.

An example of one of those drugs is fentanyl, a synthetic opioid that is wreaking havoc across the country.

We must not only look at the types of drugs that are being used, but also how people are acquiring them and how to effectively limit that. Our enforcement personnel are working diligently with the Postal Service to find ways to curb this trend, such as using advanced data. But it is a topic that needs more work. By cutting off their ability to purchase these dangerous synthetic opioids, we can help to limit this epidemic.

As a lifelong pharmacist, I have seen firsthand the dangers and problems associated with opioid abuse and its impact on our communities. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to counter this trend in hopes of saving lives.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman for hosting this tonight. It is so very vital to our country. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. As a pharmacist, when people come into the pharmacy, for example, if they want to get Sudafed, a cold medication, they have to go through some special process. It is behind counter. Is that right?

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Now, what if they wanted to pick up an opioid prescription? Do they have to show an ID? Are they required by law to have the same kind of restrictions?

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Yes, they are. They have to show an ID in order to pick it up. Now, the prescription itself is a C2 prescription, so if we don't recognize them at the pharmacy, we have to ask them for their ID to make sure that is indeed the person who is picking it up.

We also have a program in Georgia, in fact, a program that you are very familiar with, a prescription drug monitoring program, that allows us to go and check a database to see if that person has actually been doctor shopping or is pharmacy shopping and getting it at other places. That has helped us. It is a great tool in fighting this epidemic.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. But as the gentleman knows, that is data within the State, but across State lines, that data is still not populated.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. That is one of the major problems. For instance, in my practice, I practiced in Savannah, Georgia, which is on the South Carolina line, and only 2 hours from the Florida State line. That was a constant problem for us. I could look at my data all day long, but I wouldn't know whether they had gotten something filled in South Carolina or in Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I appreciate that. That is a problem we are going to have to fix in our committee.

I want to call up the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), eastern Ohio. Speaking of being able to jump across State lines and have prescriptions filled, minutes away from the Pennsylvania/West Virginia border, could travel down there, and also part of that deadly area along the Ohio Valley where so much of this is occurring.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I want to thank my colleague, Representative MURPHY, for holding this Special Order on such a critically important topic.

And you mention that my district borders the State of Pennsylvania, and it does. And I have had so many incidents of engagement with my constituents on the opioid addiction issue. Several of them really stick out.

Representative MURPHY, one of those happened in Pennsylvania. Occasionally, because my district goes all the way up to the top into northeast Ohio, occasionally I fly in and out of Pennsylvania. I was there a couple of years ago, and I was sitting in the lounge waiting for a flight. I happened to be on a phone call, and I noticed that a gentleman began to look my direction. He very patiently waited until I got off the telephone, and then he came over, introduced himself. He recognized me, and he said: I am not one of your constituents, but I know that you represent a district just across the border in Ohio. He said: But I want to implore you, to beg you and your colleagues in Congress, please do something about the opioid addiction. He said: Our 21-year-old son died of an overdose in January. He had just gotten out of a rehab, was doing well, had gotten a job. He came home one Friday night, said he was going out with some friends. The next morning his mother and I found him dead in his room.

I hear stories like that all of the time.

I can tell you that the opioid addiction epidemic that is streaking across our country is not one that we are going to be able to arrest our way out of. It is not one that we are going to be able to incarcerate our way out of. It is an issue, my dear colleagues, that is going to take everybody from the top to the bottom, from the President of the United States all the way down to the family members. I am talking about local government officials, law enforcement, the judiciary, faith-based organizations, community organizations. This is something we are going to have to all be engaged in.

We have appropriated, as you know, Representative MURPHY, hundreds of millions of dollars, billions, in fact, to attack the opioid epidemic. More is needed. We are not going to be able to simply throw money at this problem. It is going to require a cultural change within our country.

I have so many other stories, but I don't want to take up more time because I know I have other colleagues here who want to testify on this very important issue.

Just know that I am with you. We take this issue very seriously in our district. Back in Ohio, we are constantly reaching out to law enforcement, mental health providers, healthcare providers, faith- and community-based organizations, and families on how to attack this problem.

I thank you for giving me a chance to speak on it.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

I want to next recognize the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON). Certainly he sees this issue, too. As I mentioned before, one of the problems physicians have, if they do not know what kind of prescriptions that person is on, for example, a medical record may show if a person has an allergy to penicillin or something, but you may have no idea that that patient may, for example, be taking buprenorphine or methadone unless they tell you or you test for it. And as a surgeon, what happens when they go to get anesthesia and the complications come from that, but it is part of the reasons why we have to make sure that you as a physician have access to these records, things we can clean up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for holding this Special Order tonight to talk about this really important subject on behalf of the American people.

The opioid abuse disorder and drug addiction have impacted every community in our Nation. The epidemic knows know boundaries; does not discriminate based on age, gender, or socioeconomic status.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 91 American lives are lost every day from an opioid

abuse overdose. Unfortunately, drug overdoses in Indiana have increased fivefold over the past decade, and southern Indiana and the Wabash Valley, the area I represent, are bearing the brunt of this devastation.

This year in Vigo County, Indiana, population around 108,000 citizens, authorities have responded to over 16 opioid- or heroin-induced overdoses already this year.

Vanderburgh County, Indiana, 182,000 citizens, saw 29 deaths from overdose in 2016, which is a fourfold increase from the prior year. This year, the county has seen 25 confirmed heroin- or fentanyl-related overdoses already, but the coroner thinks it may be more.

Just this month, we have seen reports of instances of an opioid-based drug called gray death in Evansville, Indiana.

We are working here in Congress with our States and local communities to finally bring relief to these families, but a lot of work has to be done. While we still have much to do, over the past couple of years, we have actually made significant progress to bring hope to our communities and expand access to treatment for those who need it.

I was proud to be part of our efforts that we put into law, the landmark legislation, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, and I had the opportunity to author a portion of CARA that expanded access to medication-assisted opioid use disorder treatment, ensure patients have wider access to more comprehensive-based treatment options, and helped minimize the potential for diversion.

As Congressman MURPHY mentioned, the key here is ongoing therapy, counseling, and monitoring. Medication-assisted treatment is not a panacea, but it is a component of a more comprehensive treatment plan for each individual.

Through our work in implementing the 21st Century Cures Act, Congress has provided significant funding for the States. In fact, Indiana recently was granted nearly $11 million from the Department of Health and Human Services to help us with this epidemic.

Again, most of us know someone, a family member, a friend, a neighbor, who has been impacted by this epidemic in some way. As a physician, I have seen the power of addiction up close and have focused on shaping real policy solutions here in Washington, D.C., to improve access to treatment for patients who are battling their problem every day. We all share in this fight, and we can't end this epidemic through policy changes alone. It is ongoing, and it is going to take all of us working together as a community to meet this challenge.

In that respect, I have met with and have been working with people who represent medical schools and residency programs in our country to help better educate the physician on prescribing habits as it relates to pain, whether that is surgical pain or chronic pain. It is a multifaceted approach, and I commend Congressman MURPHY for his dedication to helping end this crisis in our country, and I thank him for yielding.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for his impassioned words and dedication here.

I want to refer back to my map here a moment. Dr. BUCSHON was referring to his district in southern Indiana here, which, on this 2014 map, was already showing high mortality rates for those who have drug overdoses.

Look here in the State of Washington, also an area that, on this 2014 map, showed a lot of problems, and now the problem is getting worse.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) to speak on this issue.

□ 1715

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership on this important issue and for the opportunity to address the House on this very important topic.

Mr. Speaker, as you have heard, our Nation is facing an epidemic. Over the past two decades, opioid overdoses have quadrupled. Think about that. They have quadrupled in the United States. My home State, as Dr. Murphy has just mentioned, has faced significant increases in drug overdose death rates, including a 70 percent increase in synthetic opioid overdose deaths in just the last 10 years. It is clear that this is a crisis, which is why we in Congress are committed to combating this growing epidemic.

Late last year, Congress passed sweeping legislation, called the 21st Century Cures Act. It was bipartisan legislation that authorized $6.3 billion in funding to bring our healthcare innovation infrastructure into the 21st century. This legislation included $1 billion for opioid intervention and prevention treatment programs throughout all 50 States. Earlier this spring, the Federal Government began awarding grants in order to confront this crisis, including $11.7 million to the State of Washington.

While these funds will help expand treatment options, there is still much more work to be done at the Federal level, which is why I cosponsored legislation like H.R. 1057, the Synthetics Trafficking and Overdose Prevention, or STOP, Act. Designed to stop dangerous synthetic drugs like fentanyl, which you heard about, and carfentanil from being shipped through our borders, this legislation will combat bad actors from China and India who have been taking advantage of weaknesses in international mail security standards to break U.S. customs laws and really wreak havoc on our communities.

This is just one step of the opioid crisis that we must address. We need to combat the illicit drugs coming into this country as well as equip doctors, nurses, and first responders with the resources they need to treat pain appropriately.

We also need to support better access to care for individuals suffering from psychiatric and substance abuse disorders. And, most importantly, we must ensure these drugs are not falling into the hands of our Nation's children.

My colleagues in Congress and I are committed to combating this epidemic to keep it from causing further harm to our Nation's families and communities.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and his dedication to helping his State of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), whose district is just north of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to talk about some of the problems, in his experience, and his thoughts about what we should be doing about substance abuse.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his long work in this field, not just the last 2 years but, really, a lifetime in this space. I commend him for that work. Also, with mental health issues, he has been helping educate Congress about moving toward solutions.

My colleague has outlined the scope of the national problem we have, and each of us can talk about our respective districts and what has been going on there.

In my district, just over the border from my colleague's, western Pennsylvania has been especially hard hit. In Beaver County, we saw 102 overdose deaths related to opioids in 2016, up from 30 in 2013. In Cambria County, we lost 94 people to overdose deaths in 2016, a startling 62 percent increase from 2015.

The stories just keep coming. A story of the mother who lost her 10th child, her youngest child, to this epidemic, who insisted that the words ''damn heroin'' be put in her son's obituary. Or the couple we learned about before Christmas, who overdosed, and 3 days later their infant died from neglect, all three being found 4 days after that.

Mr. Speaker, it is all hands on deck to address this crisis. We are coming together at the Federal, State, and community level to develop a comprehensive strategy to stop this epidemic and to share best practices at every level. That is what a big part of our Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, passed last year, was all about—an important first step.

Another asset we have, Mr. Speaker, is the Office of National Drug Control Policy. This week, I led a bipartisan group of my colleagues, in a letter to President Trump requesting that the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy be re-elevated to a Cabinet-level position.

Since its inception, this Office has played a central and critical role in fighting drug trafficking and drug addiction. Both the Office of National

Drug Control Policy and its Director have played, and should continue to play, a central role in this effort.

The Office was created in 1988 with the Anti-Drug Abuse Act. Its mission is to fight the Nation's drug problem through three areas: prevention, addiction recovery, and enforcement.

The Office's Director, commonly referred to as the ''drug czar,'' was elevated to the Cabinet in 1993 by President Clinton, who wanted to raise the Office's profile in order to coordinate and emphasize legislative efforts on the Hill. More importantly, he wanted to focus and emphasize efforts within the administration for the antidrug efforts of the Department of Justice, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Department of Education, and the Department of Health and Human Services. The Obama administration removed the Office from the position it had in the Cabinet.

When it comes to drug addiction as well as to the illicit drug trade occurring across our southern border, the challenges have never been greater. This is no time to retreat in our efforts, and it is time to restore the Office of National Drug Control Policy to the Cabinet.

The Office is a very important part of the fight against the opioid epidemic, particularly because it plays a crucial role in coordinating efforts at various levels of government. In addition to the legislation that we are passing here in Congress, the administration has a crucial role to play, as do leaders at the State and local level.

We all want to end this crisis, and this common cause unites us, perhaps more than any other issue, across party and partisan lines.

Again, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for giving me this opportunity, and I thank him for his work in this area.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for his dedication on this issue. And, yes, he is right: we have to cross party lines and work on this together.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), another friend, who has seen these problems, as well, in his district and knows full well how these problems have merged well into the Ohio area, as it is an insidious problem.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in this most important area.

Mr. Speaker, the heroin and opioid scourge is running this country into the ground, and, unfortunately, the problem appears to be getting worse, not better. That grim reality is particularly true in my district in Cincinnati, where, during a single week last summer, city health officials reported 174 overdoses in 1 week.

Deaths caused by opioids have doubled in my district, where, during the first 4 months in 2017, the Hamilton County Coroner's Office had already logged in hundreds and hundreds of opioid overdoses—heartbreaking numbers.

But numbers only tell part of the story. The circumstances surrounding the spike in overdoses can, at times, be horrifying.

A couple of months ago, in Cincinnati, Ohio, a 9-year-old girl called 911 about both of her parents, who overdosed on heroin in their SUV. She told the dispatcher she was scared and that her parents wouldn't wake up. The girl didn't know where she was or what was wrong with her parents, but she, fortunately, knew how to call 911. That call saved her parents' lives.

But no little girl—or little boy, for that matter—should ever be placed in that situation by their parents, or by anyone.

These types of stories are becoming all too common. Opioids don't discriminate based on age or race or socioeconomic class. Opioids can kill anyone, in any neighborhood. Every day, there are more headlines about how heroin and other opioids are basically taking over the country.

The simple fact is that nearly every Member of Congress could come to the floor today and share a similar story from their own district. That is why, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we work together to find new and more successful ways to combat the opioid epidemic. We need to put politics aside and help people in need.

Last year, we came together in a bipartisan manner to pass the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, and I think there is a good chance that the expanded treatment and recovery options that legislation created will help some of those suffering from addiction to turn their lives around.

While CARA will give local law enforcement and healthcare officials more resources to fight opioid addiction, we need additional legislation to help combat the importation into the United States of extremely dangerous synthetic drugs like fentanyl and carfentanil, which many have blamed for the spike of heroin overdoses. According to the DEA, much of the supply of these two dangerous drugs on our streets originates overseas, particularly from China and India.

Bipartisan legislation is being led by Representative TIBERI and Senator PORTMAN, the Synthetics Trafficking and Overdose Prevention, or STOP, Act. It would update the customs process to require that advanced electronic notice of all packages, large or small, be provided to Customs officials. Providing this information to Customs before the packages arrive will help them, meaning the Customs agency, to intercept more illegal shipments and prevent these dangerous drugs from reaching drug traffickers within our borders.

I am hopeful that this legislation will be embraced with the same bipartisan enthusiasm that we saw with CARA because the heroin and opioid problem in this country is too serious, too significant, and too widespread for us not to work together at every level of government to find a solution to this epidemic. It is way overdue. We need to work together in a bipartisan manner about this.

I again want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership in this area.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

I point also on this map here to the Cincinnati area in southern Ohio, which is one of the hot spots in 2014 that has continued to grow as a problem. We recognize this is both a local problem and a nationwide problem.

I want to tell a story here.

Last December, when the President was signing into law the 21st Century Cures Act, which included my legislation, the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, a former State Senator from West Virginia took the stage to introduce it. David Grubb talked about his daughter, Jessie, who, herself, had been in rehab, in treatment, something like three or four times, had had several drug overdose instances and had been revived. But what happened to her also is part of what they called the loaded gun that never should have happened.

She went into the hospital for some surgery, but the doctors and nurses never told her discharging doctor that she was in recovery for heroin addiction. The point we made before about the NASPA list, or the other lists there, or the 42 C.F.R., blocks information from going into the medical record. So while someone was out to protect her privacy, they didn't protect her from death.

She was given a prescription of 50 opioid painkillers. Remember, I said before that when a person is given this prescription, they run the risk of relapse, overdose, or bad drug interactions. In her case, it was an overdose that finally took her life—another important reason why we have to deal with this 42 C.F.R. and get rid of that arcane and, quite frankly, deadly law.

Let me talk about some other recommendations of what I believe Congress can do to help.

The references made before by Dr. BUCSHON and others about the prescription drug monitoring program—and also BUDDY CARTER of Georgia mentioned this, too—where a pharmacist or a physician can say, ''Is this person on other opioids? Have they jumped across the border? Have they seen four, five, or more physicians for some opiates?'' by having a better PDMP, prescription drug monitoring program, or National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting program, we have to make sure that all States use the same system and that it collects data from across borders so doctors can easily see this.

But part of this, too, in dealing with the 42 C.F.R., is understanding Federal

law prohibits including buprenorphine and methadone in the PDMP. How absurd and how cruel that is that a doctor would not even be able to know that a patient is taking one of those prescriptions.

Also, some of these drugs can end up being a respiratory suppressant, and when the patient takes another drug such as benzodiazapine, it can add to that effect and add to further complications.

Another aspect, too, which we must be further engaged with is vigorous public education programs across all age groups, beginning with early elementary school.

□ 1730

When schools have some of these programs—and we will bring forth some models that talk about these programs in a future hearing I will be holding in the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee—these are very, very important to help students, early on, understand the dangers of this.

This is not just recreation, but it is so easy to slip into addiction. Given that 80 percent of drug abuse begins with a prescription, whether it is a student, athlete, perhaps a football player who injures a leg or something and he is given some of these drugs, it is essential the whole family be counseled from the onset, understanding the concerns and dangers of continuing to take these drugs.

We also have to have drug take-back programs and public education programs stressing the importance of proper disposal of unused opiates and pain prescriptions to prevent them from being stolen or misused. For example, if a family is selling their home and they are having an open house and strangers come into the house and while they are there they say, ''Can I use your restroom?'' and the family lets them do that, don't be surprised if that person has no intention of buying a house but does have an intention of going into the bathrooms and checking the medicine cabinets and finding any medication and taking it.

Also, when teens come over to the house for parties or socializing, don't be surprised if they also go into medicine cabinets, look in drawers in the bathrooms or drawers in other places of the house looking for some of those drugs which they, themselves, will take or sell.

We have to make sure we have vigorous patient education programs about doctor-prescribed opioids to make sure people know about that before the addiction takes foot. And taking one of these prescriptions may only take 3 or 4 weeks before it begins to kick in and cause problems.

I know myself, back in 2005, I was in a rollover accident in Iraq with a couple of other Members of Congress. Our vehicle rolled, and as a result of that accident, I ended up having a mild concussion, snapping my neck, having some temporary paralysis, and a great deal of pain. Well, battlefield medicine is one that gets you out of the area, stops the bleeding, stops the pain, and ships you off to some other hospital, and that was the case for me.

But I know what happens. Everywhere I landed in a helicopter or an ambulance, appropriately so, the physicians would ask me a number of orienting questions, but also say: ''Are you in pain? On a scale of 1 to 10, how much pain are you in?'' And when I proceeded to say that number, immediately, as they would do for many other people in the battlefield, they would administer morphine or some other pain reliever and move you on from there.

What happened, though, returning to the United States, where pain continued for me, I was prescribed some pills for that pain, but I was also prescribed fentanyl. Never once was it ever described to me: ''Be careful with this. This is highly addictive. This is a problem.''

Now, after a few weeks on this and recognizing it was hard to even do my job because I couldn't keep my head clear, I just said: ''That it is. I am not taking this anymore.'' But at that point, my body had already begun to develop some tolerance for this, and when I stopped taking it, I had some reaction.

Granted, it was not as severe as some of those who have been taking these drugs at a higher dosage and longer, but I could feel myself actually saying I understand what people mean when they say their skin feels like it is peeling off of them and they feel a sense of nausea and other problems as well.

Now, I can't even imagine what it is like for someone who is taking higher doses for longer periods of time. But it is extremely important that, every time a prescription is written, pharmacists have an opportunity to counsel patients and doctors are also doing more than simply passing out a prescription.

Pharmacists should do what BUDDY CARTER was saying before: make sure they have the person showing a photo ID. Is this, indeed, a prescription they are picking up for themselves or claiming they have it for someone else? Perhaps that prescription was stolen from someone.

We have to make sure that we also understand, for those out there trying to legalize marijuana, I caution you, because the marijuana that is out there on the streets or presented in many areas can cause tremendous psychiatric problems for those who are already at risk. The longer you are on some of the types of marijuana, the greater risk you have for things like delusional behavior.

We have to make sure we also eliminate Medicaid payments for those question 14 responses I made reference to before when you are in the hospital to ask if the hospital adequately addressed your pain.

In the area of treatment and recovery, we have to expand the mental health workforce. As I said before, half the counties in America have no psychiatrists, no psychologists, no drug and alcohol counselors, and those who are out there likely have their schedule so filled, they don't even have room to treat someone. Not all of them even know how to treat addictive disorders.

The fact that a majority of people who may have an addiction disorder also have a concurrent mental health disorder is another reason why we have to increase this workforce by tens of thousands. Just for child and adolescent psychiatrists alone, we need another 21,000 of those.

We need tens of thousands more psychologists. It is important that the schools of medicine, schools of psychology, and schools of social work are graduating more people with these degrees and getting them into our workforce.

I have had legislation before, and we passed some things in the 21st Century Cures Act and in my Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, to provide more funding so that more of these folks can continue with their education. It is essential. It is like trying to fight a war without soldiers, trying to fight this war, which is killing more people every year than the entire war in Vietnam, but we do not have the soldiers to fight this.

We also have to make sure that, with regard to the government-sponsored medication-assisted treatment which I referred to before, we cannot simply rely on synthetic opioid maintenance alone. We have to make sure there are requirements to have that person in counseling and treatment.

I have heard from some persons that go to those treatment programs that they have no counseling at all, and some have great counseling. In some cases, sitting in the waiting room, perhaps a nurse or someone simply checks up on them: ''What are you doing? How are you doing?'' That is considered and written down as group therapy. That is not acceptable in any way, shape, or form.

We need 100,000 more inpatient psychiatric beds, and we have to make sure insurance companies recognize that an addictive disorder is a chronic disorder. Simply giving someone a weekend or a few days for withdrawal and then putting them back on the street is not an answer.

That is why we have to encourage private insurance companies and Medicaid and Medicare. And I say Medicare because a large number of people who are having some of these problems are also the elderly.

We have to make sure that we increase the availability of fast-acting opiate blockers for first responders, such as Narcan. But let's keep this in mind: In some cases, we hear of some of those pushers of these drugs who also give an accompanying dosage of Narcan, recognizing that the drug will bring that person to a near-death experience.

We have heard from first responders and others, law enforcement, where someone may actually have a party where someone will remain there expecting that someone will actually have an overdose and die in order to bring them back to life. That is how some of these people are seeking some of those experiences.

We have to make sure that States review their laws, as some are doing, that if you take one of these opiates and you do have that near-death experience, perhaps that should be treated the same as a suicide attempt, that that person is in imminent danger of harming themselves or someone else and perhaps determine if they need an inpatient psychiatric stay.

We have to make sure we have support of employment for those in recovery to break the cycle of recovery and reexposure. Many times, persons who are trying to stay clean, they can't get a job because they can't pass the drug test, so they may be in a job and have exposure to other people who still end up with substance abuse.

We have to make sure they have higher standards and increased accountability for payment models that require evidence-based treatment in halfway houses, three-quarter houses, and residential treatment facilities.

We have to deploy certified addiction counselors to emergency rooms because we know that, when a person comes to an emergency room, if they see an addiction counselor there, they are not just simply given a business card and told, ''Call someone next week and we hope you get treatment''; but if they see an addiction counselor in the emergency room, they increase their chances of follow-up by 50 percent, according to a Michigan study.

We must make sure the FDA is working with companies to find alternatives to opioids and that, again, Medicaid and other physicians are educated on some of those aspects.

Physician training has to also be ramped up: require them to have training in opioid prescribing practices on risk for addiction and abuse and prescribing limited dosages. Instead of prescribing dosages for a month, perhaps just a couple of days. In many cases, they are not adequately trained in alternatives to opioids and the potential harm of overprescribing.

We have to increase training requirements for healthcare providers who deliver this medication-assisted treatment. Right now, in many cases, they only have a few hours of training, and then they can go and prescribe this and have very little, if any, training at all in drug addiction counseling. Before doctors write a prescription, we can make sure they are looking at the NASPER list or other lists as well.

In the area of law enforcement, it is critical that what is called the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program is made more available, with greater access around the country.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left in our segment here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. We have to make sure we have more border security so that we are intercepting these drugs as they come across the border.

We need funding for the post offices because, in many cases, unwittingly, the letter carriers are the ones who are delivering to people's homes fentanyl and other drugs.

In the incarceration system, we have to make sure we are testing inmates for the presence of drugs in their system during their incarceration. We can offer them medications which, upon discharge, actually block any effects of some of these drugs.

We need to also make sure that Medicaid and other insurance companies' payments resume immediately upon release from their incarceration to prevent them from relapsing or returning to the drug culture.

We also have to make sure we have solid data collection. In many cases, when we show the charts about death rates around the country, the charts may be grossly inaccurate. In many cases first responders, paramedics, and coroners do not keep accurate data on these rates. The persons themselves may not even be tested to see if they died from a drug overdose.

There are several items in here listing what we can be doing here as a nation, and there are many more. The point is we have fallen short and we have seen some problems with this. There is more that we can do and we must do in order to save lives.

I know I just have about 3 minutes left, Mr. Speaker, am I correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to talk about some of the issues dealing with substance abuse.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MURPHY for his incredible leadership on this important topic and for holding this Special Order this evening.

I can tell you, the citizens of the State of Ohio are paying attention. The opioid epidemic continues to intensify with over 2 million people addicted to prescription opioids and more than half a million addicted to heroin in 2015, alone.

According to an estimate from The New York Times, drug overdoses are now the leading cause of death for Americans under 50; and drug overdoses are the leading cause of accidental death in our country, with prescription opioids responsible for more than 20,000 deaths in the United States just in 2015, according to the American Society of Addiction Medicine.

I have to mention that Medicaid plays an important role in addressing this epidemic because it is a lifeline program, providing coverage to over 650,000 non-elderly adults with opioid addiction and covering a range of treatment services.

Ohio, tragically, leads the Nation in opioid overdoses in 2014. Sadly, deaths have continued to rise with increased use of heroin and fentanyl. Many States have expanded Medicaid, including Ohio, to cover adults who make a modest $16,500 a year per individual. By broadening coverage of adults, the Medicaid expansion reaches many low-income adults with opioid addiction who were previously ineligible for coverage and facilitates access to treatment.

The opioid epidemic is so bad that even librarians are learning how to treat overdoses for individuals who come into libraries.

Mental health can be comorbid with opioid abuse, and those suffering from that duality are truly an American tragedy. For an addict to complete rehab and recovery successfully, they need to work in concert. And over half of uninsured non-elderly adults with an opioid addiction had a mental illness in the past year, with over one in five operating with a serious mental illness, such as depression, bipolar disorder, or schizophrenia.

To address the gravity of the challenge, I want to put on the RECORD the work that Lucas County, my home county, is doing with their DART program, which engages hospitals, mental health centers, and businesses in the community.

Believe it or not, according to Sheriff Tharp, the DART program has helped nearly 2,300 overdose victims and has a 74 percent success rate of getting people into detox and treatment programs at a total cost of about $370 per individual. This is truly an amazing record, and I wish to include in the RECORD the information about other counties in the district that I represent.

The opioid epidemic does not just affect the addicted. Lucas County Children Services is struggling to help children displaced by the opioid epidemic.

The agency has been repeatedly forced to do the unimaginable tasks of comforting children as first responders work to save their parents from a heroin or fentanyl overdoses. On several occasions, it has had to break the terrible news to these children that their parents succumbed to their addiction.

LCCS is also coping with a dramatic increase in the number of children placed in protective custody because their families have been blinded by substance dependence. The State's current budget proposes no increase for this program, which is a shame. This is no time to short change children.

Finally, I submit for the RECORD a story of the Guest family of Lorain, Ohio, whose daughter Tera died of a heroin overdose at the age of 24.

According to the Cleveland Plain Dealer: ''Tera Guest, 24, died Jan. 29, 2014, shortly after she and her sister used painkillers and a heroin-fentanyl mix. Her death marked the end of a two-year period that included stints in treatment and losing custody of her two children to her mother.

"Tera is among the hundreds who have died of overdoses within the last three years in Lorain County. The county coroner's office said a record 67 people died in 2013, followed by 60 in 2014 and 62 in 2015."

Lori took her tragedy and turned it into action and formed the Lorain Community Task Force, which is a group that raises awareness and provides assistance to addicts and their families.

Lori stepped up, and now Congress must do the same. We cannot turn our back on these people now. We must fight, we must work together, we must put politics aside. Only then can we begin to heal our Nation from this crisis.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this critical issue.

As was laid out, communities across this country, communities like mine in northeast Wisconsin, are in the midst of a public health crisis. It is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. It is an American issue, one that should bring us all together.

Opioid abuse is wreaking havoc on our homes, our schools, our churches. Its devastating effects are destroying our families and the lives of our loved ones.

As was pointed out, more Americans will have died from drug overdoses in 2017 than there are names on the Vietnam War Memorial. That is alarming. That should put it into sharp relief.

As a Marine veteran, I am acutely aware that servicemembers are more susceptible than the average person to addiction. In fact, veterans die from accidental drug overdoses at a 33 percent higher rate than the rest of the population, and something must be done to reverse this awful trend.

I commend our State lawmakers in Wisconsin who are doing aggressive work on this front, and I commend the gentleman and everyone who has spoken out for doing the same thing at the national level, and I look forward to working with him.

Because headline after headline reminds us of the tragic loss of life that has resulted from our Nation's opioid and addictions risk, we have to step up. We have to take action.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the gentleman convening this Special Order this evening. It has been fun working with him in the past on creative, bipartisan efforts to try and make sure the Federal Government is a better partner on this.

I look forward to working with him on legislation that will make it easier to be able to have the information available that people need for integrated treatment and his commitment to trying to bring people together to understand the problem and the fact that we are agreed more than we are divided on these things. I look forward to working with him on some progress in the months ahead.

□ 1745

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Oregon, and I thank all the Members speaking here tonight. I want to say, as you saw, this was a bipartisan coalition of Members. We are much better off working hand in hand to pass legislation that changes issues than standing next to each other as pallbearers for another 59,000 people in our Nation next week.

Mr. Speaker, with that and with some hope that we can pass this legislation and save some lives, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3003, NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (during the Special Order of Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–195) on the resolution (H. Res. 414) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3004, KATE'S LAW, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 3, 2017, THROUGH JULY 10, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (during the Special Order of Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–196) on the resolution (H. Res. 415) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3004) to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens, and providing for proceedings during the period from July 3, 2017, through July 10, 2017, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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, I thank all my fellow Members that are speaking up on this very important issue. I appreciate Dr. Murphy taking the lead. It is something that has not gotten enough attention. We continue to have people dying, and we need to deal with the issue.

It is interesting: some people find great hope in their religious beliefs. Throughout America's history, Christianity has been an important foundation. No, you didn't have to be a Christian to participate in government, to be a Founder, but, as Ben Franklin said, we know because he wrote out the speech in his own handwriting immediately afterwards, as requested.

So often, teachers teach that he is a Deist, as so many of the Founders, we are told, were Deists. Yet in his own words, in his own handwriting, at the Constitutional Convention in 1787, at 80 years old, 2 to 3 years away from meeting his Judge, his Maker—severe gout, arthritis, overweight, trouble getting up and down—he said these words:

''I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid?''

Franklin said, we have been—by the way, that is obviously a reference to Jesus' comment about the sparrow, and God seeing the sparrow, watching the sparrow.

But he goes on and he makes it very clear, as his own words indicate, that unless—he said: ''We have been assured, sir, in the Sacred Writing that except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.''

Again, referencing Scripture.

Those are not the words—any of them—they are not the words of a Deist. So teachers that have been miseducating people for so long, I know they are just passing on what they were taught, but there has been so much miseducation for so long.

Regardless of what else, we don't try to force our religious beliefs on anyone. That is not what the House of Representatives is for. But since it formed such an important part of our founding and a part of the discussion for most of our Nation's history, it is important to point out that those Scriptures that Ben Franklin referenced at the Constitutional Convention, the Scriptures that have been quoted so often—

We know the Bible is the number one, far and away, most quoted book in the House of Representatives and the Senate. Nothing else anywhere even close. It has brought hope to people that had no hope.

So it is interesting that, as our Nation moves further and further away from the source of so much hope for so much of our Nation's history, and for those who lived through that part of our Nation's history, the hope that Franklin Roosevelt brought to the microphone when he read the famous prayer on D-Day as American soldiers were fighting, as he said, against those forces of evil, drawn from a country that was used to peace that were fighting forces of evil.

But they had hope. That hope and prayer that Franklin Roosevelt gave over the microphone for several minutes now is condemned by so many.

That hope that served as the foundation, the building blocks for the beliefs of Sam Adams, that so many around in those days gave credit as being an important foundational building block for the revolution, for the new Nation.

We are arriving at a time when record numbers of people are dying. We heard today in our Judiciary hearing, I believe it was 144 Americans each day are dying of drug overdoses.

Who dies of a drug overdose?

People without hope, people who are drawn to drugs to provide a good, warm feeling.

We have more military members killing themselves than at any time probably in any nation's history. I don't know that for sure, but it is just hard to imagine a time in any nation's history when so many of its veterans are taking their own lives, a time when so many of our active military have taken their own lives.

Obviously, as people have said over the years, that is a permanent solution to a temporary problem, and it is the act of someone without hope.

So we know, regardless of whether people accepted Christian beliefs or not, Christianity, throughout our Nation's founding, provided hope. The Bible provided hope for those who were slaves through the 1700s and 1800s. So many were Christians, and it was the Bible, it was those wonderful spirituals, it was Scripture that gave them hope to endure and get through the horrors of slavery.

Though Abraham Lincoln bragged in his early twenties about being an infidel and not believing in God, Steve Mansfield, in his book in the last 5 years or so about Lincoln's struggle with God, documents his going from being an infidel to a point where, as President, he read Scripture constantly.

Dr. Rufus Fears, a brilliant history professor at the University of Oklahoma, asked me once: You know why Lincoln's speeches are so good and touch our hearts?

And I said: I don't know. They are just really well-worded. They are great speeches.

He said: No. He was reading so much Scripture by that point in his life, like the Gettysburg Address, he wrote his speeches as if they were Scripture. His words provided hope because he referenced Scripture so much.

And whether atheist, agnostic, Muslim, Buddhist, whatever, so many have a general knowledge of what Christians believe, and it is very basic. God, according to Genesis, the Old Testament, He created the world, created the universe, created man and woman. Basically, we got the Bible as an owner's manual, giving us important history so that we could get a good look at what works and what doesn't, and what the owner expects, and how we can live the most joyous and hopeful life even through terrible, perilous times.

Christianity goes on and, in the New Testament, points to the belief that the Old Testament, as we refer to it, points to the Messiah coming to be born in Bethlehem. So many of the prophecies about the Messiah to come. Even if one believes Jesus was not the Messiah, incredible that He could fulfill those prophecies the way He did.

And Christians, as people of most religions understand, believe what John 3:16 says: ''For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.''

So, clearly, Christian religion is based completely on love; that God so loved the world, that he gave His only Son, who was perfect, unblemished with sins of the Earth. And only something—someone unblemished could take away the sins of the world.

And the additional exclamation point that makes clear that Christianity is a religion based on love: it was made clear by Jesus himself when He was asked by the lawyer, naturally: What's the greatest commandment?

He said: love God, and the others like it. Love each other. And on those two commands hang all the law and the prophets.

If you were to go about outlining the Ten Commandments, they easily fall under those two headings: Love God, love each other.

But then Jesus also made clear: Greater love hath no one than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

And Jesus knew, because whether you believe he was the fulfillment of all the prophecies from the Old Testament or not, He could have escaped. He made no effort. He gave himself out of love.

It is easy to say He is either a liar, or He is a lunatic, or He is exactly what He said. But his acts were based on love. He gave his life for a world that needed an unblemished lamb.

□ 1800

With that background, Mr. Speaker—and, of course, the Supreme Court outlined it much more thoroughly in the late 1800s as it came to the conclusion well after the horrid case of Dred Scott, when the court analyzed and made clear, determined, pronounced: Even though everyone in the United States is not a Christian, this is a Christian Nation.

And everything that the Court called into view in their decision testified to that fact, as the Court pronounced.

Now, so why am I going into this?

It is because we have hit what may be as low a point as we have ever hit in Congress. When Russell Vought was being questioned, on the same day, another person named Comey was testifying here on Capitol Hill. Russell Vought was being questioned by Senators so they could determine how they wanted to vote on whether or not he could fill a role in the administration. This low point in our Nation's history has to rank down there as one of our low points.

When so much throughout our history has testified to the fact that Christianity was such an important part of our foundation, of everything that has been good in America, the ending of slavery, driven and guided by churches. Sure, there were some atheists involved. The revolution following The Great Awakening, 1730s and 1740s, ended up yielding a revolution that produced the greatest country in the history of the world by virtue of the opportunities, by virtue of the protections for freedom-loving people around the world, by virtue of, you know, the opportunities and the assets, and that a country would ultimately arise where the number one health problem for the Nation's poor was obesity. With more opportunities, more assets, more freedoms, even then Solomon's Israel—incredible country with many religions—celebrated here in the United States.

But as General Jay Garner was told when he was in Iraq after Saddam Hussein was driven out—he has told me twice—actually, three times has said it when I heard him speaking back in 2004. I called him. He reiterated it. He told me again in last September. Yes, I remember it correctly. He talked to a direct descendant of Mohammed in Iraq about what kind of government the U.S. should help Iraq have. I will contend we shouldn't be about nation building, but that was his order and that is what he was doing.

And he said that this descendant of Mohammed with a black turban said he was going to explain in his native tongue, because they were recording it. And then after he finished, he said: Now, let me just give you, in a nutshell, what I told you we need here for a government in Iraq. We need a government formed by Iraqis, a government composed of Iraqis, and a government based on a constitution which is based on the teachings of Jesus.

A descendant of Mohammed told Jay Garner that the best hope for a country was a constitution based on the teachings of Jesus, because basically those teachings of Jesus are the only way in which a nation can allow freedom of religion.

No matter which religion or agnosticism, atheism, whatever religion, it is not going to be able to truly allow freedom of religion unless it is based on the teachings of Jesus. And that is what this insightful descendant of Mohammed in Iraq told retired General Jay Garner.

So we get to 2017, a hearing on the same day Comey testified, this appointee nominee by President Trump, Russell Vought, a great man, a fine man, had his Christian beliefs perverted, twisted into something that was represented to be hateful. It is a religion based on the love of God and the love of His Son that would give his life for others.

Senator SANDERS said: ''Let me get to this issue that has bothered me and bothered many other people. And that is in the piece that I referred to that

you wrote for the publication called 'Resurgent.' You wrote, ''Muslims do not simply have a deficient theology. They do not know God because they have rejected Jesus Christ, His Son, and they stand condemned.''

Senator SANDERS then went on and said: ''Do you believe that statement is Islamophobic?''

Mr. Vought replied: ''Absolutely not, Senator. I am a Christian, and I believe in a Christian set of principles based on my faith. That post, as I stated in the questionnaire to this committee, was to defend my alma mater, Wheaton College, a Christian school that has a statement of faith that includes the centrality of Jesus Christ for salvation, and . . . ''

Senator SANDERS interrupts: ''I apologize. Forgive me, we just don't have a lot of time. Do you believe people in the Muslim religion stand condemned? Is that your view?''

Mr. Vought relied: ''Again, Senator, I am a Christian, and I wrote that piece in accordance with the statement of faith at Wheaton College.''

Senator SANDERS said: ''I understand that. I don't know how many Muslims there are in America. Maybe a couple million. Are you suggesting that all those people stand condemned? What about Jew? Do they stand condemned, too?''

Mr. Vought replied: ''Senator, I'm a Christian . . . ''

Senator SANDERS at this point is shouting: ''I understand you are a Christian, but this country are made of people who are not just—I understand that Christianity is the majority religion, but there are other people of different religions in this country and around the world. In your judgment, do you think that people who are not Christians are going to be condemned?''

Mr. Vought replied: ''Thank you for probing on that question. As a Christian, I believe that all individuals are made in the image of God and are worthy of dignity and respect regardless of their religious beliefs. I believe that, as a Christian, that is how I should treat all individuals . . . ''

Senator SANDERS responded: ''You think your statement that you put into that publication, they do not know God because they rejected Jesus Christ, His Son, and they stand condemned, do you think that is respectful of other religions?''

Mr. Vought said: ''Senator, I wrote a post based on being a Christian and attending a Christian school that has a statement of faith that speaks clearly in regard to the centrality of Jesus Christ in salvation.''

Senator SANDERS said: ''I would simply say, Mr. Chairman, that this nominee is really not someone who this country is supposed to be about.''

And that came from—the quotes came from an article in the National Review quoting from the hearing itself.

That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, this may be the low point for hope in America when a sitting Senator condemns someone who is simply quoting from the teachings of Jesus, teachings that even a descendant of Mohammed knew was helpful in creating a great nation.

We have come a long way from the hope that abounded within the founders of this country, within the hope of those who fought to bring about the end of the horrendous, hideous practice of slavery, where human beings treated brother and sister human beings with chains in bondage.

And now we come to a point that I feared—and I brought it up when hate crime legislation was discussed—that the day would come when the religion of the world based on the love of God and the love of Jesus Christ would be twisted to the point that it would be called hateful.

Jesus said: ''I am the way, the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.''

He is either a liar or a lunatic or he is exactly who he said he was. But that is not hateful. It is not hateful to believe in a religion where you want to share the joy and the hope that comes from it.

One of the results, maybe it is a—not a result, but more of an unfortunate situation that exists. When you take away the hope of the Christian religion, condemn people for believing Jesus is the hope, as he said he was, or as our friend, the late Chuck Colson, pointed out: ''Our hope is not going to arrive on Air Force One.''

He believed the hope was in Jesus.

And now we have someone who is declared totally inappropriate to be a government official because he believes the teachings of Jesus. It is not hateful to believe the teachings of Jesus. In fact, someone—I know I have Jewish friends who have said: I thought Christians blamed Jews for killing Jesus.

Well, the truth is that anyone who is a true Christian, if they blame Jews or anyone else for the death of Jesus, they are not a Christian. They don't understand the belief that Jesus died for me and for anyone who has done wrong in this life.

□ 1815

So it is a sad day, it is a sad week, and it is a sad month to look how far we have come from the hope that was once so prevalent. Now we are in a society where suicide is rampant—144 drug overdoses a day, and that doesn't count all of the suicides by veterans and Active Duty military.

Christianity is a religion of love. May God grant wisdom to any Senator who thinks otherwise.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 2(g) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Mr. Robert Reeves Deputy Clerk to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 115th Congress or until modified by me.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STIVERS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today through June 29 on account of his duties with the Ohio National Guard.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 28, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1803. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Selected Acquisition Reports for the Chemical Demilitarization-Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives and Ballistic Missile Defense System programs, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432(b)(1); Public Law 97-252, Sec. 1107(a)(1); (96 Stat. 740); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1804. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting an additional legislative proposal for the proposed legislation titled the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018''; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Natural Resources, and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 414. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–195). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 415. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3004) to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens, and providing for proceedings during the period from July 3, 2017, through July 10, 2017 (Rept. 115–196). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

H.R. 3064. A bill to develop an anticorruption strategy, establish Offices for Anticorruption in the Department of Defense, Department of State, and United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3065. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to Congress a report on the national security implications of the outsourcing of industrial and manufacturing capacities to locations outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3066. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a program to protect United States students against foreign agents; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 3067. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish certain criminal violations for various aspects of harassment using the interstate telecommunications system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the research credit for domestic manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 3069. A bill to provide for guidance relating to the management of Department of Defense arsenals to ensure affordability and competence in critical capabilities areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 3070. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to clarify the definition of a deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 3071. A bill to require executive agencies to consider equipment rental in any cost-effectiveness analysis for equipment acquisition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 3072. A bill to increase from $10,000,000,000 to $50,000,000,000 the threshold figure at which regulated depository institutions are subject to direct examination and reporting requirements of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3073. A bill to provide for the issuance of a Mental Health Awareness Semipostal Stamp; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. ELLISON:

H.R. 3074. A bill to reclassify certain low-level felonies as misdemeanors, to eliminate the increased penalties for cocaine offenses where the cocaine involved is cocaine base, to reinvest in our communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, 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. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Ms. ROSEN):

H.R. 3075. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase adjustments of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 3076. A bill to amend section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Privacy Act) to require agencies to accept electronic release forms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 3077. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the retirement earnings test, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIHUEN (for himself, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 3078. A bill to extend quarterly reports on confirmed ballistic missile launches from Iran and imposition of sanctions in connection with those launches; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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 Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JONES, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 3079. A bill to reduce by one-half of one percent the discretionary budget authority of the Department of Defense for a fiscal year if the financial statement of the Department of Defense for the previous fiscal year does not receive a qualified or unqualified audit opinion by an external independent auditor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 3080. A bill to provide installation reutilization authority for arsenals, depots, and plants; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico (for herself and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 3081. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period in the disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3082. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to translate the FAFSA into foreign languages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia (for himself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 3083. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the preparation of career and technical education teachers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 3084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of certain equity grants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARCE (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 3085. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to American military personnel who fought in defense of Bataan, Corregidor, Guam, Wake Island, and the Philippine Archipelago between December 7, 1941, and May 10, 1942, and who died or were imprisoned by the Japanese military in the Philippines, Japan, Korea, Manchuria, Wake Island, and Guam from April 9, 1942, until September 2, 1945, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service to their country; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 3086. A bill to improve understanding and forecasting of space weather events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Foreign Affairs, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 3087. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of certain Tibetans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 3088. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to require one-stop delivery systems under such Act to offer services through internet websites and to direct the Secretary of Labor to develop standards and best practices for such websites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. Res. 410. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HARPER:

H. Res. 411. A resolution adjusting the amount of the Members' Representational Allowance; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ:

H. Res. 412. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. ISSA):

H. Res. 413. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July as ''American Grown Flower Month''; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, and Mr. ELLISON):

H. Res. 416. A resolution recognizing the Muslim holy month of Ramadan, commending a month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and extending best wishes to Muslims in the United States and across the globe for a joyous and meaningful observance of Eid al-Fitr; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. Res. 417. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the importance of civic education and civic involvement programs in the elementary and secondary schools of the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

71. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 13, affirming and supporting the designation of the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte National Monument under the Antiquities Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

72. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7, urging the Congress to fully preserve the critical benefits which many older Nevadans have come to rely upon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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 Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 3066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I, SECTION 8.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3067.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3068.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 3069.

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. MCHENRY:

H.R. 3070.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay Debts and provide for the common Defence . . . of the United States; but all Duties, Imports and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 3071.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 which grants to the Congress power to make all laws which sall 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. CLAY:

H.R. 3072.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 3073.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3074.

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, which states:

The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 3075.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 3076.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3077.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. KIHUEN:

H.R. 3078.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 3079.

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. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 3080.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3081.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia:

H.R. 3083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution states that ''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.'' [Page H9375]

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 3084.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article 1, clause 8, section 6, Congress in empowered ''to coin Money, regulate the Value therof, and of foriegn Coin, and fix the Standard or Wieghts and Measures''

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 3086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 3088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 22: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 140: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 305: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 351: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 449: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 468: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 474: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 486: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 489: Mr. PETERS, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 490: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. COMER, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. AMASH.
H.R. 525: Mr. BABIN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 535: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H.R. 544: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 545: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 592: Mr. BACON, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 604: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 632: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 703: Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 747: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 767: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 799: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 828: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 845: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 884: Mr. RUSSELL.
H.R. 920: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 921: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 952: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 970: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 986: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 1002: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1016: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1017: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 1046: Mr. HECK.
H.R. 1058: Mr. TURNER and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.
H.R. 1070: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1094: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1098: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1116: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MARINO, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1122: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1124: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 1143: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1148: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1155: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 1164: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1178: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1223: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1225: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1243: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 1253: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 1281: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1298: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1358: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1398: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1409: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1441: Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 1444: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1495: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1537: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 1542: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1552: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. RATCLIFFE.
H.R. 1555: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 1563: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1575: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1599: Mr. BRAT and Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 1606: Mr. CORREA, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 1626: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1649: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1659: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1661: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1676: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1686: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1699: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 1777: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 1793: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1817: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 1825: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1828: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1846: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1868: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1881: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 1884: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1905: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 1927: Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 1928: Mr. SOTO and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1953: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1957: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1991: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2029: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 2036: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COLE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BEYER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2040: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2053: Mr. BOST.
H.R. 2095: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2106: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. REED.
H.R. 2108: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2121: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2128: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 2133: Mr. BUDD, Mr. HARPER, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 2142: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2152: Mr. BUDD and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2158: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2186: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2193: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2315: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2319: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 2328: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2340: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 2386: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 2396: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2408: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2409: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2431: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. McClintock, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2472: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2480: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. NOEM, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2501: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2506: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2519: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2532: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2545: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2564: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2569: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2589: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 2598: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2628: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2695: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2696: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 2706: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2718: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 2723: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 2732: Mr. HIMES, Mr. COHEN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2740: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2790: Mr. MOULTON and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 2797: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2803: Mr. COSTA and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 2807: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 2823: Mr. BUDD and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 2825: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 2832: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 2851: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 2856: Mr. BLUM, Mr. CORREA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HILL, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2862: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 2871: Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 2886: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2901: Ms. ROSEN, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 2902: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2908: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CRIST, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2909: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DUNN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 2913: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2918: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2938: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2940: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 2945: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 2946: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 2956: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 2957: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 2970: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2979: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. BASS, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. NUNES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2982: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2987: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2999: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3003: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 3004: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 3008: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 3018: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 3032: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. KHANNA.
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.J. Res. 104: Mr. ELLISON.
H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. PITTENGER.
H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. HARPER.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. POLIS and Mr. KILMER.

H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. NUNES.

H. Res. 15: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 31: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H. Res. 43: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H. Res. 135: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H. Res. 161: Ms. BASS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. COLE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. STIVERS.

H. Res. 185: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. SUOZZI.

H. Res. 218: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Res. 257: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. EVANS.

H. Res. 265: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 282: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H. Res. 307: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 313: Mr. ALLEN.

H. Res. 318: Mr. TROTT.

H. Res. 346: Mr. BOST.

H. Res. 349: Mr. ELLISON.

H. Res. 351: Mr. ZELDIN.

H. Res. 359: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. COOK.

H. Res. 397: Mr. COHEN and Mr. BACON.

H. Res. 400: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 405: Mr. COSTA, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. EVANS.

H. Res. 407: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. MEADOWS.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 2017 No. 110

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.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.

Gracious God, Ruler of all nature, Your strong right hand continues to sustain us. The Earth belongs to You and everything in it.

Today, inspire our Senators to trust fervently in You. Lord, show them the path that leads to success in their many endeavors. Guide them with Your truth and plant Your secrets of joy in the soil of their hearts. May integrity and honesty protect them as they put their hope in You. Let Your wisdom sound a clarion call in their minds so they will glorify You with faithful service. Fill them with an attitude of gratitude.

We pray in Your merciful 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for debate only, with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The Senator from Utah, the President pro tempore.

TAX REFORM

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to discuss once again the ongoing effort to reform our Nation's Tax Code.

I have been coming to the floor regularly to talk about this subject for more than 6 years, and, during that time, more and more Americans have recognized the need to fix our broken and outdated tax system. Members of Congress from both parties have similarly acknowledged that, when it comes to our Tax Code, the status quo is untenable.

President Trump has made tax reform one of his top priorities, which is essential. Presidential leadership on tax reform has been sorely lacking in the past. Of course, for some the involvement of the President in this endeavor complicates matters. Indeed, some of my friends on the other side of the aisle are, by all appearances, bound and determined to block the passage of any part of President Trump's agenda even if, in terms of policy, there is common ground and it is good for all Americans. Still, I welcome the involvement of the President in this effort and hope that more and more of my colleagues will eventually do the same.

Today I want to take a few minutes to rebut the growing narrative in the media and elsewhere that tax reform is going to be a secretive exercise, involving the input of only a few key players.

True enough, there have been meetings involving the administration, House and Senate leaders, and tax writers in recent weeks, wherein we have been discussing tax reform at a high level in an effort to reach some agreement. However, while this process may result in an agreed upon framework, this will not be the be-all and end-all of tax reform. On the contrary, as chairman of the Senate's tax-writing committee, I am committed to ensuring a robust process in the Senate for developing, considering, and passing any tax reform package. That is how the Senate functions best, and that is what I intend to see happen.

Toward that end, I have been working to involve all of the Republican members of the Senate Finance Committee in this effort. We have a number of great Senators on the committee, many of whom have put in years of work on different areas of the tax system. I think it would be foolish to let that experience and expertise go to waste, especially at this time in our lives. Every Republican on the committee is involved in this process, and I have asked some Senators to focus on particular areas.

For example, I have asked Senators ENZI and PORTMAN to focus on the international tax system. This issue is essential. Our antiquated international tax system leaves American businesses at a decidedly competitive disadvantage, and it is one of the main drivers behind the stream of inversions and foreign takeovers we have seen in recent years. Both of these Senators have put in a lot of time and a lot of work on this issue in developing proposals for a better path forward, and some of that development in the past has occurred with substantive input from our Democratic friends. With both Senators ENZI and PORTMAN working on this issue, I think we can and will see significant progress.

In addition, I have asked Senator GRASSLEY, a former Finance Committee chairman himself and currently chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to take a look at our individual tax system. I think most of us here in Congress—and not just on the Republican side—would like to see a tax reform bill that reduces the tax burden on middle-class individuals and families. I think Senator GRASSLEY and others will put their experience to good use.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

Likewise, Senator THUNE has quite a bit of experience and expertise when it comes to the business tax system, and he has done a lot of work over the years to reform the estate tax. So I have asked him to provide his thoughts and advice as we work through these issues.

I have asked Senators HELLER and CASSIDY to work on solutions for energy tax policy. Similarly, I have asked Senator ROBERTS to find solutions to tax issues relating to agriculture.

There are other issues out there, as well, and over time I intend to enlist the help of other committee members to focus on particular tax issues and provide advice and assistance on crafting suitable reforms.

So, as you can see, the idea that tax reform is going to be a closed-door exercise is absurd, at least as things pertain to the Senate. Every Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee is involved in this effort.

Of course, we will need to go beyond the committee as well. There are Members throughout the conference with particular interests and expertise relating to tax policy. Many of my colleagues have introduced bills over the years and have become outspoken advocates on a number of key issues. I want those Members to be involved as well.

Just to be clear, I do not think this process should be limited to just Republican input. I want to see Democrats at the table. I want a bipartisan process that renders a bipartisan result. I think the relevant leaders from the administration have said much the same thing.

I have reached out to my Democratic colleagues on the Finance Committee and invited them to participate. Once again, I do not believe this process has to be limited to the committee. Any Member of the Senate, from either party, should have an opportunity to express his or her views and ideas and have them considered as part of this process.

I am willing to sit down and work with anyone who wants to be a good-faith participant in this endeavor and who wants, ultimately, to see it succeed. After all, we have had years and years of bipartisan efforts, including working groups and reports, to find common ground. Recently, however, we have not been hearing much from our Democratic colleagues and friends when it comes to tax reform.

We have heard some of the usual accusations that Republicans are hell-bent on giving massive tax breaks to the super wealthy and inflicting some harm or another on the middle class—total bullcorn but, nevertheless, a constant theme by those on the other side. It is a constant, annoying theme by those on the other side.

We have also heard some process demands that some have set as preconditions for any real bipartisan tax reform discussions. All too often, those preconditions either reflect a lack of willingness to compromise or outright demands for things that are unrelated to tax reform.

In other words, we have heard our colleagues cite a number of reasons as to why they do not want to work with us on tax reform, and I suspect that, to some degree, this false narrative about secrecy and closed doors on tax reform will be added to the list. But I will say it again: I am willing to work with anyone—Republican or Democrat—in this effort. If anyone doubts my sincerity, I think my record for bipartisanship and compromise should speak for itself.

Long story short, my goal on tax reform is to draft and pass a bill with the broadest possible support and input from all who are interested in helping put our economy on a sustained, higher growth path. To do that, I think we need a vigorous and open debate in the Senate, which, in my view, should include a full process in committee and regular order on the Senate floor. At the end of this process, no one should be able to credibly claim that he was unable to participate or that he did not have enough information about the bill.

So I hope this puts to rest any claims or suppositions that the tax reform process is going to be secretive in nature, because, if I have my way, this process is going to be open, fair, and joint. It will be open, and it will be bipartisan.

The goal of everyone in this body, with respect to tax reform, ought to be to help the American people by providing tax relief to American families, simplifying the tax system, improving our business tax system to allow American businesses to compete in the global economy, and creating stronger growth in the economy, wages, jobs, and opportunity.

I hope more of my colleagues will join me in supporting this important effort. It is important that we work our Tax Code out. It is a mess. It is not working. Too many people feel oppressed by it. A lot of our Members of the Senate do not feel very good about our current Tax Code. I do not feel good about it either. I think we need to get together as people who really want to help this country out and want to do the best for our constituents—whether they are Democrats, Republicans, Independents, or whatever—and do it the right way.

I just hope we can get enough interest on both sides of the floor to be able to do what really needs to be done in this very crucial area, and I intend to see that we do. As chairman of the tax-writing committee, we are going to do it. I just hope that I will have some support from the other side, as well, and that they will dig in and present their viewpoints and give us their ideas and help to mold and modify and work and improve and decide what is great in any tax approach that we take.

This is the greatest country in the world. We have the greatest economy in the world. We have the greatest opportunities in the world, but we can certainly hurt every one of those aspects of our lives if we do not handle the tax reform issue properly and if we do not handle taxes properly. I think it is important that we get together, work together, and get rid of some of the churlish stupidity that occasionally exists around this place and start doing what is best for the United States of America and best for all of our supporters, best for all of our constituents, and best for the world, really, because, if the United States is strong and powerful, the rest of the world will be better off.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BETTER CARE RECONCILIATION BILL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would like to read a few headlines from the past couple of weeks.

From the Detroit Free Press: ''ObamaCare rates in Michigan could skyrocket as much as 31 percent in 2018.''

This is from the Associated Press: ''New Mexico health insurer proposes 80 percent premium hike.''

From the Washington Examiner: ''CMS: 47 counties won't have ObamaCare coverage in 2018.''

From Bloomberg: ''Anthem to Leave ObamaCare Markets in Indiana and Wisconsin.''

From the Washington Free Beacon: ''Last Insurer in Delaware Requests Rate Hike of 33.6 Percent for 2018.''

These headlines should probably be shocking—an 80-percent premium increase; 47 counties without an insurer—but they are not. Insurers leaving the market, huge premium hikes, lack of coverage—that is par for the course for ObamaCare. Unfortunately, too many Americans have gotten used to those types of headlines. I have lost count how many times I have come down to the floor to read similar headlines.

While these headlines may not be shocking anymore, they are still disturbing. Behind these stories are tens of thousands of struggling Americans who can no longer afford the ObamaCare premiums, Americans who are losing their healthcare plan again, Americans who are worried they won't have any coverage options at all for 2018. ObamaCare may have been well-intentioned, but good intentions are not enough.

ObamaCare was fatally flawed from the beginning, and it is rapidly imploding. We can do one of two things: We can just wait around for the exchanges

to collapse completely, as our colleagues across the aisle seem inclined to do, or we can act. Sitting around waiting for the exchanges to collapse might be the easier path, but we can't do much good for the American people if we are sitting on the bench and watching.

Republicans promised the American people that we would rescue them from the burdens of ObamaCare, and we intend to keep that promise. Last week, Senate Republicans released legislation to start undoing the damage caused by ObamaCare. It is called the Better Care Reconciliation Act.

To start with, our bill provides relief to individuals and families by repealing ObamaCare's burdensome individual and employer mandates. Under our legislation, Americans will no longer be forced to buy insurance they don't want or can't afford. Employers will no longer be faced with the choice of reducing worker hours or not hiring more employees simply to avoid the Federal Government's heavy hand.

Our bill also repeals the burdensome ObamaCare taxes. Taxes have consequences. When you raise taxes on everything from lifesaving medical devices, such as pacemakers, to health insurance itself, which ObamaCare did, it is no surprise that these things get less affordable. Our goal with this bill is to make healthcare more affordable and more accessible for all Americans. Repealing ObamaCare taxes is one part of that.

Stabilizing the rapidly collapsing ObamaCare markets is another part. Premiums on the exchanges are spiraling out of control, and insurers are fleeing the marketplace. The Better Care Act will help stabilize the markets and check premium increases.

The Better Care Act provides funding to help States implement solutions to help make healthcare more affordable for their low-income and high-risk residents.

Giving States flexibility was an important priority for us in drafting the Better Care Act. ObamaCare, of course, took the opposite approach, attempting to impose a one-size-fits-all solution on every State in the Union. But the problem with that is that it is pretty much impossible for a massive Federal bureaucracy to hand down one comprehensive solution that will somehow meet the needs of everyone in this country, not to mention that top-down, one-size-fits-all solutions are seldom the most efficient or affordable. Bureaucracy costs money, after all.

Our goal in drafting the Better Care Act was to make sure the States had the flexibility to address the needs of their specific populations. So we provide a State innovation fund to help them meet the particular needs of their residents. We also empower States by simplifying the waiver process by which they can seek relief from some of ObamaCare's demands and by allowing them to encourage a greater variety of healthcare solutions. We give States more flexibility when it comes to meeting the needs of their residents who rely on Medicaid.

In addition to giving States the flexibility to design affordable healthcare solutions and to encourage innovation, our bill also provides help directly to Americans who are most in need. The Better Care Act provides advanceable and refundable tax credits to Americans making from zero to 350 percent of the Federal poverty level. The credits are adjusted to ensure that those in the most need get the most help.

Among other things, these credits will provide help to low-income Americans around the country who currently receive no healthcare assistance. In many States, thousands of Americans are unable to qualify for Medicaid but don't earn enough to get ObamaCare subsidies. That leaves these families with no assistance when it comes to purchasing health insurance. The Better Care Act fixes this.

The Wall Street Journal reports: ''The Senate bill would extend eligibility for premium subsidies to about 2.6 million more adults with income below the federal poverty line, according to estimates from the Kaiser Family Foundation.''

Since ObamaCare became law, I have heard from so many South Dakotans struggling under the law's mandates and the massive healthcare costs it has imposed. This bill is going to bring them relief. No more ObamaCare mandates, protection for those with preexisting conditions, more affordable premiums, a more stable insurance market, assistance for low-income families, more flexibility to contribute to health savings accounts, increased flexibility for States to meet the needs of their Medicaid populations, more funding for hospitals that provide care to low-income South Dakotans, relief from ObamaCare taxes and, for the first time ever, 37,000 South Dakotans living below 100 percent of the poverty level will have assistance in getting health insurance on the individual market. This bill will give South Dakotans and all Americans access to better and more affordable healthcare.

The Better Care Act is the product of weeks of dialogue and collaboration among the Members of our conference, and I am particularly grateful to Senators ALEXANDER, ENZI, and HATCH, who have helped provide outstanding leadership throughout this process.

As I said earlier, Republicans made the American people a promise. We promised we would provide relief to the millions of Americans suffering under ObamaCare, and this bill delivers on that promise. I hope we will have the opportunity soon to vote for this legislation because it is time to give the American people access to real healthcare reform.

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.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I just want to take a moment because we have all been so focused, and there has been so much concern about what is going to happen in terms of healthcare in this country. So many people have called me concerned about whether they are going to be able to continue their cancer treatments or whether their child is going to be able to get the operation they need or whether their mom with Alzheimer's is going to be able to continue to get nursing home care and so on, and I thank everyone who has told their story.

We have spent 6 months. This debate, this fight, isn't over yet, but it started the day after we were all sworn in, in this Chamber, in January, on January 4. A process was set up intentionally to be a partisan process that took just 51 votes, and instead of the regular committee process and working together, a path was initiated. Great concern went out across the country about what would be happening in terms of healthcare.

People have spoken up. They have written letters, emails, and made phone calls, and marched and told their stories. Today, at least for a moment, this Senate will not proceed this week because there are not the votes to proceed to what I believe is a complete unraveling of our healthcare system. That may come. Certainly, I don't underestimate people's abilities to make deals and to create a way to have this happen when we get back from the Fourth of July, but at least, in the short run, I want to thank everybody who has been involved and spoken out about this critically important issue.

There are lots of things that have been said on this floor and have been said publicly about the healthcare system. We do have a situation of people buying insurance on the private exchanges where there is a combination of things that have been done to create the situation where people are paying more, but there are also situations where there are problems and not enough competition and areas where people are paying too much, and we need to address that.

One of the biggest cost drivers is the cost of prescription drugs, and we desperately need to address that. I hope, when we come back after this next week, the Fourth of July, that we will have a conversation about the real problems we need to address, to build on healthcare, not take away medical care from tens of millions of people but to build on successes and tackle the things that aren't working.

I am very concerned about small businesses. I have introduced a bill

that would give a 50-percent tax credit for small businesses with 50 or fewer employees to help them cover the cost of their employees. We know most people who don't have insurance work for a small business or work for themselves as a single employer. Let's help them.

There are things I know we could work on together across the aisle that would lower costs and tackle the real problems.

This is what I also know; that is, when people talk to me about lowering cost and addressing healthcare, they are not talking about another tax cut for multimillionaires or billionaires. That is actually not on their list of healthcare reforms. It is in the bill that is in front of us, but it is not on the list when someone says to me: You know, I want to bring down out-of-pocket costs so I can afford insurance for my kids and, by the way, would you give another tax cut to multibillionaires. That is not on the list.

If we could come together and take the two things off the table, tax cuts funded by the second thing, which is cutting medical care for seniors, families, and children on Medicaid—if we could take that off the table and focus on the real cost drivers, the real problems that need to be addressed so that healthcare is more affordable, then we would see enthusiasm on our side of the aisle and probably both sides of the aisle. I know we can come together; the Presiding Officer and I have worked together many, many times on issues. We can do this again, but we have a situation where somehow tax cuts get involved in every debate. Secondly, addressing Medicaid, which is actually saving money for taxpayers, States, and families, is part of this in a way that makes no sense.

I have said it before, but just to illustrate it one more time, our Governor and State legislature expanded Medicaid to working families, people making minimum wage, and what has happened as a result of that? Well, 97 percent of the children in Michigan can go to a doctor. What does that mean? That means they cut in half the number of people walking into the emergency room who don't have insurance and can't pay. Uncompensated care is down by 50 percent, and guess what happens. Magically, the State of Michigan is saving money. There is $432 million more in the budget—taxpayers' money—and that savings can be used for something else important in the State, other than paying for people who don't have insurance, can't see a doctor, and have to use the emergency room.

For me, this debate gets all smooshed together with all kinds of things that aren't connected to each other. The truth is that Medicaid is saving money. More people can go to the doctor and get preventive care. Fewer people are walking into the emergency room, which is the most expensive way to get healthcare. This is working. For seniors, three out of five seniors in Michigan in nursing homes are there because of Medicaid healthcare.

I am not interested in cutting healthcare for seniors, children, and working families. I am not interested in a tax cut that is going to give the top 400 people in the United States a combined $33 billion in tax cuts. But if we want to focus on small businesses, folks who are individually buying insurance and either can't find insurance or it is too high, count me in. Count me in. That needs to get fixed, and that involves making sure that the administration does not continue with actions that are raising people's costs on purpose. We need to fix the things in the system that aren't working.

I hope that for the rest of this week, next week, and beyond, we can have some real conversations about working together to solve the real problems that deal with costs, prescription drug costs, out-of-pocket costs for people, and we can do that in a bipartisan way if we are focusing on the real problems in healthcare and how we make healthcare stronger, better, and more affordable for American families.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess until 4:20 p.m. today and that following the recess, Senator WYDEN or his designee be recognized for up to 60 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:36 p.m., recessed until 4:20 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BLUNT).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the last few days have proven, once again, that political change in America doesn't start in Washington, DC, and then trickle down. It is from the bottom up.

Because millions of Americans called and texted and tweeted their opposition to an abomination of a health plan, that plan is not going to be on the Senate floor this week, thanks to grassroots America. It is so appropriate at this hour. I also want to make clear we have a bottom line for the next 2 weeks. We have an incredible amount of heavy lifting we have to do to make sure working families and seniors get a fair shake from the American healthcare system.

I say that because, as we speak, Senate Republicans are at the White House strategizing with the President. The horse-trading has already begun, and the Senate Republicans have a slush fund paid for by working families that contains hundreds of billions of dollars that can be used for sweetheart deals that would get them the 51 votes needed to pass this horrendous healthcare bill in the U.S. Senate.

Now I will turn to what we need to focus on in the next 2 weeks at townhall meetings, civic group lunches, discussions with rural healthcare providers. That focus has to be to highlight what this flawed Republican bill really means and how it can't be fixed no matter how much money the Republican leadership throws at these problems. This bill is a healthcare smash-and-grab, designed to benefit the fortunate few, and is paid for by hundreds of billions of dollars in reductions from Medicaid—tax breaks for the wealthy that Senate Republicans are so anxious to dole out, they are willing to make them retroactive. Contrary to what Senate Republicans say, their tax changes don't create jobs. They do create tax windfalls.

Exhibit A, under their bill, you have a $1 million capital gain in February, and, if this bill passes, that lucky person would get a $38,000 tax break. Many of these gains go directly into the pockets of America's 400 most affluent families, while disabled kids, those with opioid addictions, and families where a baby boomer has the misfortune of having a stroke and needs nursing home care face the prospect that the crucial health services they need—services that are life and death for them—will not be there because of this flawed healthcare bill.

Next, I want to point out that over the next 2 weeks, we are going to lay out how this legislation would send costs into the stratosphere for millions and millions of Americans. Start with older people who are about to get hit by what I call a double-age tax. If this bill goes through, insurance companies will have a green light to charge older Americans more than they charge younger people. As if that doesn't raise their costs enough, older Americans are also going to be forced to pay a higher share of their income on healthcare costs because the Senate Republican bill shrinks their tax benefits as they age. Older Americans need more healthcare. They can't afford to skimp out on bare-bones insurance. So many of our older people are going to see their premiums nearly quadruple.

It is not just older Americans who are going to see their costs jump. Right off the top, hundreds of thousands of middle-class families across the country are going to lose tax cuts for healthcare because the Republican bill snatches away their eligibility.

When it comes to the private insurance market, this bill is centered on a plan to push Americans into bargain-basement healthcare coverage. After all the talk about deductibles and out-of-pocket costs being unaffordable, this

Republican proposal ties middle-class benefits to high-deductible, low-value insurance plans. It is a sleight of hand to make it look like consumers are getting a better deal and lower premiums.

Here is the reality. Of course you can make premiums go down if you force people into insurance that only covers bandaids and a bottle of aspirin. When people get sick or suffer an injury, they are going to read the fine print on their insurance. With this legislation, if it were to pass, they would see sky-high deductibles and cut-rate coverage. For working families, they would face the prospect they would get buried under medical debt because their insurance doesn't cover the care they actually need.

Finally, not even people who get their insurance at work—those folks probably thought they were home free in this debate—not even folks who get their insurance at work are safe from the Senate Republican healthcare plan. Four million Americans are going to lose their employer-sponsored insurance coverage just next year if this bill goes through. Tens of millions of Americans could once again face some of the worst insurance company abuses—annual and lifetime limits on coverage. Those are limits the Affordable Care Act banned, but Republicans are proposing to bring them back.

Let's be real clear. If you bring them back and don't protect people from skyrocketing costs, it means that if they develop cancer, they could bust through their coverage limit, and, once again, we would go back to the days in America where those folks were forced into personal bankruptcy because millions of people without coverage will be unable to pay for the care they need. People with employer-based insurance are going to get hit with a hidden tax in the form of higher premiums.

So if an American listening to this is considering early retirement, think again. The cost could well be too high. If you were thinking of leaving your job, becoming an entrepreneur, and starting your own business, you can think again. Your costs could be higher under this plan, especially if you have specific medical needs.

Then there is the generation of adults in the workforce today—people who are middle class, who are doing everything they can to support their families and save whenever possible. They may not be thinking about the expense of long-term care, but the fact is, growing older in America really costs a lot.

Because of this bill, millions of people will no longer be able to count on Medicaid being there to cover their long-term care in a nursing home or at home where they are most comfortable later in life.

I want to close by way of saying that what we have to do now is make sure that—to beat this destructive Republican bill; this is the only way to do it—Americans keep tweeting, keep sending letters, keep finding rallies to attend, tell your stories about how you are going to do worse with this bill. And then tell your friends' stories and your family's stories. It is a virtual lock that this bill is going to come back around.

I close today by way of saying that grassroots America, by speaking out—the fact that they did that and did all that work I have described is why this flawed bill is not going to be voted on in the Senate this week. We need everybody over the next 2 weeks, seniors and working families and people all across this country—my message is that we need you to stay loud because that is the only way we will finally stop this bill in its tracks.

I yield to our friend from Maryland, Senator CARDIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRASSLEY). The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator WYDEN for his leadership on this issue and so many issues, his position as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee. He serves this body very well, and he has done that today in outlining the flaw of the healthcare bill that was presented a week ago by the Republican leadership and what it would do to our healthcare system.

I want to acknowledge that I am very proud that I was in the Congress when we passed the Affordable Care Act. Today, millions of Americans have coverage who didn't have coverage prior to the enactment of the Affordable Care Act. I am also proud about the quality of that coverage. That coverage has guaranteed benefits so that individuals know they will be covered for their needs—no preexisting conditions, no caps. It is affordable, and we made sure it was affordable to the people of this Nation.

I have listened to the debate from some of my Republican colleagues about how the Affordable Care Act is collapsing under its own weight. Nothing could be further from the truth. The problems we are experiencing with high increases in the individual marketplace are caused in part by the actions of the Trump administration to try to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

Let me give an example in my own State of Maryland, where CareFirst—the largest carrier in the individual marketplace—sought about a 50-percent increase in individual rates, and they were very direct. At least half of that increase is as a result of the uncertainty of the Trump administration putting the cost-sharing payments into the budget. That raises the premiums for all of those individuals in the individual marketplace. There is also the uncertainty as to whether the Trump administration is going to enforce the requirement that people buy insurance, which means only the people who have higher risks are likely to buy the insurance, raising the price for those who want to buy insurance.

When we talk about the fact that there are increased costs beyond what we think are reasonable, recognize that it is the actions of the Trump administration that are causing a large part of that premium increase, which brings me to the bill that was unveiled last week by the Republican leadership. It moves us in the wrong direction in trying to fix the problems. It does that because it decimates the Medicaid Program. The largest expansion of coverage has been in the Medicaid Program.

This bill will significantly cut back—CBO has scored that a total of 22 million individuals who have insurance today will lose their coverage, but it does more than that. It does that for what reason? Not to make healthcare more affordable—it does that in order to give tax cuts to the very wealthy.

I am glad that we now have a little cooling-off period. We are not going to come back to the bill for about another 10 days, it looks like.

I want my colleagues to know that as proud as I am of the Affordable Care Act, I acknowledge that we can make it better. I hope Democrats and Republicans will work together to move in the right direction on improving the Affordable Care Act. Let me give some examples.

We know there is a high cost on the premiums, a higher increase than we would like. Why don't we join together to make sure there is predictable cost sharing provided to the companies that are in the individual marketplace? That would remove the uncertainty and reduce the premiums significantly in the individual marketplace. Why don't we work together, Democrats and Republicans, to increase the subsidies we provide to low- and middle-income families so that the premiums will be more affordable? We intended to do that under the Affordable Care Act, but after we got the cost scoring, we had to trim that back. Let's work together, Democrats and Republicans. Those two changes alone would deal with the concern that in the individual marketplace, we are seeing large premium increases. Together, we can solve that problem.

Why don't we work for more competition? I have heard my colleagues talk about the fact that some of the insurance companies are leaving, and some are mainly because of the uncertainty as to whether they are going to get their rightful payments for cost sharing. We can do something about that.

Why don't we, Democrats and Republicans, come together and say that there should be a public option with no public subsidy, so it is a level playing field of competition? That way, we are guaranteeing to every market in the country that there will be coverage for the people in your community. That encourages more competition. That gives stability in the marketplace. We could do that together.

Then, Democrats and Republicans, let's work together to bring down the

overall cost of healthcare in this country. We made proposals that—why are we paying more for prescription drugs, twice as much as our Canadian friends? Because they have an organized market, and they negotiate as an organized market. Why don't we come together and say: Let's take the entire market that we have for the government paying prescription drugs and have one negotiation? That would significantly bring down the cost of prescription medicine.

Why don't we build on efforts that we have done for collaborative healthcare, for value-based reimbursement? That would significantly reduce the cost. We have seen that in mental health and addiction. We could see the same savings in kidney care and in diabetes and heart disease.

There are ways we can improve the Affordable Care Act. Democrats are ready to work with Republicans to get that done. What we will not do is make this current system worse. We are not going to cut the Medicaid Program in order to provide tax cuts to the wealthy. Join us in improving the law to make premiums more affordable in the individual marketplace, to bring more competition into the program, and to drive down the overall cost of healthcare in this country. That is what Democrats stand for, and we are ready to work with Republicans today in order to get that done. I would encourage our colleagues to work together, and let's improve the healthcare system.

Mr. WYDEN. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. CARDIN. I yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I know my friend from Maryland is a real expert on this whole matter of private insurance, going back to his days in the State legislature, and I was director of the Gray Panthers.

I think what you are saying is that it is critically important that we get more predictability and more certainty in the private insurance market. What I am struck by is, of course, this is the private sector. This is not the government. This is the private sector. The President has been basically pouring gasoline on the fires of uncertainty in the private insurance market because he is always in or out on this question of cost sharing, and the private insurers then say: We can't really predict what our rates are going to be, and maybe we have to pull out or we have to raise rates.

Could the Senator again highlight his thoughts with respect to more predictability and more certainty? It is such an important point.

After my good friend from Maryland has made that point, I know the Senator from Delaware is interested in the same subject.

Mr. CARDIN. Senator WYDEN is exactly right. I have met with the largest insurer in Maryland. I have gone over their rate requests for this year. They told me directly that the largest amount of their premium increase request is based upon the uncertainty.

They don't know whether the cost sharing is going to be put in the budget, and they have to make their decisions on rates now. Not knowing that, they have to cover themselves, and they are asking for a rate increase under the concern that the cost sharing may not be in the payment.

That was not only envisioned, we thought it was mandated in the Affordable Care Act. Now the President is talking about: Well, maybe I am not going to put it in. And we see some of his other activities. So if you are an insurance company and you are answerable to your board of directors and you know that this payment is how you are able to get low deductibles and copays, but you are not sure you are going to get the Federal payment, and you know that your customers are going to want the low cost sharing, you have to charge a higher premium just to cover yourself. That is exactly what was done in Maryland.

If the President of the United States had said that money is going to go into the program because that is what Congress intended, we would have had significantly lower rates in Maryland in the individual marketplace. Predictability is critically important.

Mr. CARPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARDIN. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Senator CARDIN and I serve together on the committee called Environment and Public Works in the Senate. One of the issues we deal with is clean air.

This conversation about predictability and uncertainty that businesses seek is not just in health insurance, it is in all kinds of businesses across the country.

I remember being in a conversation 8, 9 years ago with—I think Senator ALEXANDER of Tennessee was with us. We met with the CEOs of a number of utilities across the country. Senator ALEXANDER and I were pushing legislation in response to President George Bush's proposal called Clear Skies. It was designed to reduce the emission of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, mercury, and CO_2, carbon dioxide. We talked with these CEOs from across the country for an hour in my office. We had been talking about reductions of X percent and Y percent and so forth in the emissions from these harmful pollutants from primarily coal-fired utilities. At the end of the conversation, this one older fellow who was representing a utility in the southern part of our country—he was sort of a curmudgeon-like person—he said: Senator, this is what you need to do with respect to the restraint on emissions, reduction in emissions. Here is what you need to do. You need to tell us what the rules are going to be. You need to provide us some certainty and predictability and give us a reasonable amount of time to comply and then get out of the way.

I will never forget that conversation. Tell us what the rules are going to be, provide us with some certainty and predictability, a reasonable amount of time, and get out of the way.

It is not just utilities that want certainty and predictability, so do others, and particularly, as utilities are a regulated industry, so is insurance. They do like to have predictability and certainty.

We tend to focus just on the exchanges and the marketplaces in the 50 States, which provide health insurance for maybe 5, 6, 7 percent of Americans who get healthcare coverage. Most people get their healthcare coverage from employer-provided programs. Maybe 20, 25 percent get their coverage through Medicaid.

I used to think Medicaid was healthcare for poor women and children. When I was elected State treasurer, I used to think Medicaid was healthcare for poor women and children and not much else, and it turns out, it is a lot more than that today. Twenty, twenty-five percent of folks get their coverage there, another 15 percent or so in Medicare, and the rest are in the exchanges. Every State has an exchange. That is for folks who can't get coverage anywhere else. The idea is to have some opportunity to participate in a purchasing pool.

When we passed the Affordable Care Act, we made a promise that we would do the kinds of things that Senator CARDIN is talking about to provide certainty and predictability for the health insurance companies when they insure in these exchanges. The health insurance companies were reluctant to provide coverage to the folks who were going to get coverage through the exchanges. As my friend will recall, some of these people hadn't had healthcare for months, years, maybe even decades, and maybe some never had healthcare in their lives, so nobody really knew how much healthcare they would need, except we knew and the insurance companies knew that these people would need a lot. As my friend said, we provided some ways of reducing that lack of predictability. It is like the comic strip ''Peanuts,'' with Lucy and Charlie Brown and the football. When she pulls the football away, she always fools him. He still kicks and misses every time. We sort of did that with the insurance companies. We assured them we would help provide stability, and we took away the very mechanisms designed to do that.

I think what my friend is saying, we need to come back and provide maybe three ways to do it; one, with respect to reinsurance; two, cover the risk costs; and the third is to do something—if we don't continue with the individual mandate, we need to come up with something like the individual mandate, which is not as harmful as Republicans are suggesting. I don't think the a 6-month lockout is humane.

Mr. WYDEN. Will my friend yield?

Mr. CARPER. I will be happy to.

Mr. WYDEN. The Senator, as a Governor, really has helped educate me over the years on this whole question of the States being ''laboratories of democracy'' and trying fresh approaches. Delaware has done that and Oregon has done that.

I ask the Senator: As a former Governor, what would it mean to you if you are staring at a 20- or 25-percent reduction in Medicaid? Because as you know, that is what is contemplated with the Senate Republicans.

Mr. CARPER. I was Governor from 1993 to 2001. We started in a recession and ended up with 6, 7 really strong years, as you recall, during the Clinton administration. We were able to balance our budget 8 years in a row, cut taxes 7 out of 8, pay down some debts, and get good credit ratings across the board.

The person who was my secretary of finance the last 4 years is now our Governor, John Carney. Ben knows him pretty well. He was a wonderful member of Congress and a wonderful Lieutenant Governor before that. He is looking at a budget of less than $4 billion. He is looking at a $400 million hole to fill. What is being proposed by our Republican colleagues on Medicaid would not make that $400 million hole any smaller. It would add anywhere from $100 to $200 million—increasing it anywhere from 25 percent to 50 percent. It is a killer. Our Governor and our legislature are struggling enough to try to fill a $400 million hole rather than trying to figure out how to deal with something as vibrant as $600 million. It would be a backbreaker. That is what we are looking at. I share that with everybody.

Going to my ''laboratory of democracy,'' some people would like to have Medicaid for all. Several of our colleagues are very much interested in a single-payer system. As an old Governor—someone who had the privilege leading the National Governors Association—I am a believer that States can be that laboratory of democracy. They can take ideas and show us it is a good idea for the country and other States or take ideas and prove they are bad ideas. We ought to enable them to do that.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my friend. Would my friend like to add anything else or should we yield to Senator CANTWELL?

Mr. CARPER. I want to say a kind word about our Presiding Officer. He heard me say this before. I will say it again. He may recall having cosponsored legislation in 1993, offered by John Chafee and cosponsored by ORRIN HATCH and others, that actually had a lot of good ideas in it. It had the idea of establishing exchanges in all 50 States. Having the sliding scale tax credit brought down the cost of healthcare insurance to lower income people in the exchanges with a bigger tax credit. It had the individual mandate in there to make sure young, healthy people got coverage too. We didn't leave health insurance coverages to a pool of unhealthy young people to try to insure.

We added employer mandates so a certain number of employers had to participate. There was prohibition against insurance companies denying coverage. I want to say, our Republican friends took that idea—and Mitt Romney used that idea to establish RomneyCare when he was Governor of Massachusetts. It worked there. It wasn't perfect. It took a while, but it worked. I would just say, we shouldn't give up on that idea. We should not give up on that idea. There are ways we can fix it. Senator CARDIN talked about some of those ways, and I am sure Senator WYDEN as well.

I just heard John Kasich on one of the shows on TV. He said he was with Governor Hickenlooper. We have to stop being Democrats on this or Republicans on this. Folks want us to be Americans on this and work together. That is what I would like to do. I think we can do that in a way that brings credit, not just to our party but really to our Country. It accomplishes the three things the President talked about for a while: coverage for everybody, better quality coverage for less money. There is no way Democrats by themselves or Republicans by themselves are going to do that. If we work together, all things are possible.

Mr. WYDEN. Before Senator CARDIN leaves the floor and we yield to our friend from Washington, who is also so knowledgeable about healthcare, on this point with the States being the laboratories of democracy, during the debate with my colleagues over the Affordable Care Act, we wrote a provision, 1332. It gives the States the authority to do better, to come up with, as the distinguished Senator from Delaware, Mr. CARPER, said—it is a chance to do better and try out those fresh ideas on my colleagues.

The problem is, with the Senate Republican bill, they are talking about giving the States the right to do worse, to waive out some of these essential protections. Again, I think this is natural for something that could be bipartisan, where Democrats and Republicans could work together to really encourage States to do better. Let's not go the other way and abuse that provision in the Affordable Care Act so States can work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURR). The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I join my colleagues here from the Finance Committee. Although I don't want to admit it, it was 10 years ago that we had this discussion in the Finance Committee—my colleagues from Maryland, from Delaware, and from Oregon. What people don't realize—even the Presiding Officer knows we spent a lot of time talking about healthcare. This was not ''let's have a few meetings and roll out a bill.'' There was a very long period. In fact, the Chair knows that, in fact, our side got a lot of heat for a lot of dialogue that happened with him and our colleague from Maine at the time—a lot of heat for dialogue with her. I think there was a period of time, about 6 or 7 months, where every single day I went to at least one thing in the discussion of the healthcare policy—at least one thing every day for like 6 months. That wasn't even the markup. Those weren't even the meetings. That was just the time period where the committee had designated various subgroups so we would talk about policy.

I don't know if the two of you remember that period, but my recollection is every single day I was going to something regarding the healthcare policy and listening to experts and recommendations, and then, of course, we had these—I call them more roundtables than hearings. We had a lot of roundtable discussions, and we obviously went through a very formal bill process.

There is a little bit of irony that we are the ones out here today still talking about this healthcare bill. I think it is because we knew what the challenges were, and we tried to address them and were not afraid to keep addressing them. We are not afraid to be out here today talking about solutions we want to see as well.

I thank my colleague from Delaware and my colleague from Oregon for both being part of that effort because it really was an unbelievable amount of time and energy and discussion and formulation. The notion that somehow now we would take something that is one-sixth of the economy and draft something up in a dark process, then throw it out here—I am not surprised today that there aren't the votes. The thing to do now is not try to just rack up some votes in the next few days and come back in July. The thing to do is to sit down and have a serious discussion.

I notice a couple of my colleagues are down at the White House. They are positioned right there next to the President. Maybe they are trying to put them on the hot seat. He is sitting there talking about the individual market. He is talking about the individual market in Alaska. All I am thinking is that the individual market in Alaska—we are sitting here, and the other side is proposing to cut 15 million people off of Medicaid. What does that have to do with the individual market? Nothing.

I don't know if people are ready to focus on this the way we focused on it in that time period for more than a year—more than a year, day after day, meeting after meeting, hearing after hearing. I hope what they will do is stop this proposal and sit down and have an open process and have a discussion on these policies because they are so important.

We have been having all this discussion, and a lot of the frustration people have talked about is the individual market, where 7 percent of Americans

get health insurance. There are ways to fix and improve the individual market. I feel like I was fortunate enough to put forward one of the better ideas that worked successfully, at least it is working successfully in the State of New York, the Basic Health Program. So 650,000 people are on the Basic Health Program as a proposal. I think they call it, in that State, the Essential Plan. Two adults in a family of four can buy a policy for about $500 in premiums, on an annual basis, instead of about $1,500 on the exchange for that population that is above the Medicaid rate that needed to have a solution in the marketplace. There are 13 different companies offering insurance to those 650,000 people, so that is obviously working.

Now, it got implemented late. New York did it in 2016 because they were off to the races, but other States should now consider this. What is so great about this and helping to address the individual market is because, where we are on this side, we are willing to allow individuals who don't work for a large company to get the same clout as if they worked for a large company. When you buy in bulk, you get a discount. Americans know that. That is why they shop at Costco. If you go there and buy in bulk, you get a discount. That is what they are doing in New York. So 650,000 people have been bundled up like they are a big company and saying to the marketplace: Who wants to bid on selling us insurance? The end result has been more affordable insurance in the individual market. That is what they should be discussing down at the White House today. That is what they should be discussing, not cutting 15 million people off Medicaid. That is not a smart idea.

I am sure my colleagues here have already gone over this notion that once you cut people off of care, they end up in the emergency rooms or have exacerbated healthcare needs. So there are longer periods of time to get access to healthcare, more complicated healthcare costs, rising premiums.

We have gone around our State and heard loud and clear from the provider community and the hospitals that they have seen downward pressure on the price of private insurance because we expanded Medicaid, and the economic numbers are out there now to show the same thing. Cutting people off of Medicaid is not the solution to the individual market. I hope somebody down there at the White House brings that up.

In 2020, when the Medicaid cap—if it did go into effect—the analysis is it would cost shift $324 million per year to my State. They would be cutting people off of Medicaid, and then basically the cost would be $324 million a year to our State. You can imagine that our State doesn't have that money and isn't interested in picking up that tab. By 2028, when the Medicaid cuts start to kick in, we would be cost-shifting $4.2 billion per year to the state of Washington. That is not smart economics for us.

Over the weekend, I visited Virginia Mason Hospital in the northwest—again, a great success in delivery system reform. They implemented the Toyota model of production. There is, literally, faster turnaround time on lab reports and better expedience of nursing care. I think there was something like a 72-percent reduction in insurance liability costs. I mean, there are huge successes by changing and improving the delivery system that helps put pressure down on price. This is what we need to be talking about.

There is much innovation that was in the Affordable Care Act. We need to now ask the question: What further things do we need to do to make sure we drive down costs in the individual market as well? But with this Senate bill, you are not going to drive down price. There are reports now out by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities last Friday that show the price will actually go up in the individual market if you cut people off of Medicaid. Basically, it will just increase by several thousand dollars the actual amount of money the people in the individual market will have to pay for insurance, so that clearly is not the solution.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—I hope they come back and say that it is time to work in a discussion about these ideas in a broad way, not just another Hail Mary pass. Just get rid of this notion that cutting poor people off of Medicaid is somehow going to magically fix the individual market. It is not. I thank my colleagues from the Finance Committee who went through all of that.

Believe me; I am telling you, these discussions went on for weeks and weeks and weeks. Some people here are trying to come up with a score and get an answer in a week on this entire package. I think we debated, I would say, probably 2 or 3 weeks just on the notion of reforming—getting off of fee-for-service and focusing on a value index and getting the priorities of the delivery system focused on better outcomes at lower costs. This is something that really should be a big priority in healthcare.

I remember we had private meetings. We had the head of CBO come down and talk to us. We had hearings. We probably spent 3 weeks just on one concept of how effective that would be in the healthcare delivery system.

I see we are still here. We are still talking. We are still willing to improve this delivery system and make sure people have better access to care, and I thank my colleagues for including me in this discussion today.

I want to again thank the Senator from Oregon, the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee. I know he knows exactly what I am talking about when we talk about innovation. There is so much innovation he put into the Affordable Care Act, giving states discretion. They already have all the discretion they need; they have all the discretion they need to keep innovating.

Hopefully we will get our colleagues to follow suit because this is where we are going to deliver better care at lower costs and help improve the access for everybody in America.

I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington State who was for care coordination, moving away from fee-for-service, using bargaining power, locally driven approaches long before it really became a buzzword in American healthcare. I thank her very much for this.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon to yield for about 30 seconds?

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, of course.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, something the Senator from Washington said just reminded me—after we heard the news that Republicans are going to go back to the drawing board and see what they can come up with maybe during the Fourth of July recess, I did a radio interview with a station back in Delaware. One of the questions the interviewer asked me was: Well, the Republicans have a lot of money to play with; I hear a couple hundred billion dollars. Won't the Republican leaders just offer money to one Senator after the other after the other to find out what they need in order to get them to support this?

I said: I hope not. I hope that is not what happens. This is a time when we need to hit that pause button and, rather than dole out money to try to draw this Republican or that Republican to come into the fold, if you will, why don't we just spend some time in the rooms the Senator from Washington was talking about.

We spent all that time—a lot of time together, with Democrats and Republicans in hearings, public hearings, private meetings, roundtables, and so forth. That is the kind of thing we need to do over again. If we do that, we might be surprised. We might surprise the rest of the country about how well that would work out.

Thank you.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

Senator WARNER.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me join my colleagues on the Senate Finance Committee and not only express my concern about how we got here, but also acknowledge that an awful lot of folks in Virginia and a lot of decent folks in North Carolina and folks across the country breathed a little bit of a sigh of relief today. But that sigh of relief was just the fact that we have a bit of a reprieve from a proposal that, in my years here, I don't think I have ever seen—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia will suspend for a moment.

If the Senators are going to carry on a colloquy, the Senator from Oregon has to remain standing.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the Presiding Officer. At this point, we are just going to hear from Senator WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Thank you, Mr. President.

Again, I am here joining my Democratic colleagues from the Senate Finance Committee.

I believe that folks in Virginia and, for that matter, folks across the country got a reprieve today when the majority leader indicated that we were not going to vote on the piece of legislation that he brought forward, a piece of legislation which, as has been acknowledged by the CBO, would take 22 million Americans off of healthcare, would transfer close to $800 billion of costs currently borne jointly by both the Federal and State partnership in Medicaid and then thrust that cost upon the Governor of North Carolina, the Governor of Virginia, and a host of others. I can't recall in my time here in the Senate where a proposal has been as universally panned by organizations from the left, right, center, and everywhere in between.

As perhaps the President is now acknowledging with the majority leader and a number of other Republican Senators, using his own quote, that ''nobody knew healthcare [was] so complicated.'' The fact is, the vast majority of Members on both sides of the aisle have realized healthcare is extraordinarily complicated. It is why it took years to fashion the ACA and why there are many of us, again, on this side of the aisle who continue to say we acknowledge, years after implementation of the ACA, that there are many things that need to be fixed, but the only way they are going to be fixed is if we do it in a bipartisan fashion.

Instead, the legislation that we were going to vote on tomorrow would have actually made healthcare much more expensive, less affordable, and less accessible for a whole wide breadth of Americans. Don't take my word for it; don't take these other elected officials' word for it. Let's look at well-respected, bipartisan groups.

The American Cancer Society said that the bill the majority leader put forward ''would be devastating for cancer patients and survivors.'' The American Medical Association said that the majority leader's proposal violates the very first dictate of the Hippocratic oath, which says ''do no harm.'' Obviously, this bill would have done a great deal of harm. The American Academy of Pediatrics says ''The bill fails [our] children.'' The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse says the Republican proposal ''will crush efforts to end the opioid epidemic.'' And the AARP says the proposal ''would leave millions, including our most vulnerable seniors, at risk of losing the care they need.''

But it is not just these leading healthcare organizations that have come out uniformly and virtually universally against what the majority leader had proposed. I am also hearing that from Virginians. On Monday of this week, I attended an opening of the new PACE Program in Fairfax, VA. The PACE Program—I know the ranking member on the Finance Committee has been a big advocate of the PACE Program—is a program that works in an extraordinary way at keeping seniors in their homes rather than having them migrate to nursing homes. Well, folks at the PACE Program in Fairfax were more than disturbed when they heard that the majority leader's proposal cuts Medicaid by $772 billion. Medicaid allowed so many folks to get access to healthcare, particularly if they had individuals in their family who might have severe disabilities. The majority leader's proposal, the per capita caps would actually take away the amount of health insurance they could receive.

The truth is, Medicaid covers 28 percent of all Americans and covers about 40 percent of all poor adults and seniors. In my State of Virginia, for those folks in PACE or in nursing homes, literally two-thirds of seniors who receive any kind of care receive care through Medicaid.

The cuts in this proposed bill would devastate our seniors and their families, and the cuts will not save money because so much of this is just the old-fashioned trickle-down that trickles down this responsibility to States that, again, would have to either raise their own taxes to take care of their responsibilities or, frankly, put out seniors who receive this critical care.

Mr. President, I also want to share with you and my colleagues a meeting I had last week with a series of families who came in. They had children or adults who had devastating disabilities.

I heard in particular from Marlo Dean from Virginia Beach, who was there with her 15-year-old son Dante, who has extensive health needs because of a rare brain disorder. Dante had just received a Medicaid waiver after being on the waiting list for 10 years. Ms. Dean, Dante's mother, said:

> Cutting Medicaid is not the right thing. It's not the humane thing.

There were other families. Angie Leonard, who traveled from the Roanoke Valley with her 22-year-old son Joshua, who has autism, said that this is not what America ought to be about.

Rebecca Wood, who brought her daughter Charlie from Charlottesville, said that she has private insurance, but she is wondering what would happen when that private insurance hits its cap, a cap that had been removed when we put in place the ACA. Again, Rebecca said: ''Our country is better than this.'' Boy, oh, boy, is she right.

When our colleagues talk about cutting Medicaid, when they talk about cutting it at the numbers they are talking about or putting caps back in place, I hope they realize that this is more than about the numbers of a government program. This is about providing support and services to families facing the nightmare of chronic illness or crippling medical illness and bills, quite honestly, that they can't pay on their own. It is about peace of mind for these families.

I have said from the outset that there were mistakes made in the ACA, and I stand ready to work with any Member of either side of the aisle to make sure that we fix those mistakes. But this debate ought to be about healthcare reform, not about providing the wealthiest in our country a tax break they don't need or taking hundreds of billions of dollars out of Medicaid.

I look forward—I hope our colleagues who come back from this meeting with the President will come back with a renewed sense of cooperation and collaboration. I know there are other members of the committee who want to speak on this issue. I stand prepared to work with them and the ranking member from the Finance Committee to do this right, but it ought to be done in a way—whether it is Rebecca and her daughter Charlie, whether it is Ms. Dean and her son—that they get a chance to have their voices heard through a regular order process, where at the front end of the process we can hear the concerns, get those concerns vetted, and make sure legislation that gets brought to the floor is fully vetted and actually improves the quality of care for Virginians and Americans all across this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he yields the floor, I just want to thank Senator WARNER for his insightful comments. As a Governor, he really understands why a Medicaid cut of hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars is going to permanently damage the lives of so many people in Virginia. I thank him for his comments.

Let me yield now to Senator MENENDEZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey seek recognition?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, call me old-fashioned, but as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I still believe the legislative process matters, especially when you are dealing with matters of life and death, like healthcare.

In 2009 and 2010, we had a painstakingly open, deliberative process while drafting our healthcare reform bill.

In the Senate Finance Committee alone, we held 53 hearings, roundtables, and meetings, consulting with patients, advocates, doctors, and industry leaders.

Only after months of bipartisan negotiations and marathon markups did we bring the healthcare bill to the floor, and when we did, we spent 25 days debating it in full view of the American

people. That is how we passed a law that protected Americans with preexisting conditions. That is how we stopped health insurance companies from dropping consumers the moment they got sick. That is how we passed a law that delivered coverage to 9 out of 10 Americans for the first time in history.

Because when you have an open, deliberative, bipartisan process, you can deliver real progress to millions of Americans. But when you have an ugly, partisan, backroom process, you get an ugly, partisan bill. And that is what we have with the Senate Republican healthcare bill.

It is an ugly bill, born out of an ugly process with ugly consequences for the American people.

And you don't have to take my word for it. Just last night, the CBO confirmed that the Republican health bill will leave 15 million more Americans uninsured next year—and 22 million uninsured by 2026.

And mind you, this is the plan that Republicans promised would be so much better than the unpopular, disastrous legislation passed by House Republicans earlier this year.

Well, if Trump thought the House healthcare bill was mean, then the Senate Republican plan is downright nasty.

It is really quite simple. Republicans want to give the 400 wealthiest families in America—the Warren Buffets and Donald Trumps of our society—a huge tax cut they do not need, paid for by taking healthcare away from those who need it the most.

For years, Republicans railed against the Affordable Care Act, and pledged they would repeal and replace it with something better. But under the plan they put out last week, the only people who are better off are millionaires and health insurance company executives.

Across the board, Americans will pay the price. They will pay higher premiums, higher out-of-pocket cost, higher deductibles—all for less comprehensive coverage. That is because the GOP plan still rolls back key consumer safeguards, like protection from lifetime limits and coverage for preexisting conditions.

It still ends the Affordable Care Act's Federal guarantee that every health plan cover essential health benefits, like prescription drugs, prenatal care, hospital stays, and more. It still defunds Planned Parenthood and saddles women with higher costs. It still imposes a crushing age tax on middle-aged Americans.

My Republican colleagues like to say that this bill gives Americans more choice over their healthcare. But I have heard from countless New Jerseyans in recent weeks who know that under the Republican health plan, they will have no choice but to go uninsured.

I have heard from older workers, like Howard in Park Ridge, NJ.

He writes: Without subsidies provided under the ACA, my 51-year-old wife and I would have no insurance. We could not afford premiums in excess of $1100 a month. . . . Without these subsidies millions will go uninsured and many of these people, myself included, will die.

If all the choices Republicans provide workers like Howard are unaffordable, what good are they? That is not choice. That is a death sentence.

Or consider the half a million low-income New Jerseyans who secured coverage thanks to the ACA's Medicaid expansion.

My Republican colleagues call them ''able-bodied adults.'' But they aren't able to even afford a trip to the doctor under this bill. Many of them have low-wage jobs that don't come with health benefits—dishwashers, cashiers, home health aides. These are the people I grew up with in Union City. These are the people abandoned by the Republicans' heartless healthcare plan—people like Alton Robinson of Morris County. He credits Medicaid expansion with saving his life.

Alton struggled with addiction for nearly two decades. Medicaid enabled him to get substance abuse treatment and the physical and mental healthcare.

Today, Alton is clean. His life is on track. And he spends his working days helping other New Jerseyans get on the path to recovery.

Republicans' cruel bill leaves millions of people who rely on Medicaid expansion with no options at all. And for what? To give health insurance executives, real estate moguls, and hedge fund managers a massive tax cut they don't need?

According to New Jersey Policy Perspective, a handful of New Jersey millionaires and corporations get a $15 billion tax cut under this terrible Republican health plan, while over half a million people lose their coverage.

And, of course, this legislation goes far beyond ending Medicaid expansion. It ends Medicaid as we know it.

Their plan fulfills a decades-old right-wing mission to shred the social safety net—forcing the most vulnerable among us to pay for tax cuts for the richest among us.

It has nothing to do with giving States more choice over how to run Medicaid. Because when you slash Medicaid by nearly $800 billion, you leave States with no choice but to provide less care. When you cut Medicaid funding by $60 billion in New Jersey, you leave the State with no choice but to abandon the most vulnerable—people like Leandra, the 13-year-old girl I met last week in Newark. She suffers from a rare muscle disease that leaves her confined to a wheelchair, too weak to walk and in extraordinary pain. She takes 18 medications each day. She has survived 19 surgeries.

Leandra can't speak out against this horrible, cruel Republican healthcare bill that would jeopardize her life. But we can. And we must continue to be Leandra's voice until Republicans finally hear her.

That is the kind of process we need when we talk about healthcare—a process that gives voice to the voiceless.

So today I say to Americans everywhere: don't sit on the sidelines. Don't be silenced. Make your voices heard. Tell Republicans what this heartless healthcare plan means for your families and your future.

Mr. President, I have a group of Nordic Parliamentarians I am hosting in a few minutes. Let me say that I join my Senate Finance Committee colleagues in this effort because I still think the legislative process matters, especially when dealing with matters of life and death like healthcare.

To reiterate, in 2009 and 2010, we had a painstakingly open, deliberative process while drafting our healthcare reform bill. In the Senate Finance Committee alone, we held 53 hearings, roundtables, meetings, consulted with patients, advocates, doctors, industry leaders, and only after months of bipartisan negotiations and marathon markups did we bring the healthcare bill to the floor. And when we did, we spent 25 days debating it in full view of the American people. That is how we passed a law that protected Americans with preexisting conditions. That is how we stopped health insurance companies from dropping consumers the moment they got sick. That is how we passed the law that delivered coverage to 9 out of 10 Americans for the first time in history.

When you have an open, deliberative, bipartisan process, you can deliver real progress to millions of Americans, but when you have a backroom, partisan process, you get an ugly, partisan bill, and that is what we have with the Senate Republican healthcare bill. It is an ugly bill in terms of what it does to people, it is born of an ugly process, and it has ugly consequences for the American people.

Just last night, as we all heard, the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan scoring division for all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, said 22 million people will lose their health insurance and 15 million next year if the law were to pass.

Mind you, this was a law that was supposed to be better than the House Republican version. Well, that bill was mean, this bill is downright nasty. It takes healthcare away from those who most need it, only to give tax cuts to the Warren Buffetts and Donald Trumps of the world, who, fortunately for them, don't need it.

It is amazing to me that for years I have heard my Republican colleagues rail against the Affordable Care Act—or as they call it, ObamaCare—and pledge to repeal it and replace it with something better. They had 7 years to come together and decide what that would be, and then, on a plan that was put out only late last week, we see the consequences of something that was rushed together by 13 men, no women, and nobody creating the diversity of America that relates to their

healthcare. That is fundamentally wrong, and I am not surprised that many of my Republican colleagues revolted against it—at least at this point. The question is whether they will continue to demand of their party and of all of us the type of healthcare that we want to see for each American, because under the plan as it was proposed, Americans will pay higher premiums, higher out-of-pocket costs, higher deductibles, all for less comprehensive coverage—pay more for less.

It rolls back key consumer safeguards. There is a difference between a guarantee—when we hear the word ''entitlement,'' we are really talking about a guarantee against lifetime limits. You have a serious disease, and you come up to that cap in your insurance. You still have the disease, you still have cancer, you are still treating it, you are still fighting it, you are trying to save your life, but you don't have any more money because there is no more insurance coverage. We eliminated that under the law. There is no guarantee of continuing that safety under the Republican bill.

There is no guarantee that when you give States waivers, the way in which they treat those waivers—that you truly have a guarantee against preexisting conditions being a prohibition to getting healthcare.

Finally, if you are middle class and middle aged, this bill gives you nothing. Nothing. If you are an older American, it costs you enormously.

Let me make my final point about Medicaid. Look, I am tired of hearing about Medicaid being only about the poor, as if the poor don't deserve health insurance. They certainly do. But Medicaid is about a lot more than the poor. In my home State of New Jersey, 60 percent of recipients are either seniors or those who are disabled. They didn't choose to be disabled; they either were born with or developed a disability. They deserve the full potential of their God-given potential, as anybody else does. Medicaid provides them healthcare so they can be a successful part of our society. Medicaid provides seniors with dignity in the twilight of their lives. Medicaid provides for pregnant mothers who may not have insurance elsewhere. Medicaid takes care of special education children in our schools. And, yes, Medicaid takes care of the poor.

Medicaid expansion helps those who go to work in some of the toughest jobs in my State and in our country. They have the dignity of having healthcare and being able to stay healthy so they can work. We want them to work. Yet we take away the healthcare that is the very essence of what keeps them healthy so they can work. That is not the America I know. That is not the healthcare that was promised.

We can do better, and we can do better together. What we need to do is get over the mantra of, let's just repeal the Affordable Care Act instead of improve it. If you want to improve it and improve the healthcare of Americans, you are going to find a lot of Democrats ready to do that, myself included.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I believe we are very close to consuming the hour that the Finance Democrats have, so I ask unanimous consent that at this time Senator CASEY be recognized for his remarks and at the conclusion of his remarks, I be recognized for some final comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I seek recognition to continue this discussion on healthcare, and I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to talk about an issue that some of us have talked about, but I think it is an issue that is barely breaking through now. There has been a lot of discussion in the debate so far about various aspects of the bill. We know the bill in its current form is about 142 pages, I guess, and more than 60 of those pages deal with one topic—Medicaid. So this is basically a Medicaid bill and a tax cut bill, and the two are not just referred to on a regular basis in the text, but I would argue they are actually in conflict with one another.

I was on the floor last night showing a chart that indicated that the top 400 households in the country would get a tax cut of $33 billion. Just imagine that. Four hundred families get $33 billion out of the bill—the House bill, but it hasn't changed substantially at all when it comes to tax cuts—and then on top of that, the Medicaid cuts in just four States add up to the same number. So we have $33 billion in cuts on Medicaid for 4 States and $33 billion in tax cuts for 400 families.

If you are within the sound of my voice and you are one of those 400 families, sorry, but I don't think you deserve a tax cut.

Here is another way of looking at it. This is the same basic information, but now, instead of looking at four States, as we did last night—those four States were Alaska, Arkansas, Nevada, and West Virginia—where the total Medicaid cut was just below $33 billion, here is just one State, the State I represent, Pennsylvania. The cuts over time come up to $35 billion. The Senate bill might move that one way or the other by a little bit, but basically that is what it is. But we still have this number we just referred to—$33 billion in tax cuts for the 400 highest income households in the country. Nothing about that is fair. In fact, I think that is obscene. There are other words we could use, but we shouldn't use those words on this floor. That is obscene.

In the same bill, they are ripping away Medicaid over time, and, as we know from the CBO report we saw last night, the House bill has a Medicaid cut of 14 million people losing their Medicaid coverage over the course of a decade. In the Senate bill, the number goes up to 15 million. So 15 million of the 22 million who lose their healthcare coverage are from Medicaid.

As my colleague from New Jersey just outlined, low-income folks, folks with disabilities, and folks who need to get into a nursing home—that is basically the Medicaid population. They are low-income children and adults, adults and children with disabilities, and, of course, seniors.

That is the basic inequity here. I don't think anyone around the country, if they were looking at that comparison, would really say that is fair. How could that be fair in a healthcare bill, that a small group of Americans gets a tax cut?

By the way, it doesn't end there. It is not just the top 400 Americans, it is a lot of other people as well. So if you are in any way wealthy, this bill is a bonanza for you. This is a once-in-a-lifetime injection of revenue that you are rarely, if ever, going to see. But why should a single family get millions and millions of dollars—under this scenario, potentially tens of millions for one family—why should they get that kind of a break while others are losing their healthcare by way of the Medicaid cuts or otherwise?

So if we are going to have a real process here that leads to a bipartisan conclusion, we have to get serious about the issue of healthcare. This is not a serious attempt to change our healthcare system for the better. A third-grader could rip healthcare away from a lot of people and give away the store to very wealthy people. That is an exercise anyone could do. That is simple. But to fix problems in our healthcare system, to make sure that if you are living in a rural area and there is only one insurer, that we work to create some competition—to fix that requires some work. To fix that requires bipartisan support. It is not this exercise we have been going through so far.

I hope folks on the other side can defend this and go home and say: I voted for this bill—or the updated version of the bill in a couple of days or weeks—and I am here to tell you that I not only voted for the bill, but I am asserting that it is fair to give $33 billion to 400 households and tear $35 billion out of the Medicaid Program just for Pennsylvania—just for Pennsylvania, one State, and it gets worse when you add other States.

I know our time is short and others are waiting to speak, but we have a long way to go to make sure we are focused on some of the real challenges we have in our healthcare system, not just ripping coverage away from vulnerable Americans in order to enrich people who need no help, need no injection of a tax cut.

In fact, they don't even want the tax cut. I was at a townhall the other day, and a doctor stood up and said—if the House version of the healthcare bill went through, this one doctor in Pennsylvania would get $20,000 in a tax cut. He said: I don't need that. I don't want it. We want to fix the system. We want to make sure the people on Medicaid still get coverage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. To wrap this up, Mr. President, I was struck when Senator MENENDEZ talked about the Senate Republican health bill being more for less. I think millions of Americans might say it is a classic bait-and-switch. After the horrible House bill was passed, Senate Republicans and the Trump administration promised something new. It would have more heart. It would be less mean. But essentially what they have done is doubled down on exactly what the American people rejected in the House bill—the secrecy, the fact that the breaks went to the fortunate few and the pain went to millions of Americans who needed nursing home care, who have youngsters with special needs, or who are disabled.

The fact is that the process Senate Republicans have used on this health reconciliation bill hasn't gone well. That is why they can't go forward with consideration of their healthcare bill this week. And it looks as though—I heard remarks from one of our senior colleagues early this afternoon—it looks as though the same darn thing is going to be used for tax reform. Once again, a bill processed behind closed doors, without any input from the other party—it looks as if that is the route that is going to be taken on tax reform. I think that is unfortunate.

I have made it very clear—very clear—to the Trump administration that the history of successful tax reform is bringing both sides in early and finding ways to secure principles that each side feels strongly about that the other can live with. There has been no such consultation—zero—with respect to this administration and Democrats on the Finance Committee.

I am struck, because I wrote, over the last decade, what are the only two bipartisan Federal comprehensive tax reform bills—first with our former colleague, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Senator Gregg, and most recently with the new head of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Senator Coats, and we have had no consultation on the substance of tax reform. That is a prescription for trouble. It is, in effect, walking away from the history that the only way to get a sustainable, bipartisan tax reform plan is to get both sides together, not do what is being discussed now openly in the media: that the Republican leadership and the Trump administration are going to write a tax bill and then just pop it on the American people in the fall. And I anticipate it will be more of the same in terms of stacking the deck dramatically in favor of the fortunate few.

I say this because we heard again what appears to be the plan of the Senate Republicans to kind of double down on the flawed strategy of healthcare, which is just to do it in secret and then expect to see if maybe they can get a couple of Democrats to go along. Then they can say: Oh, that is a bipartisan bill.

That is not a bipartisan bill.

A bipartisan bill is the kind of work that was done in 1986 with my predecessor, Senator Packwood, and Bill Bradley of New Jersey, who was another tall Democrat on the Finance Committee. A big group got together and worked out a bill that made sense, broadened the tax base, and gave everybody in America the chance to get ahead.

My hope is that over the next 2 weeks, in terms of defeating a flawed healthcare bill and showing that there needs to be a different path for tax reform, the American people will keep making those calls, keep tweeting, keep texting, keep going to rallies, keep going to meetings where healthcare providers get together and say: Look, this healthcare bill that Republicans are talking about does not work for us, and it does not work for our parents and our grandparents and youngsters and the disabled folks and those who need opioid services.

Again, I thank my colleagues from the Finance Committee. We have had something like eight colleagues participate in this over the last hour.

I would just say to the American people that the reason we have been able to hold off this horrendous Senate Republican healthcare bill is that grassroots America showed again that political change does not start at the top and trickle down but comes from the bottom-up. It was all of that citizen involvement that caused the Republican leadership to put this bill off, but it is a lock—an absolute lock—that it is going to come up again in a couple of weeks.

As I wrap up my remarks this afternoon, I hope that over the next 2 weeks, the American people will be loud, will come out to their elected officials' events, and will tell them what they are for and what they are against.

On behalf of the Senate Finance Democrats, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, before I begin, I want to make something absolutely clear. This healthcare fight is anything but over. TrumpCare is not dead—not even close—and we cannot let up. It is no surprise that Senate Republicans needed another week to try to jam their TrumpCare bill through, given everything it would mean for families' health, their financial security, and their lives.

So, while we do not know what kind of backroom deals the Senate Republicans will cut or which Republicans will decide that they care more about toeing the party line than protecting the patients and families in their States, here is what we do know. The majority leader is not going to give up. He wants to get to yes, and so does President Trump, so the backroom deals and arm-twisting are going to go into overdrive starting now.

That is why my message is, to every patient and family, every mom and dad, adult caregiver, doctor, nurse, teacher, anyone who believes TrumpCare would be devastating for their communities: Do not let up the pressure. We saw what happened in the House. We need to keep fighting, and Democrats are going to keep fighting along with all of you.

One has to ask, given how mean this bill is and how clearly patients and families are rejecting it, why are my Republican colleagues pushing ahead?

It is not like this is some kind of forgone conclusion. At any moment, Republicans can drop this effort and work with Democrats on healthcare policies that will actually help patients and families and not hurt them. Yet it is clear right now that Republican leaders are not interested. In fact, they have done just about everything possible to prevent not just Democrats but anyone, including most of their own party, from being involved in this process.

As Democrats have made clear, this is unprecedented. I was here when the Affordable Care Act was debated and passed. We organized dozens of bipartisan meetings. We held hearings, and we took amendments from both sides. We certainly did not leave the fate of women's healthcare up to a few men.

Yet, with the Republican's TrumpCare plan, there have been no hearings, and there has been no scrutiny, no public input, no expert testimony. Why is that? It is that their bill is not actually about healthcare—far from it. Their bill is about giving a massive gift to the wealthy and the already well-connected on the backs of children, working families, the sick, and the elderly. It is an enormous broken promise, and yesterday's CBO report made that alarmingly clear.

Republican leaders promised to lower healthcare costs. This plan will actually raise them, especially for seniors. They promised not to pull the rug out from under patients, but this plan would take coverage from 24 million people and gut Medicaid with even deeper cuts, by the way, than would the House's version. Under their bill, they said no one would be worse off. Tell that to a woman who would have to pay as much as $1,000 extra for maternity care or who would have to see her local Planned Parenthood center closed. They said their bill would protect patients who have preexisting conditions. Read the fine print. The fine print says, this plan is a backdoor way of putting those patients' fates in the hands of the insurance companies.

This is truly shameful.

Republican leaders promised they were committed to tackling our growing opioid epidemic, but with this plan, all of our efforts—all of the work left to be done by the States—would be at risk. That would be incredibly harmful.

Over the past year, I have met so many families in my home State of Washington who have lost a loved one to the opioid crisis—in Bellingham, in Spokane, in Yakima, in the Tri-Cities—in community after community. I know the same stories are actually being told in West Virginia, in Ohio, in Kentucky, and in Pennsylvania—in States all across our country. I have heard directly from people who are on the path to recovery who have told me how their getting treatment and Medicaid coverage changed their lives for the better.

What will they do under TrumpCare?

I would be ashamed, too, if I had to defend this cruel bill over the upcoming recess. I would be ashamed if I had to explain this bill to constituents of mine like Jennifer England.

Jennifer is a woman from Kent, WA. She is a mom, a softball coach, and a cancer survivor. Because of coverage she had under the Medicaid expansion, she decided to play it safe and go to the doctor to get a lump checked out, something she told me she would not have done before. Jennifer was diagnosed with invasive ductal carcinoma. It was about to spread to her lungs and could have been deadly. Jennifer went through rounds of chemo and trip after trip to the doctor. On March 8—her daughter's 18th birthday—she was finally able to tell her daughter she was in the clear. Now Jennifer is terrified of what this bill would mean for her finances, for her family, and for her life if her Medicaid coverage goes away.

I would be ashamed if I had to defend this bill to Kelly Hill, from Seattle.

I met Kelly during a recent tour of Seattle's International Community Health Services clinic. Kelly shared with me that she has been living with HIV for 17 years and has a son with a severe developmental disability. Fortunately, Kelly told me she was able to get Medicaid when she needed it the most, in graduate school, when she was first diagnosed and when she was pregnant with her son.

Today, her son Avram is 15 years old and cannot be left unattended. He is going to need expensive care and support for the rest of his life. Medicaid plays a crucial role in keeping Avram active at home, in their community, and it allows Kelly the opportunity to have a full-time job so she can support her family. Kelly knows just how important access to healthcare is and the harm and uncertainty TrumpCare will cause.

I want to be very clear. If Republicans jam through TrumpCare this month, they will own the consequences. They will have to defend this bill to people like Jennifer and Kelly in their own States, and they will be responsible for increasing families' healthcare costs, undermining protections for people with preexisting conditions, defunding Planned Parenthood, and allowing insurance companies to charge women more. They will be responsible for taking away care for seniors, pregnant women, and people with disabilities.

Again, Republican leaders can still choose to drop TrumpCare once and for all. I am not going to take any chances, though, and neither should anyone who is listening who joins Democrats in opposing TrumpCare. I fully expect the backroom deals to continue and to get even worse now that Republican leaders have been forced to delay this week's vote. I just hope the Republicans who are rightly concerned about the impact of TrumpCare will take a close look at the facts on the table, will recognize it is time to change course, and will stand strong for their constituents.

That is what this debate should be about, making sure the people whom we represent can count on the security of healthcare when they get sick so they will not have to consider forgoing treatment for a sick child because they do not have the money and so they will be treated fairly and equally in our healthcare system.

That is what I have been thinking about these last several weeks. It is why Democrats have been holding the floor all of these nights, participating in rallies, and staying out on the Capitol steps. It is why my friend, the senior Senator from Hawaii, took to the floor yesterday and bravely talked about what this fight now means to her personally. As she said, everyone is only one diagnosis away from a serious illness, and no one should have to worry about what he will do if and when that moment comes.

In this country, healthcare should be a right, not a privilege reserved for the few. That is what Democrats are going to keep fighting for, and we will not let up.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I am deeply relieved that the majority leader has delayed a vote on the Republican's cruel bill to rip up healthcare for 22 million people. People in Massachusetts and across this country spoke out against this terrible bill, and today they proved they can make their voices heard. But let's be clear. The Republican's so-called healthcare bill has come back to life already more times than the scariest zombie in a horror movie. Despite how deeply unpopular this bill is and how hurtful it would be to families across the country, Senator MCCONNELL says he intends to vote as soon as the Senate returns in a little more than a week. That means that Senate Republicans still stand on the brink of passing legislation that will end health insurance coverage for 22 million people in America.

Make no mistake, if this plan passes, the rich will get richer and other people will die. I know that is a strong statement, and I know some people don't want to hear it. I know some people will hear it, but they don't want to believe it. But facts matter, and here is the fact that Republicans simply want to ignore: People without healthcare coverage are more likely to die than people with healthcare coverage. For many Americans, health insurance is a matter of life and death. Decades of rigorous academic research back this up. The data show that people with no health insurance die earlier than those with coverage.

For example, a 2009 study published in the American Journal of Public Health found that uninsured people died at significantly faster rates than those with insurance. The authors claimed that lack of health insurance was associated with nearly 45,000 American lives lost in just 1 year. So 45,000 American lives were lost in 1 year. That is more people in this country dying for lack of health insurance than from breast cancer, and the impact isn't limited to adults. Johns Hopkins researchers found that sick kids without insurance who end up in the hospital are 60 percent more likely to die than the children down the hall who had health insurance.

In 2012, a study in the New England Journal of Medicine compared States that expanded Medicaid, which provided coverage to millions of low-income Americans, to those that didn't. They found that for every hundred thousand people in States that did not expand Medicaid, nearly 20 more people die every year than in the States that expanded Medicaid. That is right. More people died in States that refused to expand Medicaid.

Now, we know a lot about this in Massachusetts, which has been one of the best test cases for understanding how insurance affects death rates. We have been working for years—long before the Affordable Care Act—to expand health coverage. Today, with the help of the Affordable Care Act, more than 97 percent of people in Massachusetts have health insurance. That is the highest coverage rate in the entire country.

Researchers from Harvard and the Urban Institute studied our health reforms to figure out the impact of expanding coverage. Their results, a 2014 study published in the Annals of Internal Medicine, found that Massachusetts health reform was associated with a 4.5-percent drop in preventable deaths. These data suggest that, nationwide, the ACA's coverage expansions are already preventing 24,000

deaths a year, and it is in effect in only 31 of the 50 States.

I could keep going, but the consensus is clear. A new study, hot off the press, in the Annals of Internal Medicine put it bluntly: ''The case for coverage is strong.'' The reasons are actually pretty straightforward. People who don't have access to high-quality, affordable care—people who work as hard as they can but just don't have the money—can't go to the doctor when they need to; can't get preventive care, such as breast cancer screenings and vaccinations; and can't fill the prescriptions they need to stay healthy.

When someone doesn't have coverage, they typically wait to go to the doctor until things get really bad—when the cough turns into a rattle, when the lump gets too scary to ignore or the backache makes it impossible to even to walk. This is the reason why everyone who actually works in healthcare—doctors, nurses, hospitals, patient groups, researchers, experts—is coming out against the Republican bill.

The American Medical Association—the nation's largest association of doctors—says that the Republican bill violates the most basic principle of medicine: ''First, do no harm.''

The National Council for Behavioral Health, whose 2,900 member organizations provide mental healthcare and addiction treatment to 10 million Americans, said the bill would ''cost hundreds of thousands of lives.''

National Nurses United, representing 150,000 registered nurses across the country, said the bill would ''prove to be deadly for our nation's seniors.''

The President of a leading coalition of safety-net hospitals said about the Republican bill: ''Let's not mince words. . . . People will die.''

If the Republican bill passes, ''people will die.'' That is what the healthcare professionals are telling us. The Republican plan is to kick 22 million people off their health insurance. They want to slash tax credits that help people afford their premiums. They want to open the door to insurance companies to offer plans with higher costs and less coverage.

And why? Nothing in this bill—not one thing—improves healthcare for anyone—not one thing. No, the only reason for this bill is to finance $569 billion in tax cuts for a handful of millionaires and billionaires.

There has been a lot of concern about the discussion of healthcare getting overheated. The facts do not lie. The academic studies don't mince words. If the Republican healthcare bill passes, tens of thousands of people in this country will die every year.

Republicans can ignore these facts. They can turn away from these studies. They can pretend they don't know what is going on. But the people who lose their healthcare—the babies, the women, the seniors in nursing homes, the people with disabilities, the workers who get hurt on the job, the people who get hit by heart attacks and strokes and diabetes—will suffer all the same.

Yes, if the Republicans go forward with their bill, people will die. Those are the facts. We have less than 2 weeks to make sure the Republicans hear from everyone in this country who wants them to abandon this terrible bill once and for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am back for my weekly ''Time to Wake Up'' speech, which, given the theme of the week in Washington, it is going to focus on the health consequences of what is going on in climate change. It is timely to do so because just recently the National Weather Service issued an excessive heat warning for the Southwestern United States. In California, San Diego County set a record at—hang on—124 degrees.

As a result of this heat, the National Weather Service warned of ''a major increase in the potential for heat-related illness and even death.''

In Phoenix, AZ, it got up to around 120 degrees. It got so hot that flights had to be grounded at the Phoenix airport because the hot air was too thin for the jet engines to get enough bite on the air for the planes to fly safely. The emergency rooms saw patients coming in with burns caused by walking barefoot on hot pavement or touching their cars that had gotten so hot in the sun that they were burned. There were several heat-related deaths reported in the Las Vegas area and in California.

This heat wave problem is not going away. ''Heat waves like the one we are seeing in the Southwest are becoming much more frequent,'' said Robert E. Kopp, director of the Coastal Climate Risk and Resilience Initiative at Rutgers University.

He went on to say: ''Looking forward, we expect the amount of extreme heat on the planet to continue increasing even more'' with obvious health effects.

It has gotten deadly serious in many places. In the 2003 European heat wave, there were more than 30,000 deaths across the continent, and the 3-day 1995 Chicago heat wave killed more than 700 people.

We need to pay attention. As Mr. Kopp concluded, ''that calls for a major rethink of the systems that we rely upon.'' This is not normal any longer.

This week also saw the publication in the Providence Business News of an article by Nitin Damle called ''Climate Change's Dire Health Consequences.'' Nitin Damle is a physician in Rhode Island. He is a leader of our medical profession in Rhode Island, and he just recently was the President nationwide of the American College of Physicians.

In the Providence Business News, he writes:

> The medical community is witness to the health effects of climate change now and not in some distant future. There are five categories of health effects that will affect not thousands but millions of people in America and around the world.

First, as we just talked about what we saw in Arizona and in Southern California, he goes on to say:

> An increase in global temperature and frequency of heat waves will expose people to a risk of heat exhaustion (dehydration, headaches, weakness, nausea and vomiting) and/or heat stroke (high fever, stroke, confusion and coma). The most vulnerable will include the elderly, with multiple heart, lung and kidney conditions, multiple medications and a poorer ability to regulate their body temperature.

But Dr. Damle went on to say:

> Children will be at risk due to their inability to thermo regulate, as will laborers who work outdoors and the homeless. History tells us that there have been 7,400 annual deaths between 1999–2010 in the United States, 15,000 deaths in France in 2009, 70,000 deaths in Europe in 2003 and 15,000 deaths in Russia in 2010 from heat waves.

Respiratory effects are another health consequence that Dr. Damle elucidates here.

> Respiratory effects from particulate matter and ozone result in exacerbation of asthma and other chronic lung conditions.

He continues:

> Fifty-five percent of the U.S. population tests positive for allergens and 34 million people have asthma. The increased length of the pollen season and growth of allergen-producing weeds, grasses, mold and fungus will lead to more exacerbations of asthma and chronic lung conditions at an annual cost of $56 billion per year with visits to the emergency room and hospital admissions.

I was at a conference recently and saw a presentation by Dr. Kari Nadeau, who is the director of the Sean N. Parker Center for Allergy & Asthma Research at Stanford University and the Naddisy Foundation Professor of Medicine and Pediatrics.

I am going to borrow a few of her slides that relate to the asthma and allergen concerns. Let me start with this graph, which shows asthma prevalence nationwide and asthma prevalence in Rhode Island.

In Rhode Island, we run a little bit higher for the experience of asthma than nationwide, and this is an issue that is important to us. It comes home to roost. Dr. Nadeau used this slide. This was exposure to extreme heat and precipitation events associated with increased risk of hospitalization for asthma. This was a study that was done in Maryland. As the temperature went up, and there was extreme heat or precipitation, and asthma hospitalizations went up as well.

She showed a graph from another study in New York that of the ED visits, or emergency department visits, related to ozone or related to smog, which is a well-known asthma trigger

and the estimated increase in ozone-related emergency department visits for children in New York from the 1990s to 2020s resulting from climate-change-related increases in ozone concentrations. As the ozone concentrations went up, up went the ozone-related emergency department visits.

The dark blue shows places where the emergency department visits went up 10 percent; the lighter blue, 7.8 to 9 percent; the even lighter blue, 6.6 to 7.7 percent; and in these counties, up 5.2 to 6.5 percent.

Globally, we see that pollen counts go up in conjunction with increasing carbon dioxide. In 1900, there were about 280 parts per million of pollen production, and we hit 370 parts per million in 2000. I take it back. At 280 parts per million of carbon dioxide, there were 5 grams per plant of pollen production. At 370 parts per million of carbon dioxide, pollen production increased to over 10 grams per plant. We are over 400 now. We are headed for 720 parts per million. At that point, we have more than quadrupled the pollen output.

We are seeing this happen not only in terms of the amount of pollen output that can trigger asthma but also the length of the pollen season. The months in which people who have asthma are vulnerable are extending themselves. Here, it is nearly 27 extra days. Here it is 24 extra days, 17 extra days, 19 extra days, 14 extra days, 13 extra days. We went through the middle of the country and saw over and over that the ragweed pollen season is getting long, and it is worse for asthma sufferers.

Another thing we have associated with climate change and with the dry drought spells has been wildfires. Wildfires, for obvious reasons, put a lot of stuff—ash and things—up into the air. In this monitoring map of California, when the wildfires were going on, you could see these spikes in asthma activity.

Here is before the fire. Here is during the fire activity, and here it falls back down afterward. The risks for asthma climbed dramatically during that period. The wildfires present yet another climate-related risk for people who have asthma. And here are the wildfires in California, shown to increase asthma, as determined by the emergency department visits. The emergency department visits climbed based on various risk factors. So when you are seeing folks having to go to the emergency department for asthma, that has gotten pretty serious. There is a lot of support for Dr. Damle's assertion that this is a concern we should pay attention to.

He goes on to list another category of concern: exposure to infectious disease from vectors such as mosquitos and ticks. He says it has and will continue to escalate.

> There is a documented increase in cases of dengue, chikungunya, West Nile virus and Zika.

He goes on to say:

> We will likely see a resurgence of malaria in certain areas of North America.

Other illnesses come from other consequences of climate change.

He goes on to report:

> An increase in heavy downpours and flooding in America and the world will lead to an increase in waterborne diseases such as E. Coli and other bacteria (salmonella, typhoid and cholera), parasites (Giardia) and viruses (Hepatitis A and Norwalk) with an impact on millions of people around the world.

He goes on to cite extreme weather events, which create stress, anxiety, and depression. Hurricane Katrina, he reports, led to 32 percent of people affected by the hurricane suffering from post-traumatic stress.

He continues:

> We know that there will need to be a global effort to reduce anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions and the developed countries need to take a leading role developing/implementing and moderating the success of those mitigating measures.

He concludes:

> We need to reenter the Paris agreement and move forward at the local and State levels for the benefit of our patients.

He is a respected doctor in Rhode Island. He is a clinical assistant professor of medicine at the Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University. Also, he was recently the president of the American College of Physicians.

I know my colleagues don't want to listen to any of this stuff about climate change because the fossil fuel industry controls them so much that they cannot even say the words, in many cases, ''climate change'' on the floor of the Senate, but for crying out loud, you have the former president of the American College of Physicians talking about the health effects; you have a prominent researcher at Stanford University talking about the health effects; and you have the National Weather Service warning about dangerous health effects from climate-related heat in the Southwest. When are we going to finally get around to having a serious discussion about this?

It is great that we had a little pause on this wretched healthcare bill. I couldn't be happier to be rid of it for a while, and I am hoping we can be rid of it for good, but it is probably going to come back. We will have to hammer a few more stakes into the heart of this zombie before we are rid of it, and then we can move on to a serious bipartisan healthcare bill.

There is good work to be done on healthcare. There is good work to be done on climate change. But we have to take the wretched special interest politics out so we can get to serious business.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I have come to the floor tonight to join my colleagues in opposing the Senate healthcare reform bill, what I will call the Senate TrumpCare bill. I am also here to thank the thousands of my constituents, the thousands of Delawareans who called and emailed my office to express their opposition to this bill that is about neither health nor care. It is because of your efforts, because of the efforts of thousands of Americans across the country who have made their voices heard, that today the Senate doesn't have enough votes to pass this TrumpCare bill.

I urge everyone watching and listening to remember that this fight is not over. The Senate will be back next month, and Republicans will be doing everything they can to make tweaks or shaves or changes or amendments to the bill to get it past this body. We need the engagement, the persistence, even the resistance of Delawareans and Americans to make sure the Senate TrumpCare bill never becomes law.

This is as urgent now as ever because of how fundamentally heartless this bill is. As many nonpartisan organizations, including the Congressional Budget Office, have pointed out, this bill is essentially a massive tax break for the wealthy paid for on the backs of some of America's most vulnerable citizens.

Many of my colleagues have already discussed the devastating impact this bill would have over time on millions of Americans. This Senate bill would make hundreds of billions of dollars in cuts to Medicaid, it would slash tax credits that help Americans buy health insurance, and it would force 22 million Americans off their health insurance and drive up costs for many millions more.

If that is not bad enough, the Senate TrumpCare bill does all of this slashing and cutting in large part to give another tax break to our wealthiest citizens. If this bill becomes law, the very richest Americans would get an extra $700 billion in tax breaks over the next decade.

If it only affected the millions of Americans who depend on Medicaid or who purchase insurance on the individual market, it would be unconscionable, but it is even worse. Let me explain.

Many of our constituents don't realize that even Americans who get their health insurance through their employer—the 150 million Americans who get their health insurance through their employer—have benefited from the Affordable Care Act. In fact, I think that in some ways, the consumer protections put in place by the ACA are the most important accomplishment of that bill.

A core requirement of the ACA was that all health insurance plans cover what are known as essential health benefits. These are basic services, such as emergency care, prescription drugs, pediatric services, maternity and newborn care, hospitalization, healthcare for the mentally ill, and substance

abuse treatment for the addicted. To put it more succinctly, these are all the reasons many people want health insurance in the first place. Thanks to the ACA, almost every insurance plan in the country today has to carry these core services, and that includes the more than 150 million Americans and the half a million Delawareans who get their health insurance through their jobs.

The Senate TrumpCare bill would allow States, through waivers over time, to gut these essential health benefit requirements, gradually making many Americans' health insurance less and less valuable and less and less protective of their and their families' health.

That provision of the Senate TrumpCare bill would also allow States to waive the ban on insurers imposing annual and lifetime limits on essential healthcare coverage. Even if you get good insurance through your employer, if you have an unexpected development—let's say the premature birth of a child, who develops serious medical challenges, or a terrible diagnosis that requires expensive and repeated surgery—you either have to come up with that money on your own or you are forced into bankruptcy once you hit the lifetime cap.

Let me demonstrate with an all-too-real example. About 1 in 10 newborns has to spend time in the neonatal intensive care unit, or NICU, after they are born. According to the American Medical Association, in the NICU, ''it is not unusual for costs to top $1 million for an extended stay.'' That means even a baby born to parents with great insurance coverage through their employer hit their lifetime insurance cap before they even leave the hospital for the first time.

As Americans are scrambling to find ways to pay for their astronomical out-of-pocket costs under the so-called Senate TrumpCare bill, wealthier Americans and corporations will be given big tax breaks.

Moreover, while Senate Republicans may claim their bill still covers preexisting conditions, insurance under this bill would be rendered meaningless if it doesn't cover what you need to treat your preexisting condition through these essential health benefits.

Let's briefly recap this Senate TrumpCare bill. Millions of Americans lose health insurance. Those who managed to keep it end up paying more but get less coverage. The wealthiest Americans get another big tax break. That is a painful, even cynical, political calculation.

Since I came to the Senate 7 years ago, I have said more times than I can count that I want to work with Republicans to fix the parts of the Affordable Care Act that need fixing. Let's simplify the reporting requirements that burden small businesses and increase the tax credits that help small business employers offer insurance to their employees. Let's find ways together to increase competition and expand the tax credits to bring down premiums and deductibles on the individual market. Let's explore new mechanisms that control healthcare costs by incentivizing reforms and producing healthier outcomes, rather than more tests and services. Sadly, this Senate TrumpCare bill does none of these things.

It is my hope that after today's developments, that after the next few weeks, that after hearing from their constituents and returning in the next month, that my colleagues will recognize that if we work together, we can address the broken parts of the ACA and sustain the best of what it has done to expand insurance and healthcare for millions of Americans.

Let me close with a story I shared earlier today on the steps of the Capitol. This is Kerry Orr. Kerry is from my hometown of Wilmington, DE. Kerry is a massage therapist and self-employed yoga instructor. Like many Americans, she considers the Affordable Care Act ''nothing short of miraculous.''

Kerry signed up for health insurance in 2014, thanks to a subsidy that made it available to her through the ACA. She had some nagging abdominal and lower back pain for years but didn't think much of it, considering she had no family history of disease and had never even had stitches before. But that next year, in January of 2015, a routine procedure covered by her new insurance—which she told me she wouldn't have even gone for if it hadn't been covered by this new health insurance—revealed that Kerry, in fact, had stage III colon cancer. She had surgery a week later. She had 6 months of chemotherapy, and she ultimately faced no out-of-pocket expenses and is fully in remission. Kerry's cancer has now been in remission since September 2015.

She wrote to me earlier this year:

> The ACA came along at the last possible moment to save my life. I am certain that without it, I would have continued to live with the discomfort and try to self-treat until the cancer was too advanced to be successfully treated.

I am opposing the Senate TrumpCare bill for Kerry and for the thousands of Delawareans and millions of Americans just like her. I have heard stories from Delawareans about things that need to be fixed in the Affordable Care Act, and I hope I get a chance to work across the aisle to do that, but I have also heard from hundreds of Delawareans whose lives have been improved or, in cases just like Kerry's, saved by the Affordable Care Act. I will not yield on defending the best parts of the ACA that have saved the lives of Americans across this country.

In the days and the weeks to come, I hope all Americans will stay active, stay engaged, and stay the course so that we can push aside this cruel, cynical bill and find an opportunity to work together on a bill with real heart. That fight is not yet over, and I will not yet yield.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 154, Neomi Rao to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Deb Fischer, Steve Daines, Luther Strange, Bob Corker, Thom Tillis, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Johnny Isakson, Richard C. Shelby, Michael B. Enzi, Richard Burr, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, Todd Young.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO ANNE ANDERSON

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to recognize Ireland's Ambassador

to the United States, Anne Anderson, on the occasion of her retirement. Since 2013, Anne has served as Ireland's 17th Ambassador to the United States, the first woman to serve in this role. She has done much to further the close relationship long shared between the United States and Ireland. My great-grandparents were Irish immigrants, settling in Vermont, where I was born and raised. I have long been aware of the contributions Irish immigrants make to our Nation.

Ambassador Anderson first represented her Ireland's interests in the United States in 1983, when she became the Embassy of Ireland's economic attache and then press attache. After moving back to Ireland in 1987, she served as counsellor in the Anglo-Irish division of the Department of Foreign Affairs and then became Assistant Secretary General in Corporate Services. In this role, Ambassador Anderson greatly influenced the fight for equal treatment of women in the workplace and worked to pass fair employment legislation in the North of Ireland.

Ambassador Anderson assumed the role of diplomat again in 1995, when she became Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations in Geneva. During her time in Geneva, she acted as chair of the United Nations Commission of Human Rights and vice president of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. She then moved to Brussels to serve as the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the European Union in 2001.

After some time as Ambassador to France, she returned to the United States once more to become the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations in New York until 2013, when she was named the Ambassador of Ireland to the United States. Her focus in her time as ambassador has been in advocating on behalf of immigration issues and undocumented Irish immigrants in the United States, pursuing her passion for inclusivity and equality in human rights and women's rights, and fostering the cultural art connections between the two nations.

The foundations of our relationship with Ireland are built upon and solidified by the great work of diplomats and public servants such as Ambassador Anderson, who seek to facilitate international relationships that rise above any national differences. While she may be retiring from her diplomatic roles, my friend Anne will forever be a diplomat in the truest sense of the word. Marcelle and I congratulate her on her retirement and thank her for her years of service and friendship and her dedicated efforts to strengthen the U.S. relationship with Ireland.

CBO ESTIMATE OF H.R. 1628

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, the Congressional Budget Office released its estimate of H.R. 1628, the American Health Care Act of 2017, in May 2017. Information related to this House-passed bill can be found on the Congressional Budget Office's Website with the following link: https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/115th-congress-2017-2018/costestimate/hr1628aspassed.pdf.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE HUNTLEY PROJECT IRRIGATION DISTRICT

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Huntley Project Irrigation District for its 110th anniversary and for its impact on Montana. The district originated from an irrigation project in southern Montana that was completed by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1907. The Huntley Project was one of the first Reclamation projects in Montana and led to the development and success of agricultural land in much of the surrounding area. As agriculture is Montana's No. 1 industry, it is critical that farmers and ranchers have irrigation projects set in place that are able to provide a reliable supply of water for their crops.

Leading by example is the way we do things in Montana, and this project shows how the dedication and ingenuity of our farmers and ranchers works. It has led to economic development for the area and beyond and transformed farming areas to be even more fruitful for our farmers and ranchers.

Our farmers and ranchers have made it through the tough times because of determination and have overcome many challenges. This anniversary celebrates more than an irrigation project but honors the determination and ambition of the Montana farmer and rancher. Congratulations again for the 110th anniversary of the Huntley Project, and thank you to everyone who has made it a success.•

SISSETON-WAHPETON SIOUX TRIBE'S SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

• Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 150th anniversary of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe's treaty with the U.S. Government, which coincides with the Tribe's 150th annual Fourth of July celebration.

Beginning in 1867, the Sisseton-Wahpeton Dakota Nation's annual Fourth of July Wacipi is the oldest continual event in South Dakota and one of the oldest established celebrations in the Nation. The Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe is dedicated to maintaining their culture in the modern world through art, language, spirituality, and traditions, all of which is celebrated during its annual Fourth of July Wacipi. They also use the celebration to honor area veterans who bravely fought defending our freedoms.

The story of the Sisseton and Wahpeton bands is one of movement of the Native people that made their home on the Lake Traverse Reservation, where they still celebrate today. Here, Tribal members draw on their rich history, continue their traditions, and contribute to a vibrant, growing economy in the area.

On behalf of all South Dakotans, I wish to congratulate the Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe on their sesquicentennial celebration. I thank them for their treaty, friendship, and alliance with the United States of America over the past 150 years and look forward to continuing our friendship in the 150 years to come.•

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1684. An act to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide technical assistance to common interest communities regarding eligibility for disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1726. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, to improve the organization of such title and to incorporate certain transfers and modifications into such title, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2258. An act to require that certain standards for commercial driver's licenses applicable to former members of the armed services or reserves also apply to current members of the armed services or reserves.

H.R. 2547. An act to expand the Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals who may qualify to perform physical examinations on eligible veterans and issue medical certificates required for operation of a commercial motor vehicle, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1684. An act to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide technical assistance to common interest communities regarding eligibility for disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1726. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, to improve the organization of such title and to incorporate certain transfers and modifications into such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2258. An act to require that certain standards for commercial driver's licenses applicable to former members of the armed services or reserves also apply to current members of the armed services or reserves; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2547. An act to expand the Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals who may qualify to perform physical examinations on eligible veterans and issue medical certificates required for operation of a commercial motor vehicle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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–43. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to pass legislation or adopt policies allowing Louisiana to manage the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery out to two hundred nautical miles off the coast of Louisiana; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 67

Whereas, in recent years, the Gulf of Mexico has contained the highest total allowable catch of red snapper in decades, but in 2016, anglers experienced the shortest recreational fishing season to date, lasting less than two weeks; and

Whereas, the federal government has overseen the Gulf recreational red snapper fishery for nearly four decades; today, federal management systems attempt to regulate red snapper fishing by the pound with tools specifically designed to manage the commercial sector, despite the fact that federal data collection systems are incapable of accounting to such a level of specificity for recreational harvests; and

Whereas, the federal government has, moreover, neglected to use recent data to provide meaningful guidelines and requirements for a systematic reallocation of federal fisheries; except for minor adjustments to account for errors in its own data collection system, the Gulf red snapper fishery allocation is based on highly suspect data from 1979–1986 and has remained unchanged since 1991; and

Whereas, the federal government is currently promoting a management strategy to privatize the Gulf red snapper fishery; approximately fifty percent of the fishery is already held by private businesses, while another twenty percent has been designated to be sold; shares of this public resource have also been given away for free, based on a commercial operator's past catch history; and

Whereas, because of extraordinarily remiss requirements in its conflict of interest guidelines, the federal fisheries management system allows commercial operators who already own red snapper shares or who may be gifted shares to serve on the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and to cast votes on issues that will result in direct financial benefit for themselves; and

Whereas, by creating a prohibitive environment for anglers and ethical issues among user groups and stakeholders, the federal government has proved itself incapable of properly managing the red snapper fishery in the Gulf of Mexico, and all five states along the Gulf Coast have increasingly implemented regulations and seasons that are not consistent with the federal management plan; and

Whereas, numerous studies, including some funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, indicate that the greatest economic engine in the Gulf reef fishery is the recreational angling sector, and federal control should be relinquished to the Gulf states, which depend most on this vital public resource. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to pass legislation or adopt policies allowing Louisiana to manage the Gulf of Mexico red snapper fishery out to two hundred nautical miles off the coast of Louisiana; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM–44. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada supporting and encouraging the retention of federal management and control of federal public lands in the state; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 12

Whereas, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the 78th Legislative Session urged Congress to enact legislation to transfer title to certain federal public lands in this State to the State of Nevada; and

Whereas, The Federal Government manages and controls nearly 80 percent of the land in this State; and

Whereas, A significant portion of the federal public lands in this State consists of national forests, national parks, national monuments, wilderness areas, conservation areas and wildlife refuges, all of which preserve the natural and scenic beauty of the federal public lands in this State and protect those lands from excessive human encroachment and exploitation; and

Whereas, The management and control of the federal public lands in this State by various federal agencies in this State confers an economic benefit upon the State of Nevada by saving the State of Nevada from incurring significant costs each year in managing those lands; and

Whereas, Some of the costs incurred each year by federal agencies include expenses for fighting fires, the management of wild horses and burros and the maintenance of national forests, parks and monuments; and

Whereas, The retention of federal management and control of the federal public lands in this State will ensure that access to and the use of those lands for recreational and other authorized purposes will remain available to all residents of this State; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly, That Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the 78th Legislative Session is hereby rescinded; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature hereby support and encourage the retention of federal management and control of federal public lands in this State; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation and the Governor; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM–45. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of California relative to new Outer Continental Shelf Oil and gas leasing in federal waters offshore California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 35

Whereas, California's iconic coastal and marine waters are one of our state's most precious resources, and as elected officials, it is our duty to ensure the long-term viability of California's fish and wildlife resources, and thriving fishing, tourism, and recreation sectors; and

Whereas, Hundreds of millions of California residents and visitors. enjoy the slate's ocean and coast for recreation, exploration, and relaxation; and tourism and recreation comprise the largest sector of the state's $445 billion ocean economy; and

Whereas, There has been no new offshore oil and gas lease in California since the 1969 blowout of a well in federal waters; and

Whereas, Beginning in 1921, and many times since, the California Legislature has enacted laws that withdrew certain offshore areas from oil and gas leasing, and by 1989, the state's offshore oil and gas leasing moratorium was in place; and

Whereas, In 1994, the California Legislature made findings in Assembly Bill 2444, Chapter 970 of the Statutes of 1994, that offshore oil and gas production in certain areas of state waters poses an unacceptably high risk of damage and disruption to the marine environment; and

Whereas, In the same bill, the Legislature created the California Coastal Sanctuary Act, which included all of the state's unleased waters subject to tidal influence and prohibited new oil and gas leases in the sanctuary, unless the President of the United States has found a severe energy supply interruption and has ordered distribution of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, the Governor finds that the energy resources of the sanctuary will contribute significantly to alleviating that interruption, and the Legislature subsequently amends Chapter 970 of the Statutes of 1994 to allow that extraction; and

Whereas, Section 18 of the federal Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) requires the preparation of a nationwide offshore oil and gas leasing program setting a five-year schedule of lease sales implemented by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management within the United States Department of the Interior; and

Whereas, Consistent with the principles of Section 18 and the resulting regionally tailored leasing strategy, the current exclusion of the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf from new oil and gas development is consistent with the long-standing interests of Pacific Coast states, as framed in the 2006 Agreement on Ocean Health adopted by the Governors of California, Washington, and Oregon; and

Whereas, In November 2016, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management released a final 2017–2022 leasing program that continues the moratorium on oil and gas leasing in the undeveloped areas of the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf; and

Whereas, Governor Brown, in December 2016, requested that then President Obama permanently withdraw California's Outer Continental Shelf from new oil and gas leasing, and along with previous California governors, has united with the Governors of Oregon and Washington in an effort to commit to developing robust renewable energy sources to reduce our dependence on fossil fuel and help us reach our carbon emission goals; and

Whereas, The California Legislature has led the nation with its landmark climate change legislation, requiring ambitious greenhouse gas emission reductions of a 40 percent emissions reduction below 1990 levels by 2030, and achieving a renewables portfolio standard of 50 percent by 2030; California must lead the nation in fostering the transition away from offshore fossil fuel production to protect both our climate and oceans from the damaging impacts of climate change, which will affect all life on earth for generations to come; and

Whereas, There are renewed calls for opening offshore areas for drilling and for lifting moratoriums on energy production in federal areas, which could lead to more oil spills and increased dependence of fossil fuels; and

Whereas, The California Legislature considers new oil and gas development offshore

of California to be a threat to the nation's economy, national security, and state's ambitious renewable energy goals; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate strongly and unequivocally supports the current federal prohibition on new oil or gas drilling in federal waters offshore California, opposes attempts to modify the prohibition, and will consider any appropriate actions to maintain the prohibition; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Governor of California, to the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, to the Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and to each member of the California State Senate and Assembly.

POM–46. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada expressing support for the determination of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Sustaining America's Diverse Fish and Wildlife Resources to recommend that the United States Congress dedicate $1.3 billion annually in existing revenue obtained from the development of energy and mineral resources on federal lands and waters for programs to diversify the funding for and management of all species of wildlife; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 13

Whereas, The State of Nevada is home to more than 890 species of animals, of which 65 of those species are found only in this State; and

Whereas, Congress has enacted legislation, commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 669–669j, and the Dingell-Johnson Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 777–777k, both of which were assented to by this State pursuant to NRS 501.115 and 501.117, respectively, to provide federal aid for the support of conservation, restoration projects and science-based management of game and sport fish financed by hunters, recreational shooters, fishermen and boaters; and

Whereas, A similarly dedicated and sustainable method of funding is not available for many species of birds, mammals, fish, amphibians and reptiles which are not hunted or fished; and

Whereas, In 2012, the Board of Wildlife Commissioners approved a Wildlife Action Plan created by the Department of Wildlife; and

Whereas, The provisions of the Wildlife Action Plan prioritize 256 species of wildlife having the greatest need for conservation and 22 types of habitat that require prescriptive actions to ensure the maintenance of those species and types of habitat for current and future generations in this State; and

Whereas, There is a recognized need to expand funding for the conservation of wildlife in the United States; and

Whereas, The Blue Ribbon Panel on Sustaining America's Diverse Fish and Wildlife Resources, consisting of 26 members who are leaders in business and conservation, was recently established; and

Whereas, The Blue Ribbon Panel was required to recommend alternative methods of funding to support fish and wildlife conservation in this State and to ensure the sustainability of all species of fish and wildlife for current and future generations in this State; and

Whereas, Securing a dedicated source of federal funding for the conservation of wildlife in this State will likely require this State to provide matching funds similar to the matching funds that are currently required under the Pittman-Robertson Act and the Dingell-Johnson Act; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature express their support for the determination of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Sustaining America's Diverse Fish and Wildlife Resources to recommend that Congress dedicate $1.3 billion dollars annually in existing revenue obtained from the development of energy and mineral resources on federal lands and waters for programs to diversify the funding for and management of all species of wildlife; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the Nevada Congressional Delegation are encouraged to support the enactment of federal legislation to carry out the recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Panel; and be it further

Resolved, That support is expressed for the development of policies and enactment of legislation that broaden dedicated methods of funding:

1. For the conservation of wildlife in this State;

2. For carrying out the Wildlife Action Plan of the Nevada Department of Wildlife; and

3. To provide state matching funds if a dedicated method of federal funding is obtained for the conservation of wildlife in this State; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM–47. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security Benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 22

Whereas, the Congress of the United States of America has enacted both the Government Pension Offset (GPO), reducing the spousal and survivor Social Security benefit, and the Windfall Elimination Provision (WEP), reducing the earned Social Security benefit, payable to any person who also receives a public pension benefit earned in public employment not covered by Social Security; and

Whereas, the GPO can negatively affect a spouse or survivor receiving a federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit earned in public employment not covered by Social Security who would also be entitled to a Social Security benefit earned by a spouse; and

Whereas, the GPO formula reduces the spousal or survivor Social Security benefit by two-thirds of the amount of the federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefit received by the spouse or survivor, in many cases completely eliminating the Social Security benefit even though the spouse paid Social Security taxes throughout the marriage; and

Whereas, according to recent Social Security Administration figures, more than half a million individuals nationally are affected by the GPO; and

Whereas, the WEP applies to those persons who have earned federal, state, or local government retirement or pension benefits in public employment not covered by Social Security, in addition to working in employment covered by Social Security and paying into the Social Security system; and

Whereas, the WEP reduces the earned Social Security benefit using an averaged indexed monthly earnings formula and may reduce Social Security benefits for affected persons by as much as one-half of the retirement benefit earned as a public servant in employment not covered by Social Security; and

Whereas, the WEP causes hardworking individuals to lose a significant portion of the Social Security benefits that they earn themselves; and

Whereas, according to recent Social Security Administration figures, more than one and a half million individuals nationally are affected by the WEP; and

Whereas, in certain circumstances both the WEP and the GPO can be applied to a qualifying survivor's benefit, each independently reducing the available benefit and, in combination, eliminating a large portion of the total Social Security benefit available to the survivor; and

Whereas, because of the calculation characteristics of the WEP and the GPO, they have a disproportionately negative effect on employees working in lower-wage government jobs, like teachers, school workers, and state employees; and

Whereas, the number of people affected by the WEP and the GPO is growing as nearly 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day; and

Whereas, individuals drastically affected by the WEP and the GPO may have no choice but to return to work after retirement in order to make ends meet, but the earnings accumulated during a return to work in the public sector may further reduce the Social Security benefits the individual is entitled to; and

Whereas, the WEP and the GPO are established in federal law, and repeal or reduction of the WEP and the GPO can only be enacted by Congress: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to review the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision Social Security benefit reductions and to consider eliminating or reducing them; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM–48. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging the United States Congress to enact the Marketplace Fairness Act; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas, In the case of National Bellas Hess, Inc. v. Department of Revenue, 386 U.S. 753 (1967), the United States Supreme Court held, in relevant part, that Congress alone has the power to regulate and control the taxation of commerce that is conducted between a business that is located within one state and a customer who is located in another state and who communicates with and purchases from the business using only remote means; and

Whereas, The United States Supreme Court established in Quill Corporation v. North Dakota, 504 U.S. 298 (1992), that a state government cannot, of its own accord, require out-of-state retailers to collect sales tax on sales within the state; and

Whereas, The United States Supreme Court also announced in Quill that Congress could exercise its authority under the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution to decide whether, when and to what extent the states may require the collection of sales tax on remote sales; and

Whereas, The State of Nevada and municipalities within this State receive significant operating revenue from sales taxes collected by brick-and-mortar businesses and online vendors with a nexus to the State and from use taxes on purchases made online through vendors without a brick-and-mortar location in the State; and

Whereas, Remittance of use taxes not collected by a vendor from online purchases imposes an undue burden and widely unknown obligation on consumers; and

Whereas, The unequal taxation schemes as between online and traditional retailers create a disadvantage for Nevada-based retailers, who are rooted and invested in the Nevada community and employ residents of this State; and

Whereas, The tax collection loophole for online retailers deprives local governments of revenue that could be used to fund necessities such as schools, police departments and fire departments, and other important infrastructure; and

Whereas, The Marketplace Fairness Act was introduced in the 112th Congress, again in the 113th Congress and again in the 114th Congress, to provide states with the authority to require out-of-state retailers, such as online and catalog retailers, to collect and remit sales tax on purchases shipped into the state; and

Whereas, The State of Nevada has enacted the Simplified Sales and Use Tax Administration Act, chapter 360B of NRS, which is in compliance with the Marketplace Fairness Act; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature urge Congress to enact the Marketplace Fairness Act without further delay; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation and the Executive Director of the Department of Taxation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

P0M–49. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging the United States Congress not to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or its most important provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, In 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), commonly known as the Affordable Care Act, was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Barack Obama; and

Whereas, The Affordable Care Act established a comprehensive series of health insurance reforms designed to make universal, affordable health insurance coverage available to all Americans, while also controlling rising health care costs and ending certain common industry practices that limited access to health insurance coverage; and

Whereas, The Affordable Care Act expanded access to health insurance coverage by creating health insurance marketplaces, allowing children to stay on a parent's health insurance plan until the age of 26 years, expanding Medicaid and establishing a system of tax credits to assist consumers in purchasing individual health insurance coverage and provide incentives to businesses to encourage them to provide health insurance coverage to employees; and

Whereas, The Affordable Care Act prohibits an insurer from denying health insurance coverage to a person on the basis of a preexisting condition, prohibits an insurer from rescinding coverage, eliminates lifetime and annual limits on coverage, requires all marketplace plans to provide coverage for 10 essential health benefits, including preventative care, establishes a mechanism for consumers to appeal determinations regarding coverage and establishes a system to assist consumers in navigating the health insurance marketplace; and

Whereas, The Affordable Care Act additionally requires health insurance coverage for annual well-woman visits, screenings for breast cancer and cervical cancer, screening for gestational diabetes, all approved contraceptive methods, sterilization procedures and patient education and counseling services often provided by nonprofit organizations such as Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; and

Whereas, In particular, since Nevada chose to participate in the expansion of Medicaid in 2011, approximately 181,000 new enrollees obtained health insurance coverage in Nevada through the Medicaid expansion alone; and

Whereas, It has been estimated that 370,000 adults in this State stand to lose health insurance coverage if the Affordable Care Act is repealed; and

Whereas, It has been estimated that Nevada could lose an estimated $1 billion in Medicaid funding if the Affordable Care Act is repealed; and

Whereas, The Affordable Care Act provides many other benefits and protections to ensure access to health care by all; and

Whereas, Congressional leaders have proposed repealing the Affordable Care Act during the 115th Congress without a plan to replace the Affordable Care Act which adequately protects the thousands of Nevadans who benefit from or may not have access to health insurance coverage without the Act; and

Whereas, The Congressional Budget Office reported that the congressional plan to repeal the Affordable Care Act will cost 24 million Americans their health insurance coverage by 2026; and

Whereas, Repealing the Affordable Care Act without establishing mechanisms to preserve the significant improvements and protections afforded by the law, and without adequately providing for those who stand to lose their health insurance coverage upon repeal, will have significant detrimental effects on individuals and their families, on the health care industry in general and on the overall economic well-being of both Nevada and the nation as a whole; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, Jointly, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature hereby urge Congress to fully preserve the critical benefits afforded by the Affordable Care Act which many Nevadans have come to rely upon; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress should maintain federal funding for organizations, such as Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., that provide essential family planning, cancer screenings and other preventative health services to Nevadans; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress should not repeal the Affordable Care Act in a manner that would deny access to these essential programs and services to future generations of Nevadans; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

P0M–50. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to review federal laws, rules, regulations, and procedures to ensure that veterans and their family members have convenient access to military service and medical records; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 136

Whereas, veterans of the United States armed forces have earned the respect, admiration, and gratitude of the state of Louisiana and its citizens; and

Whereas, the freedom and liberties we are blessed to enjoy today are a direct result of the courage, devotion, and sacrifice of the members of our armed forces; and

Whereas, it is appropriate to recognize their unwavering selflessness and courage by giving due consideration to all laws meant to protect and assist those veterans and their families; and

Whereas, in order to apply for certain military benefits, veterans or family members need access to military service or medical records to fill out the application forms and to meet the requirements to apply for the benefits; and

Whereas, when these veterans or family members need our assistance in accessing their military service or medical records, federal laws, rules, regulations, and procedures should be simple to navigate in order to obtain these records. Therefore, be it

Resolved that the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to review federal laws, rules, regulations, and procedures to ensure that veterans and their family members have convenient access to military service and medical records. Be it further

Resolved that a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM–51. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to increase funding for services for veterans who are returning from deployment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 65

Whereas, The freedom, peace and privileges that citizens of United States enjoy today are the direct results of the sacrifices of the veterans of the Armed Forces who have selflessly served to protect our nation; and

Whereas, The brave men and women veterans of the Armed Forces, who proudly served the nation and risked their lives to protect our freedom, deserve the investment of every possible resource to ensure their lasting physical, mental, and emotional well-being; and

Whereas, Investing in the well-being of veterans of the Armed Forces benefits not only

those members, but also every citizen of the United States, as such an investment ensures that these individuals will thrive upon their transition into civilian life; and

Whereas, It is no secret that certain services provided by the government have failed to adequately serve our nation's veterans; therefore, increased funding may improve areas where service to veterans is not sufficiently addressing veterans' needs; and

Whereas, Veterans of the United States military have served this country with honor and dignity, putting their lives on the line for this country, and at a minimum, deserve quality care and services upon their return from deployment; and

Whereas, It is altogether fitting and proper for this House to urge Congress to increase funding for services for veterans returning from deployment; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House hereby urges Congress to increase funding for services provided to veterans upon their return from deployment.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Minority Leader of the United States Senate, each Senator and Representative from New Jersey in the Congress of the United States, and the Secretary of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs.

POM–52. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to support the domestic beef industry; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 120

Whereas, the value of the domestic beef industry is a vital and integral part of the United States economy; and

Whereas, the 2016 economic impact was approximately sixty-seven billion dollars in farm cash receipts for cattle and calves; and

Whereas, there are over nine hundred thousand total cattle and calf operations in the United States of which ninety-one percent are family owned or individually operated, and eleven percent are operated by women; and

Whereas, domestic beef production in 2017 is estimated to be approximately twenty-five billion eight hundred million pounds; and

Whereas, the amount of beef consumed in the United States in 2016 was approximately twenty-five billion six hundred million pounds; and

Whereas, it is essential to the success of the domestic beef industry to increase international trade to key export markets; and

Whereas, the promotion of policies which highlight the quality, safety, sustainability, and nutritional value of domestic beef will drive growth in domestic beef exports; and

Whereas, it is in the nation's best interest to protect against legislative policies or agency regulations that have a negative impact on the economic health of the domestic beef industry; and

Whereas, minor changes in future domestic beef import or export levels can significantly change the net beef supply and beef prices; and

Whereas, important steps to supporting the domestic beef industry include developing a comprehensive national strategy for including beef in future dietary guidelines and investing in necessary research to improve productivity and efficiency; and

Whereas, it is critical to the success of the domestic beef industry to identify barriers and develop strategies to attract and enable the next generation of farmers into the domestic beef industry; and

Whereas, terrorist attacks have heightened the nation's awareness of agriterrorism and placed a renewed focus on ensuring the protection of the nation's critical infrastructures, including the domestic beef food supply; and

Whereas, an intentional contamination of the domestic beef food supply could harm millions of people and cripple our vast agriculture system; and

Whereas, it is critical to preserve the United States domestic beef supply and prevent reliance on foreign nations for food; and

Whereas, it will be necessary to develop a variety of federal actions to support the domestic beef industry including proposals which encourage domestic beef production, improve consumer demand, protect our nation's critical infrastructure, attract new farmers, improve the business climate, and increase trade to export markets; Therefore, be it

Resolved that the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to support the domestic beef industry; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is strongly encouraged to adopt import and export policies that will protect the economic survival and prosperity of the domestic beef industry in Louisiana and America and the nation's food supply; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate, the clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM–53. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, supporting United States Senate Bill 928 and related House Bill 2119, creating the Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act of 2017, which would impose a nationwide prohibition on commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy as an unfair or deceptive act or practice; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 1443. A bill to improve Department of Defense software management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of certain equity grants; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1445. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to ensure community accountability for areas repetitively damaged by floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 1446. A bill to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1447. A bill to reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1448. A bill to affirm the authority of the President to require independent regulatory agencies to comply with regulatory analysis requirements applicable to executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1449. A bill to authorize payment by the Department of Veterans Affairs for the costs associated with training and supervision of medical residents and interns at certain facilities that are not Department facilities, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to establish or affiliate with residency programs at facilities operated by Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and the Indian Health Service, 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. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Con. Res. 19. A concurrent resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Smithsonian Folklife Festival; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 59

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 59, a bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as long guns.

S. 109

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 220

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 220, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were

added as cosponsors of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 360

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 360, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 667

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 667, a bill to amend titles 5, 10, 37, and 38, United States Code, to ensure that an order to serve on active duty under section 12304a or 12304b of title 10, United States Code, is treated the same as other orders to serve on active duty for determining the eligibility of members of the uniformed services and veterans for certain benefits and for calculating the deadlines for certain benefits.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to lower the mileage threshold for deduction in determining adjusted gross income of certain expenses of members of reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 822

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 822, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, and for other purposes.

S. 844

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 844, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to consider certain time spent by members of reserve components of the Armed Forces while receiving medical care from the Secretary of Defense as active duty for purposes of eligibility for Post-9/11 Educational Assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 947

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 947, a bill to protect passengers on flights in air transportation from being denied boarding involuntarily, and for other purposes.

S. 951

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 951, a bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, and for other purposes.

S. 1014

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1014, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations to provide service dogs to veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1024, supra.

S. 1172

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1172, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1196

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1196, a bill to expand the capacity and capability of the ballistic missile defense system of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1201

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1201, a bill to allow individuals living in areas without qualified health plans offered through an Exchange to have similar access to health insurance coverage as Members of Congress and congressional staff.

S. 1217

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1217, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for appropriate designation of collective bargaining units.

S. 1228

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1228, a bill to require a National Diplomacy and Development Strategy.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to prioritize the fight against human trafficking in the United States.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions.

S. 1393

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1393, a bill to streamline the process by which active duty military, reservists, and veterans receive commercial driver's licenses.

S. RES. 136

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 136, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the 102nd anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 19—COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SMITHSONIAN FOLKLIFE FESTIVAL

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 19

Whereas the Smithsonian Folklife Festival, founded by the Smithsonian Institution on July 1, 1967, is commemorating 50 years of cultural exploration, exchange, and engagement on the National Mall of the United States this year;

Whereas the purposes of the Smithsonian Folklife Festival are to collaborate with individuals and communities throughout the United States and around the world to present diverse, community-based traditions in an engaging, accessible, and culturally appropriate way, to show the connections between traditional and emerging practices, skills, and knowledge through research, performance, demonstration, conversation, and documentation, and to support the efforts of

individuals and communities working to promote the resilience, integrity, vitality, and sustainability of the cultural heritage of those individuals and communities;

Whereas the Smithsonian Folklife Festival continues to collaborate with the American Folklife Center of the Library of Congress, the Folk and Traditional Arts Program of the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Park Service, scholarly societies, and State and local arts agencies to deepen and advance public curiosity and appreciation of rich folk and traditional arts and practices as vital and integral to the social fabric of families, communities, and other countries;

Whereas the Smithsonian Folklife Festival has inspired similar cultural exhibitions and festivals across the United States and around the world;

Whereas the Smithsonian Folklife Festival has generated educational curricula, scholarly publications, documentary films, and nongovernmental organizations committed to the documentation and presentation of folk and traditional arts;

Whereas the Smithsonian Folklife Festival fosters intercultural dialogue, cross-generational learning, and cultural equity;

Whereas the Smithsonian Folklife Festival celebrates the diversity of artistic expression and the dignity, delight, and innovation found in the creative process; and

Whereas the week of June 26, 2017 through June 30, 2017 is an appropriate week to designate as ''Folk and Traditional Arts and Culture Week'' in honor of the 50th anniversary of the Smithsonian Folklife Festival: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress recognizes ''Folk and Traditional Arts and Culture Week'' in honor of the 50th anniversary of the Smithsonian Folklife Festival, to—

(1) recognize practitioners of folk and traditional culture, and the institutions and organizations that support them;

(2) explore the creativity found within the families and communities of these practitioners; and

(3) congratulate the Smithsonian Folklife Festival for 50 years of outstanding efforts to champion creativity, cultural diversity and sustainability, cross-generational engagement, and intercultural communication through community-based research, public presentation, and archival documentation during the week.

APPOINTMENT CORRECTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a correction to an appointment made on March 22, 2017, be printed in the RECORD. For the information of the Senate, this correction is clerical and does not change membership of the Service Academy Board made by the appointment.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Section 1295b(h) of title 46 App., United States Code, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: the Honorable GARY C. PETERS of Michigan (Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation) and the Honorable BRIAN SCHATZ of Hawaii (At Large).

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Wednesday, June 28; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Rao nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

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, following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we have now reached a point where the Senate majority, the Republicans, and President Trump, have been unable to put together the package that allows them to take Medicaid and try to successfully turn it into a shadow of what it once was in our country, to turn it into a debt-soaked relic of what it is today by taking out $770 billion that otherwise would have gone to the families of those in our country who need healthcare services, who need help in providing for those who need it the most within our country.

The same thing was true in the House of Representatives when they were moving through their bill over there. People said: Trump doesn't have the votes. The Republicans don't have the votes. They are not going to be able to be successful. However, this TrumpCare Hail Mary that they threw in the House, notwithstanding the remarkable defense put up by the American people—the millions of phone calls, protests, and rallies—they still were able to find the votes to ultimately pass this incredible attack upon the healthcare of tens of millions of Americans.

What they did in the House is what they are doing in the Senate. The GOP retreats; they wait for the defense to disperse, but then they plow through to get this bill over the finish line, hoping that a 2-week hiatus will be sufficient for the energy level of the defense against these cuts to so wane that then they can come back and finish off the job on their second try in the same way they did in the House of Representatives. Right now it is only halftime.

It is halftime. They are coming back. The ball is in their court. They will attempt again to destroy the healthcare system of our country as we know it today. We have not defeated this bill yet.

Now is the time for those who oppose this bill to redouble their energy, to play even tougher defense against this Republican attempt to undermine Medicaid, to undermine access to care to everyone in our country. Their bill is now down, so let's keep it down for the count. Let's make sure this bill cannot get up and come back and haunt us in the middle of July.

The Senate proposal right now has $188 billion, which is now going to be within the hands of the Trump administration, in the hands of the Republican leadership as a slush fund to be used to get the votes they need in order to pass their bill. That $188 billion is right now being divided up in a way that will help them to get the votes.

What is the ultimate goal of the GOP? The ultimate goal is to take a machete to Medicaid because they harbor an ancient animosity toward Medicaid, and I will throw in Medicare and ObamaCare—all of it. They see this as the best opportunity they have had in two generations to be able to leave these programs as debt-soaked relics of what they are today. When they say: Well, we are going to cap the funding and send it back to the States with more flexibility—when they say ''cap'' the funding, they are talking about decapitating the funding, to cut it in half, send it back to the States, and then say to the States: You figure it out. You try to help those people who are poorest in your State whom you were never able to figure out how to help in the first place, which is why we put the Federal programs on the books in order to help those who are most in need in all of those States.

What is their real goal? It is pretty simple: Slash these programs and then turn them into one huge tax break for the richest people in America. That is what this program will do. One little example of that $770 billion—let's take $33 billion of it. That $33 billion gets divvied up by the 400 wealthiest families in America; 400 billionaires walk up and say: Can I please have my $7 million that I get as part of taking away coverage for cancer, coverage for Alzheimer's, coverage for opioid treatment? Can I now get my payoff for the success in your wealth-income transfer program? Because that is what you have. You don't have a healthcare program; you have a wealth care program. The wealth of the wealthiest—please make them even wealthier; that is what their entire plan is about.

By the way, that $33 billion would be enough to take care of the healthcare of 700,000 people in our country, but the Republican priority is to give all that money back to the wealthiest people in our country. That is immoral. That is inhumane. It is just plain wrong. The American public has to rise up and

fight against the greatest legislative injustice that has been perpetrated or attempted to be perpetrated on the American people in more than a generation.

This bill is ''the bill'' of my entire career in the U.S. Congress, which is now 41 years. This is the worst bill. It is the greatest attack upon the well-being of our Nation. This program is of the rich, for the rich, by the rich, and where are they going to take the money from? From the poor, from the sick, from the elderly, from the disabled. It is selfishness on stilts.

To think that there is a plan to take healthcare away from the poorest and sickest and most disabled people in our country in order to give a tax break to the wealthiest is the most indecent action that may have ever been perpetrated on the floor of the U.S. Congress.

There are billions in tax breaks for those who don't need them or deserve them, paid for by people who cannot afford it. It is healthcare heartlessness; that is what it is. If you kicked these people in the heart, you would break your toe. There is no heart. There is no sense of decency toward those families who are going to see their loved ones' diseases get even worse or to see them ultimately die because of lack of coverage.

The Republicans say that their plan—at least they purport it as their plan—is to decrease the deficit by passing this bill, but what do they do with the money that they save? Ah, a tax break for the wealthy.

I thought that you were shedding tears about your concerns of subsequent generations having such huge deficits, but we know those are crocodile tears about future generations because you want to pay off this generation of billionaires and this generation of millionaires who need no additional wealth for their families today.

So there is no real concern about the deficit. This is, once again, just an attack on the programs that the Republicans have always opposed, and if they combine it as a tax break at the same time, all the better.

From my perspective, people are just going to wind up paying more for healthcare, and they are going to be getting less. They are going to be paying for a Cadillac but only getting a tricycle as the people go forward. For too many families, they will not be able to afford anything, and there will be no subsidy to help them get healthcare for their families. The anxiety of suffering from an illness will only be exacerbated by their families' understanding that they cannot even afford the care for their loved ones because of the financial insecurity in their own families.

This is going to be a historic 2 weeks in which we must raise our voices as they have never been raised before—in which we stand on the ramparts and let those Republicans know that they are in for the fight of their lives. Cassandra-like, we must warn of the dangers of complacency, of the misunderstanding of what is happening right now.

The Republicans have removed the healthcare bill from the Senate floor for consideration. They are not defeated. They are just at halftime. They are now trying to construct a plan that will bring it back as soon as we return and with the votes now secured, from their perspective, in order to pass this bill and send it over to the House of Representatives and then down to President Trump for his signature.

These next 2 weeks will be the most important 2 weeks for the healthcare of our Nation in two generations. This battle is the battle to ensure that they are not successful. From my perspective, this is a fight that each and every American has to be a part of because it is your families who are going to be harmed.

If we just take opioid addiction coverage in Massachusetts, 2,000 people died from opioid overdoses last year. We are only 2 percent of America's population. If that number were to multiply across the whole country, that would be 100,000 people overdosing and dying. That would be two Vietnam wars of deaths in one year from one disease—a disease that we could begin to reverse if there were the treatment for families and if the prevention were put in place. Yet, if there is no treatment, if there is no prevention, if there is no access, then people, who otherwise would have been able to live normal lives with treatment, will now die.

If you have Alzheimer's, if you are in a nursing home, there is a very high probability—since two-thirds of all grandmas and grandpas in nursing homes are on Medicaid, if you slash Medicaid, the care that loved one is now receiving in a nursing home is going to be slashed. Grandma and Grandpa in that nursing home are going to see the services that they otherwise would have been provided not being available to them. That is what this Republican plan is going to do.

It says to a kid—a family member—with opioid addiction problems, it says to Grandma and Grandpa in a nursing home, it says to a woman who has cancer, it says to a man who has diabetes: I am sorry. We no longer can afford in America to help you get the healthcare you need.

We are better than that. We are a better country than that, and we are definitely a better country than our saying that we are going to take away that healthcare from all of those people and then give it as a tax break to billionaires. We are better than that. That is just wrong. So this is the battle, the most important battle.

In 1967, Martin Luther King said that the most important civil right was access to healthcare because health is the first wealth. Without health, you have nothing. That is what we are fighting for right now. We are fighting for that fundamental civil right for everyone.

This slashes coverage for those who are disabled in our country. We have made progress over the last generation in reconfiguring how we view the disabled in our country. We have given them access to the help they need so that they can be fuller citizens in our society. This bill slashes the funding to help 20 million disabled in our country live fuller, more functioning lives in order to give a tax break to a billionaire.

It is wrong. It must be stopped. We must put up the defense against this bill's ever becoming law. For the next 2 weeks, while they sit and plot to try to find a way of camouflaging what they are doing, the American people must rise up and say: No, America is better than that. We will not allow this to happen. God help us in 2017 in the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, this is the beginning, not the end. Today, we claim an important victory because of thousands of people across the country. There are not enough Senators who support this Republican healthcare plan, so there will not be a vote this week. Because of all of the people who spoke up, the realities of this bill are delayed—the tens of millions of people without insurance, a decimated Medicaid Program, the closure of health clinics and hospitals. Yet that is the key word here—that this bill is delayed. This bill is not dead.

Everyone who spoke up about this bill should take a victory lap. Pat yourselves on the back tonight. It is an extraordinary moment in terms of what grassroots democracy can accomplish. You did what you had to do with what you could, and you succeeded but only for tonight. Tomorrow morning, we have to get ready because the minute that the Senate comes back from the July 4 recess, they will have 3 weeks to ram through a bill. They are not done.

I heard the Vice President say today that they are going to keep working until they get it done. They are not giving up, so we cannot rest either.

Most importantly, we cannot let them forget that we are watching, that we are waiting, and we will still be here when they try to come back and jam this bill through.

I really hope that the Republicans take another course. In setting aside the policy disagreements that we are having, there is really a better way. There is a way for the Senate to be a Senate, which is to empower two of the best Republican Senators whom we have seen in generations. They are LAMAR ALEXANDER and ORRIN HATCH—two people whose conservative credentials nobody doubts. They are the chairmen of two of the biggest committees in the U.S. Senate—the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and the Finance Committee. They have done bipartisan work—

ORRIN HATCH for decades and LAMAR ALEXANDER for decades. Both of them, relatively recently, have done bipartisan work on tax extenders and on repealing No Child Left Behind. These are not easy issues. For these two chairmen, because they understand the committee hearing process and because they earned those gavels, I can only imagine their frustration.

Look, I am a Progressive, and I support the Affordable Care Act, but if I were sitting there as a Republican member of the HELP Committee or the Finance Committee and if these bills were going through and taking the country in a direction to which I objected and if I were the ranking member or were, maybe, a couple off from being the ranking member, I would be thinking to myself that I cannot wait until I get that gavel back.

I can tell you that I can have my own hearings, and I can listen to expert testimony, and I can craft a bill. That is what I want to do. The point of being a legislator is to actually work together on a bipartisan basis. Everybody knows that the chairman or the chairwoman has the lion's share of the authority, but it is still a collaborative process. It is politics. You try to accommodate people on both sides of the aisle, and you have quite an ideological spectrum, both on the D side and the R side, but that is the fun of it. That is the way the Senate is supposed to work.

You have a hearing, and the thing that we should remember about a hearing is that, generally speaking, if you have four testifiers—I do not know if it is a rule or just kind of an operating assumption—the majority party gets to pick three out of the four testifiers. So you are going to get three Republican witnesses and one Democratic witness if you have a normal hearing in HELP or Finance about the Affordable Care Act or what ought to happen with the American Health Care Act or whatever it may be. So it is not as if you cannot control the message, and it is not as if you cannot, in the end, do whatever bill you want to do. Isn't that the fun of being in the Senate?

Forget the Democrats for the moment. I mean, the Democrats were totally in the dark, and the public was totally in the dark. Even for the Republican Members, I mean, this has to irritate them that 13 people were sort of kept in the loop—some more than others, some less than others—but it was like these consecutive conversations: What will it take to get you to yes? OK. We will consider that. We will let you know what we are able to do.

Why not just have a public hearing?

That is, literally, what we do for everything—for the Defense authorization, for appropriations bills. Of the 12 subcommittees, we have several hearings. Whether it is telecommunications or railroads or education or even other healthcare issues, we have public hearings, and we do so on a bipartisan basis.

As tough as we are on each other in the election context and as tough as we are sometimes with each other on the floor, the committee hearing process is rarely as partisan. The committee hearing process allows you to kind of get to the work of legislating.

All I am suggesting is that I understand what Leader MCCONNELL is going to try to do. He is going to try to peel off votes. Senator MARKEY is exactly right in that he is going to try to peel off votes. Yet there is another way to go here, and that is to legislate. Let me just make the political argument for this on behalf of Republicans.

The problem with being the majority party and trashing the healthcare system by not properly funding the exchanges right now and by creating all of this uncertainty is that prices go up, and everybody understands this. Barack Obama is not the President. He was river rafting when all of this was happening, and he deserves it. I am happy for him. He is not the President. So the idea is that you are going to sort of say: Well, we are going to cut Medicaid, cut opioid funding, and we are going to turn this into a big tax cut for people who are already doing well financially because that last bill was called ObamaCare. It had the word ''Obama'' in it.

Listen, Republicans and Democrats across the country may not be politically sophisticated like we pretend to be, but they are smart. They are thinking to themselves, I am a Republican, I am a conservative, but I don't care about Barack Obama anymore. He is gone. He is not the President. So if you sit there and tell me we need to slash funding for mental health services or slash funding for my community health center in a rural neighborhood, I don't care—your argument cannot be: Because ObamaCare, right? You can't be: Because ObamaCare.

Now you have a majority in the House, a majority in the Senate, you have the Presidency. So now Republicans own the healthcare system. So here we are trying to figure out a way where we can both own the healthcare system. We are acting like this is impossible to discover. We are acting like: Gosh, what way would we work where we can each sort of shoulder some of the political and policy responsibility, the personal responsibility for the American healthcare system?

There is a very simple answer to that. We just do this through the regular order. If you do this through the regular order—what that means is—it is interesting to me that the difference between now and, say, 6 months ago is people actually know what reconciliation is. They know there is a threshold for regular legislation of 60 votes to overcome a filibuster, but it is a really important point. The moment the Republicans decided to do this via reconciliation, that was tactical, and that was kind of technical, but what that meant was, they said: We have 52. We only need 51. We don't need to talk to you.

I understand that kind of rationale. You have 52 votes. You can give up actually two and have Vice President PENCE break the tie. That may be a judgment they made; I am not sure if they regret it or not.

So here we are. The way to take this off the table as a political liability for the Republicans is to get a bill that could get 60 votes because once it becomes a bipartisan enterprise, it cannot be a cudgel. We cannot beat each other up over it.

When the Affordable Care Act passed originally, one of the challenges we had as a political matter is that we had not a single, solitary Republican vote. I will take everybody at their word that they just couldn't vote for it because it was against their political ideology and their principles, but it also had the side benefit of, the moment a bill doesn't have the patina of bipartisanship—the moment only one party participates in a process—boy, do you own it.

So the question I have is, Do you really want to own the American healthcare system, whatever happens, good or bad? You become like the utility company. Nobody likes their utility company. The best thing that can happen, if you are a utility company, is the lights stay on and the rate of increase slightly slows. You are never going to have cheaper rates, right? And when you flip your light switch on and your lights go on, you don't say: Gosh, I am so pleased with my utility company. You ignore it.

The best thing that can happen is, you come up with a brilliant bill, without any Democratic support, and then everybody shrugs their shoulders and moves on. More likely you are going to own all the problems you are creating, and you are creating myriad problems. I just want to say, there are a lot of Democrats who are on the level about wanting to legislate here, and we will do it the moment repeal is taken off the table, the moment there is a commitment to public hearings, the moment there is a commitment to doing things through the regular order.

Now, those were not my prepared remarks, but that really matters to me. I really believe in the Senate. For all of our flaws, we are still the place that has to solve the problems. We are still the world's greatest deliberative body because we must be, because these are Federal problems and we are the Federal legislature so we have to fix this ourselves. There are only two paths; one is the partisan path, which is great peril for people across the country and great political peril, and then there is the path of statesmanship and stateswomanship—the path of us working together and being a Senate again. We can do that, but we have to decide that is what we want to do.

I am hoping we go home, we participate in our parades, we hang out with our families, we cook some burgers, we cook some hot dogs, and we think: You know what, I want to legislate again. That was the battle, that was tough, I

am angry, I am disappointed, I am relieved—it depends on who you are—but I would like to start legislating again, and I would like to do so in the regular order.

I am hoping that is what happens over the next week. If it doesn't, then we will be ready to fight again, and I know there are literally millions of Americans who are not going to let up until this bill is dead.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:20 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 28, 2017, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WAYNE SMITH

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Captain Wayne Smith of Naples in honor of his sacrifices to this country during his service in Vietnam.

As pilot, Wayne flew 90 missions over North Vietnam until he was shot down and taken prisoner in 1968. Wayne spent five years and two months as a POW, where he suffered continuous torture, isolation, and separation from his family.

In recognition of his service, Wayne was awarded the Legion of Merit, two Silver Stars, two Distinguished Flying Crosses, two Bronze Stars, seven Air Medals and the Purple Heart.

Since his time in the military, Wayne continued his career as a pilot in the private sector and he has remained an active member in our community. I would like to thank Wayne for his unwavering service to our country.

A TRIBUTE TO HONOR RAYMOND LAWRENCE SULLIVAN, JR., M.D. ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, Raymond Lawrence Sullivan, Jr., was born in San Francisco on October 4, 1942. He was the second of six children and grew up in San Francisco and Hillsborough. He has three living siblings, Phillip Sullivan, Mary Sullivan Ward, and Mother Agnes of the Cross, CJM, and his late sister, Sheila Sullivan Peterson. Larry was educated at St. Catherine's Grammar School in Burlingame, Bellarmine College Prep in San Jose, the University of San Francisco and the UCSF Medical School. He did his residency in Anesthesiology at Stanford, and served our country in the U.S. Navy Medical Corps from 1968 to 1970.

Larry married Victoria Growney on August 13, 1966. Together they have five children: Larry Sullivan III; Kasey Sullivan Bradstreet, JD; Loretta Sullivan Chang, MD; Brian Sullivan; and Jason Lally, their foster child, who is part of their extended family. Their grandchildren, Liam, Andrew and Thomas Chang, Oscar Bradstreet and Harley, Riona and Raymond Lally bring them untold joy.

Dr. Sullivan joined the medical staff of O'Connor Hospital as an anesthesiologist in 1975 and has served there until his retirement. From 1982 to 1988 he served as Clinical Assistant Professor of Anesthesia at Stanford University School of Medicine. At O'Connor Hospital he was Anesthesia Department Chair, a member of the Critical Care Committee, President of the Medical Staff, Member of the Hospital's Board of Directors, and Chair of the Medical Staff Advisory Committee. He was honored in 2011 with the Vincentian Spirit Award given by O'Connor Hospital.

Dr. Sullivan has given generously of his time and talents to his professional community as a member of the Santa Clara County Medical Association, (CMA) the American Medical Association, the California Society of Anesthesiologists (CSA), the American Society of Anesthesiologists and the California Medical Association. He served as President of the CSA from 1999 to 2000, and from 1997 to 2006 he served on a Specialty Delegation to the CMA House of Delegates. He received the Distinguished Service Award from the CSA in 2009.

Larry also served as a referee and coach of the American Youth Soccer Association in Palo Alto, and was Scoutmaster of Troop 57, Stanford Area Council, where he guided 35 Scouts to the rank of Eagle Scout.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring an extraordinary physician, a devoted son, husband, father, grandfather, a vital member of our community, and a treasured personal friend. Larry Sullivan is a man of integrity and he lives a life instructed by his faith. I have never met a finer human being and a finer family. How proud I am to call the Sullivan Family my friends and to have the privilege of representing them. I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in wishing my dear friend Larry, a great and good man, and his devoted wife Vicki, every blessing that retirement has to offer, and we thank him for all he has done to strengthen our community and our country.

COMMEMORATING THE OPENING OF THE MEMORIAL LANE IN GRANBURY

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the opening of the new and expanded Memorial Lane in Granbury, Texas on July 1, 2017.

Located along the Granbury Hike and Bike Trail, Memorial Lane pays homage to those who were lost in the line of duty and honors all those serving or who have served as a firefighter, police officer or armed service member. The memorial features moving art pieces that depict the sacrifices that these individuals and their families have made. In addition, Memorial Lane also includes a plaza completed with picnic tables and areas for the community to enjoy the scenery and special atmosphere of the memorial.

Tributes such as these allow us to reflect on the remarkable lives of our fallen heroes and their families. We must continue to honor them every day and use these individuals as shining examples for generations to come. I look forward to seeing this memorial the next time I am in Granbury.

May God bless our first responders and armed service members serving today and in days past. May He comfort those who endure the pain of loss, and may He never cease to shed his grace on Texas and this great nation.

FOWL MATTERS AND THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

HON. JAMIE RASKIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I take the time to draw your attention to the important work of the Rachel Carson Council (RCC). Founded in 1965 and based in Bethesda, Maryland, the RCC honors the legacy and environmental ethic of Rachel Carson by linking environmental, health, and social policy solutions "with the goal of building a more just, sustainable, and peaceful future."

The RCC recently released a comprehensive report, "Fowl Matters," examining poultry production and its impact on public health and clean air and water. The report details the dramatic changes in the chicken industry over the past half-century, whereby the traditional practice of families raising chickens on small farms in open spaces for personal use has given way to modern-day Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs). As the RCC documents in its report, this new model has sweeping negative implications for the health and safety of people, animals, and the environment.

The report raises serious concerns regarding the enforcement of existing regulations under the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act related to CAFOs. For instance, it notes that industrial agriculture is one of the largest contributors of nutrient and sediment pollution to the Chesapeake Bay watershed, resulting in algal blooms that block sunlight from underwater grasses and suck up oxygen that fish populations need to survive. On Maryland's Eastern shore alone, CAFOs produce as much sewage as do 9.8 million humans, most of which goes untreated, threatening human health, fishing, and the public's ability to enjoy this indispensable natural resource. Additionally, the large fans used by CAFOs to aerate confined waste can cause nearby residents to be exposed to air polluted by ammonia and other dangerous particles. Breathing in this polluted air can cause respiratory diseases, asthma, and lung cancer. The RCC report underlines these pollution concerns by highlighting that CAFOs are often located near vulnerable communities of lower socioeconomic status which tend to have fewer resources to engage in litigation asserting their environmental rights.

The report also argues that conditions in CAFO facilities can endanger the health of

workers. Over the course of 12-hour shifts standing in production lines with temperatures up to 120 degrees Fahrenheit, workers breathe air contaminated by dust, ammonia, and feathers. These workers are vulnerable to all manner of health problems, including coughs, asthma, bronchitis, carpal tunnel syndrome, chemical burns, staph infections, and loss of limbs in dulled machinery.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my colleagues to review the well-researched and documented Fowl Matters report by visiting the RCC website, at www.rachelcarsoncouncil.org. We must keep these profound concerns in mind as we craft policies affecting the poultry industry and work to ensure strong enforcement of our environmental laws to protect the health and safety of communities nationwide.

FY18 TRUMP BUDGET CUTS EDUCATION

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of President Trump's proposed budget for the fiscal year 2018, specifically those within K–12 education.

The President's budget proposal aims to cut education spending by 13.5 percent. $9.2 billion dollars would be stripped from the federal education budget which would limit programs such as Title I, which provides targeted financial assistance to schools with high percentages of low-income students.

The President's budget is narrowly focused on 10 percent of students enrolled in private and charter schools, while neglecting the 90 percent enrolled in public schools. My job as a Member of Congress is to vote and be a voice for the constituents in my home state of Alabama. This budget will implement, and promote unproven programs such as charter schools and vouchers which will only benefit 10 percent of the student population and threaten public schools in my district.

This budget proposal will not only extract money from the public-school system, but will divert $1.4 billion dollars from already struggling public schools to unaccountable charter schools. Due to the lack of transparency within the charter schools and voucher system, it would appear as though school choice is a program that allows people to contribute to a charitable act to improve student's education. However, research has shown that the ''private'' schools that students would be sent to are often not accredited and the children's performance does not improve in these settings.

Alabama has some of the lowest property taxes in the country and doesn't target any state and local funding to schools with a high need. For schools in low-income, rural districts like mine these disinvestments result in a heavy reliance on federal education dollars. President Trump's plan not only redirects money to private schools, but will also allow states more flexibility to control how local educational dollars are spent. This could be fatal for public schools across rural Alabama.

The legacy I want to leave as Representative of the 7th Congressional District is to equip young people with the tools needed to succeed in the workforce. This is the chief reason I am concerned about the impact of the disinvestments in public schools and students proposed in President Trump's budget.

IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

HON. RYAN A. COSTELLO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Immigrant Heritage Month. America is a great nation of immigrants, and we should recognize the countless contributions and positive impact immigrants have made on our country.

We should take pride in the fact that most of us have passed down the stories of our families traveling from somewhere else in pursuit of the American Dream. I'm proud to be the descendant of Irish, Italian, and German immigrants who sought a better life in the United States.

Our country was built on the just belief that all men are created equal, and we have a proud history of advancing economic, educational, and personal opportunity.

It is my honor to take this opportunity to celebrate our country's traditions during Immigrant Heritage Month.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FIRE CHIEF EDWARD SWITALSKI, JR.

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to commemorate the life of a brave hero, Fire Chief Edward Switalski, Jr., who tragically lost his life in the line of duty. Chief Switalski died while serving others, just as he had selflessly done for over 35 years.

I want to begin by extending my heartfelt condolences to Chief Switalski's family, his wife Holly, two daughters Alison and Emily, his brother and sister and many nieces and nephews, and fellow members of the fire communities in which the Chief served. May you find comfort in the fond memories you share together.

Chief Switalski served the Pleasantview Fire Protection District in my district for over 34 years. Soon after he became a firefighter, he was quickly promoted to the rank of Lieutenant, then rose to be a Captain, and in 2013 he retired as the Battalion Chief. After retiring from the Pleasantview Fire Protection District, Chief Switalski joined the Comstock Township Fire Department in Michigan where he served from 2013 until he died at the scene of an accident on June 14, 2017.

While serving the communities of the southwest suburbs of Chicago, Chief Switalski was awarded with the Medal of Valor for saving a fallen firefighter, and named the Pleasantview Firefighter of the Year. Chief Switalski was a dedicated and spiritual man. He knew at a very young age that he wanted to be a firefighter, just like his grandfather. He also served his community as a volunteer with numerous organizations and was chairman of his congregation at Peace Lutheran in Illinois before becoming an active member of the Zion Lutheran Church in Kalamazoo, Michigan. Following Hurricane Katrina, Chief Switalski was honored for his efforts in New Orleans in assisting those who lost everything. This experience awakened a renewed sense of giving back and the chief's love of mission work. It was through mission work where the chief embraced a strengthened bond with his daughters Alison and Emily.

Chief Switalski's death is a great loss for his family and for the communities he served. He was a generous and selfless man, who cared deeply for his wife, daughters, and all his loved ones, including the people he served. He enjoyed being outdoors fishing and boating and being with his family and friends. And like many of us, Chief Switalski was a huge Chicago Cubs fan and loved watching them finally win the World Series last November.

I ask my colleagues today in the House of Representatives to honor the life of Chief Edward Switalski, Jr. He gave so much to others and will be greatly missed.

JONATHAN ISAAC

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Jonathan Isaac of Naples on being the sixth overall pick in the NBA draft to the Orlando Magic. Isaac spent part of his high school career playing for Baron Collier High School in Naples and he continued to amaze fans of the game during his time at Florida State University.

During his freshman year at Florida State, Isaac averaged 12 points and 7.8 rebounds per game. He also led the Seminoles to one of the most memorable seasons in program history with a 26–9 record, and an advancement to the second round of the NCAA tournament. I am look forward to seeing what Jonathan will accomplish as he continues to make his home of Naples and the entire state of Florida proud.

RECOGNIZING TREY MILLER FOR HIS STATE TITLE IN THE 100 METER HURDLES

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Trey Miller, a senior from Lewistown High School, for earning the Class IA title for the Illinois State Championship in the 110 meter hurdles.

Trey Miller earned a time of 14.80 seconds in the 110 meter hurdles to claim his title as state champion, and I would like to recognize Trey for his tremendous accomplishment. Trey's dedication and passion for his sport meant that he was determined to win gold, even after winning silver in last year's 110 high hurdles state championship. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work

and commitment to be awarded such a title. Trey is an example of the importance of dedication and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent Lewistown throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Trey Miller on his title, and I join the rest of the community in wishing him every success in the future.

RECOGNIZING THE GRAND OPENING OF THE NEW HEADQUARTERS OF UNANET

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize a local business in Virginia's 10th Congressional District that will be significantly expanding its already extensive operations. On June 27, 2017, Unanet, a preeminent and innovative organization in the software industry, will open a new headquarters in Loudoun County, in the heart of my district. Unanet plans to make significant financial investment in this new operation as part of their expansion, which will result in a larger facility and will enable the organization to create new local jobs in the next few years.

Founded in 1998, by the present Chief Executive Officer, Fran Craig, Unanet has continued to prosper since its inception, as the organization has increased its revenue by about 20 percent per year over the past decade. Today, Unanet is one of our region's premier software companies and a leading provider of Cloud and On-Premise software for project-based organizations. Unanet currently serves over 1,000 organizations nationwide, including many government contractors located in the Washington D.C. metropolitan region.

While Unanet has been an economic catalyst for the Washington D.C. area as a whole, the organization, headquartered in Loudoun since 2003, has deep roots in Loudoun County and has played an integral role in the development and success of the county's nascent technology industry. In addition to their plethora of economic contributions, the organization has also done extensive philanthropic work in our community and been firmly committed to supporting local charities, including Loudoun Hunger Relief, Loudoun Education Foundation, Loudoun Laurels Foundation, and Loudoun Cares.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding Unanet for their entrepreneurial achievements and for their numerous contributions to our local economy. I wish Unanet all the best as they celebrate this major expansion. I look forward to seeing their continued success and am thankful for the plethora of occupations and other opportunities they will provide my constituents.

RECOGNIZING EASTON BIANCHI FOR HIS STATE TITLES IN THE 100 AND 200 METER DASH

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Easton Bianchi, a junior at Newman Central Catholic in Sterling, Illinois, for earning the Class IA title for the Illinois State Championship in both the 100 meter dash and the 200 meter dash.

Easton Bianchi earned a time of 10.86 seconds in the 100 meter dash, and earned a time of 21.78 seconds in the 200 meter dash to win him the title of state champion for both races. I would like to recognize Easton for his tremendous accomplishment. Easton's dedication and passion for his sport meant that he was determined to win gold for not just one race, but two. With both of these wins, Easton is the first-ever individual track & field state champion in Newman Central Catholic School history. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Easton is an example of the importance of perseverance and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent Sterling throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Easton Bianchi on his titles, and I join the rest of the community in wishing him every success in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for votes Monday, June 26, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on Roll Call votes 323 and 324.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 324.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. FRANK D. LUCAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote Monday June 26, 2017 due to medical reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 323, and YEA on Roll Call No. 324.

CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BABCOCK & WILCOX

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 150th Anniversary of Babcock and Wilcox. While their headquarters are in Charlotte, North Carolina, I am proud to have one of their major operations located in my district in Barberton, Ohio. B&W's remarkable history began 150 years ago in 1867, when Stephen Wilcox and George Babcock established the company to manufacture and market their patented water tube boiler.

Since then, B&W has been at the forefront of energy innovation in the United States and around the world. In the 1880s, the company's boilers supplied energy for the first electric street lights in Philadelphia and the first central public utility, Pearl Street Station in New York City. B&W's boilers also powered Thomas Edison's laboratories and New York's first subway. In Barberton, B&W Power Generation Group designs and builds boiler and steam generators for industry.

As environmental issues moved to the forefront beginning in the 1970s, B&W became a leading innovator in emissions control technologies. B&W's environmental equipment protects the air we breathe, the water we drink and the land we use by controlling nitrogen, sulfur, heavy metals, ash, particulates and other emissions from hundreds of power plants and industrial facilities around the world.

Today, B&W employs 5,000 people on six continents and continues to be a global leader in commercial power and environmental technologies, renewable energy, and industrial power and emissions control. As the company celebrates its 150th anniversary, it's important for us to recognize and to be thankful for the hard work and outstanding contributions from the many thousands of employees who have proudly served at B&W, our customers for their support and trust in our technologies and expertise, and for the communities and the leaders who have stood behind B&W all of these years.

Congratulations on 150 years of quality work and innovation.

RECOGNIZING GRACE McLAUGHLIN FOR HER STATE TITLES IN THE 1600 AND 3200 RUN

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Grace McLaughlin, a junior at Rockford Boylan Catholic High School, for earning the Class 2A title for the Illinois State championships in the 1600 meter run and the 3200 meter run.

Grace McLaughlin earned a time of 5:03.97 for the 1600 meter run, and earned a time of 10:40.45 for the 3200 meter run to win her the title of state champion for both races. I would like recognize Grace for her tremendous accomplishment. Grace's dedication and passion

for her sport meant that she was determined to win gold for not just one race, but two. With both of these wins, Grace added two more state championships to her list of other championships. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Grace is an example of the importance of perseverance and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent Rockford throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Grace McLaughlin for her titles, and I join the rest of the community in wishing her every success in the future.

HONORING INDIANA'S RURAL TEACHER OF THE YEAR JAMES WILDERMUTH

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor North Miami Community Schools agriculture teacher James Wildermuth on being named Indiana's Rural Teacher of the Year.

Since 2004, the Indiana Small and Rural Schools Association has been recognizing exemplary teachers from small and rural towns across our state. Mr. Wildermuth is well deserving of this high honor. He truly embodies the characteristics of an exceptional Hoosier educator who has had a profound impact on student achievement, serves as a collaborating member of the greater rural community, fosters valuable learning among his students, and exemplifies leadership in a way that should inspire us all.

Mr. Wildermuth has taught for 17 years, including the last four at North Miami Community Schools. In addition to his remarkable accomplishments and sterling reputation as a teacher, Mr. Wildermuth serves as the district advisor for the local Future Farmers of America Program. Given his dedication to his students and the rural community as a whole, it is no surprise that he stood out among more than 6,000 Hoosier teachers in over 70 school districts considered for this prestigious award.

I am grateful that North Miami students have Mr. Wildermuth as a role model and mentor. With his kind spirit and innovative teaching style, he is sure to keep his students engaged and focused not only on the lesson at hand but also on how the knowledge and skills they learn each day will benefit them in their future. Mr. Wildermuth is a gifted educator in many ways, and his ability to connect with his students and enlighten them beyond the standard curriculum is where he truly makes a difference. He uplifts his students and teaches them how to grow as individuals with the confidence to succeed. He is a true inspiration to young Hoosiers and a truly valued leader in our community.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of 2nd District Hoosiers, I want to thank Mr. Wildermuth for all he has done to educate, support, and guide his students on the path to achievement. It is a privilege to represent teachers like Mr. Wildermuth who help make our communities vibrant and our children's futures bright.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL SUNGLASSES DAY

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Sunglasses Day. When it comes to protecting the eyes from the sun's UV rays, sunglasses with lenses that offer UVA/UVB protection are so important. Individuals—regardless of age—should always wear sunglasses during daylight hours, as UV rays are present year-round, despite the season. Unprotected exposure to these UV rays may cause serious vision problems. In the short-term, individuals may experience sensitivity to light, trouble seeing, sunburnt eyes or eyelids, irritated eyes, and red or swollen eyes. While in the long-term, individuals may experience cataracts, macular degeneration, and even cancer on or around the eyes.

Today I want to honor the sunglass manufacturers and suppliers throughout my Sacramento Congressional District, the State of California and around the country. California accounted for nearly 14 percent of all Plano sunglass unit sales from March 2016 to March 2017, and is home to a variety of optical industry leaders. I commend the sunglass industry and their trade association, The Vision Council—which includes 92 members hailing from the state of California—for their ongoing research and outreach campaigns to educate consumers regarding the damaging effects of ultraviolet (UV) rays to the eyes, as well as the sunglass and lens solutions available to maintaining healthy vision.

Since UV damage cannot be reversed, prevention through protection is key. Schedule an annual eye exam to talk to your eyecare provider about your UV eye health, and join The Vision Council, the greater optical industry and the National Sunglasses Day movement by donning sunglasses not just today on June 27th, but every time you go outside.

HONORING WESLEY JONES

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the contributions of Wesley Jones of Spokane, Washington.

The American Network of Community Options and Resources (ANCOR) recently selected Wesley Jones as a recipient of its 2017 Direct Support Professional (DSP) of the Year Award for the state of Washington. Founded in 1970, ANCOR is a national trade association of more than 1,200 private providers supporting over 600,000 people with disabilities.

The prestigious Direct Support Professional of the Year Award is given annually to outstanding individuals in each state to recognize the work of direct support professionals across our nation who support people with intellectual, developmental and other significant disabilities.

Mr. Jones has created inclusive and engaging environments for the residents of Spokane that have increased the ability for individuals with disabilities to pursue autonomy and self-determination. For one resident, Mr. Jones identified the triggers that led to self-injurious behaviors and helped calm the individual by painting his room a warmer color, changing the light bulbs, and purchasing new linens with warmer hues. For a resident who struggled to leave her home, Mr. Jones worked to build a trusting relationship and developed her coping skills, which ultimately enabled her to venture outside her home.

Direct support professionals, such as Wesley Jones, constitute the backbone of community supporters and services for American families and individuals across the country. I am proud to honor Mr. Jones for his valuable selfless contribution to the community of Spokane, and congratulate him again on receiving ANCOR's 2017 Direct Support Professional of the Year Award.

RECOGNIZING ERIKA FURBECK FOR HER STATE TITLE IN THE LONG JUMP

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Erika Furbeck, a junior at Geneseo High School, for earning the Class 2A title for the Illinois State Championships in the long jump.

Erika Furbeck jumped a distance of 19 feet, 5 inches in the long jump, and I would like to recognize her for this tremendous accomplishment. Her dedication and passion for her sport meant that they were determined to win gold, even after winning silver in last year's state championship for the long jump. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Erika is an example of the importance of perseverance and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see them represent Geneseo throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Erika Furbeck for her title, and I join the rest of the community in wishing her every success in the future.

WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON JAE-IN

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, as co-Chair of the Congressional Caucus on Korea, I rise today to Congratulate President Moon Jae-in on his recent election victory and to warmly welcome him to Washington. His trip to our nation's capital comes at a pivotal time, and I look forward to working together to strengthen the important bond between the United States and the Republic of Korea.

Just last month, the Korean people went to the ballot box and elected President Moon Jae-in in free and fair elections—highlighting

the strength and vibrancy of Korea's democracy. The R.O.K., a successful and stable democracy surrounded by autocrats and dictators, continues to serve as the lynchpin of U.S. foreign policy in the Asia Pacific region.

Tensions are rising on the Korean Peninsula, and President Moon Jae-in's visit to strengthen the U.S.-R.O.K alliance could not have arrived at a more pivotal time. North Korea continues to provoke the international community by conducting multiple missile tests and has yet to cease its unrelenting aggression against our democratic allies in the region. As his visit begins, I wish President Moon a successful summit with President Trump and look forward to working closely with the Trump Administration, and the Moon Administration to enhance the safety, security, stability, and success of the Korean Peninsula.

HONORING THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF L.A. TARONE

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I honor the life and memory of my good friend, L.A. Tarone, and express my deepest condolences to his colleagues, family, and friends.

On June 25, 2017, L.A. lost his courageous battle with lung cancer. A well-known reporter, columnist, television host, and radio personality, L.A. was a larger-than-life figure in Hazleton. His loss creates a void that will never be filled.

During the span of his storied career, L.A. hosted numerous segments on WYLN–TV, wrote for the Standard Speaker newspaper, and was a popular host on WILK radio. His voice was unmistakable. There was never a time when I talked to L.A. that I did not learn something important. I never met anyone who knew as much about baseball, music, and politics as L.A. Yet, even with his unmatched intelligence and 70's-style attire, he was a humble man, and a true gentleman.

At 58, L.A. was taken from us much too soon. He was not only a pillar of news, but also a giant in the Hazleton community. His personality and presence were so big that it felt like he lived long before his time, and I have faith that his impact on those of us in Hazleton will certainly live on long after his death.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the life and memory of L.A. Tarone.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, while I had been granted a leave of absence during the time these votes occurred on June 26, 2017, Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 323 and YEA on Roll Call No. 324.

RECOGNIZING REED VANDERHEYDEN, NATHAN SORIA, LUCAS HOFER AND NICK SWARTZENDRUBER FOR THEIR STATE TITLE IN THE 4X400 METER RELAY

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Reed Vanderheyden, Nathan Soria, Lucas Hofer and Nick Swartzendruber from Geneseo High School for earning the Class 2A title for the Illinois State Championships in the 4x400 meter relay.

Reed, Nathan, Lucas and Nick Swartzendruber earned a time of 3:21.27a in the 4x400 meter relay, and I would like to recognize them for their tremendous accomplishment. Their dedication and passion for their sport meant that they were determined to win gold, winning Geneseo High School's first-ever relay state championship and breaking school records along the way. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Reed, Nathan, Lucas and Nick are examples of the importance of perseverance, teamwork and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see them represent Geneseo throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Reed Vanderheyden, Nathan Soria, Lucas Hofer and Nick Swartzendruber for their titles, and I join the rest of the community in wishing them every success in the future.

WELCOMING PRESIDENT MOON JAE-IN

HON. GRACE MENG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in welcoming President Moon Jae-in to the United States for his first State visit this week.

The United States and the Republic of Korea share a long history of friendship and cooperation based on shared values and interests. Our ties are based on common values of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. Our two countries work together to combat regional and global threats and to strengthen our economies. In fact, the Republic of Korea is the United States' sixth largest goods trading partner overall, and the 13th largest economy in the world.

President Moon's visit will reaffirm our strong bilateral relationship at an important time, as our countries work together to address mutual security threats and improve regional security. This is especially important now as the Democratic Republic of Korea's external aggression increases, and as the Republic of Korea's role as a regional and global leader continues to grow.

President Moon's visit will continue our partnership and I am sure his visit will lead to new areas of cooperation between our countries.

HONORING MARGUERITE AND H.F. ''GERRY'' LENFEST

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Marguerite and H.F. ''Gerry'' Lenfest on being named the winners of this year's Carnegie Medal. The Lenfests are true philanthropists who have given an incredible amount to the city of Philadelphia.

The Lenfests first founded the Lenfest Foundation in 2000. However, unlike most foundations, the Lenfest Foundation was not meant to remain in perpetuity. Rather, its purpose is to give all of its funds to deserving causes and then dissolve. Their approach embodies the philosophy of Andrew Carnegie himself, who said that ''the man who dies rich, dies disgraced.''

The Lenfests' contributions to the City of Philadelphia and the surrounding areas have been innumerable. Their contributions helped build the five-story Lenfest Pavilion at Abington Memorial Hospital, they have left a lasting endowment to the Curtis Institute of Music, and they also sponsor the Lenfest College Prep Scholarship, which offers support to Pennsylvania students who would normally be unable to afford elite college preparatory private schools. Perhaps most importantly, The Lenfests have done more than anyone else to ensure that Philadelphia's important cultural events live on. Through their unparalleled support of the Greater Philadelphia Traditions Fund, they kept events and organizations such as the St. Patrick's Day Parade, Steuben Parade, Puerto Rican Day Parade, Columbus Day Parade, Pulaski Day Parade, Greek Independence Day, Odunde, Pride Day, Mummers Parade, Chester Fine Arts Center, Philly Pops, and the Martin Luther King Day Celebration alive.

Their extraordinary philanthropic spirit has led them to give more than $1.2 billion to deserving causes. Whether the beneficiaries are children at overnight camps, the Michener Art Museum, or the rowing team at Temple University, the Lenfests' generosity has touched countless Philadelphians. I cannot imagine more deserving recipients of this honor.

The City of Philadelphia would not be the same without the generosity of the Lenfest family. Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in honoring Mr. and Mrs. Lenfest on receiving this tremendous honor.

CELEBRATING THE SERVICE OF ERIN COE

HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Erin Coe for her dedication to cultivating and promoting fine arts in New York's 21st District.

Throughout her career, Ms. Coe has worked in some of New York's most interesting artistic destinations, including the Shaker Museum and the Metropolitan Museum of Art. In 1999,

she began her time as chief curator of the Hyde Collection in Glens Falls; a role Ms. Coe served in for 15 years before becoming the museum's director in 2015.

Under Ms. Coe's supervision, the Hyde has transformed into a regional center for artistic discovery, strengthening its relationship with the local community and expanding its collections and exhibit space. As director, Ms. Coe more than doubled the museum's modern art collection, and worked to open the Feibes & Schmitt Gallery, which houses incredible works from some of the best-known artists of the 20th century.

In addition to her work at the Hyde, Ms. Coe has also contributed to our community through her work on the advisory board of American Women Artists, and as a member of the Forum for Executive Women of the Capital Region. As she begins a new chapter in her career with Penn State University's Palmer Museum of Art, I want to thank Ms. Coe for these efforts, and for sharing her love of art with us all.

In New York's 21st District, we appreciate Erin Coe and her years of service. Her legacy at the Hyde Collection will endure, and I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING DEION McSHANE FOR HIS STATE TITLE IN THE 300 METER HURDLES

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Deion McShane, a junior at Freeport High School, for earning the Class 2A title for the Illinois State Championships in the 300 meter hurdles.

Deion McShane earned a time of 36.53 in the 300 meter hurdles to claim for himself the title of state champion, and I would like to recognize Deion for his tremendous accomplishment. Deion's dedication and passion for his sport meant that he was determined to win gold, breaking the all-time state record in the process. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Deion is an example of the importance of perseverance and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent Freeport throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Deion McShane on his title, and I join the rest of the community in wishing him every success in the future

HONORING DANIEL AGAMI

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of United States Army Specialist Daniel J. Agami, who was killed in action in Baghdad on June 21, 2007. He was posthumously awarded the Purple Heart, the Bronze Star, and the Army Commendation Medal.

Daniel Agami's love of his country inspired him to enlist in the Army after high school. He answered the call to serve, and in doing so, made the greatest sacrifice of all. His tremendous bravery, selfless service, and enduring faith will never be forgotten.

The debt we owe the families of our fallen service members is immeasurable, and we must always strive to be a nation worthy of their sacrifice.

I am honored to join Daniel's parents, Beth and Yitzhak Agami, for a ten year memorial service this weekend. I am proud to honor the Agamis. May Daniel's memory continue to be a blessing.

AMERICANS STRUGGLING WITH OPIOID ADDICTION

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this country faces a terrible opioid epidemic that must be confronted head on. In 2015 alone, 33,091 Americans died from opioid overdose. The use of illegal, destructive drugs like heroin and the abuse of prescription drugs like oxycodone and hydrocodone are keeping hardworking Americans out of commission.

As members of the United States House of Representatives, it is our duty to prevent such senseless tragedies from occurring. In 2015, a total of $36 billion was spent on addiction treatment, and only a fraction of those needing treatment were able to receive it. However, the Better Care Reconciliation Act (BCRA) allocates only $2 billion for opioid addiction treatment, falling remarkably short of what is needed. BCRA would cut Medicaid by $772 billion, robbing those with the greatest need of aid.

This will have catastrophic repercussions for the millions of opioid addicts that rely on Medicaid for treatment. If enacted, this legislation will strip 22 million Americans of their health insurance and deprive many of the individuals battling opioid addiction of treatment. This Senate proposal will not solve the opioid crisis; it will do irrevocable harm to American families.

In my home state of Texas, there were 2,588 drug overdose deaths in 2015. This is inexcusable. In the future we must ensure that all individuals suffering from addiction and mental illness are given access to the proper resources and treatment. It is imperative that Congress provide sufficient relief for the millions of Americans struggling with opioid addiction, or thousands of more lives will be lost.

RECOGNIZING BRAYDEN HAMBLEN FOR HIS STATE TITLE IN THE 3200 METER RUN

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2017

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Brayden Hamblen, a senior at Rock Falls High School, for earning the Class 2A title for the Illinois State Championships in the 3200 meter run.

Brayden Hamblen earned a time of 9:22.90a in the 3200 meter run to claim for himself the title of state champion, and I would like to recognize Brayden for his tremendous accomplishment. Brayden's dedication and passion for his sport meant that he was determined to win gold, adding another state championship to his list of other state titles. As a former athlete, I understand the amount of hard work and commitment to be awarded such a title. Brayden is an example of the importance of dedication and a strong work ethic. I am proud there is such young talent in our community, and to see him represent Rock Falls throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again formally congratulate Brayden Hamblen on his title, and I join the rest of the community in wishing him every success in the future.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3781–S3806

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1443–1449, and S. Con. Res. 19. **Page S3801**

Appointments:

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that a correction to an appointment made on March 22, 2017 be printed in the *Record*. For the information of the Senate this correction is clerical and does not change membership of the Service Academy Board made by the appointment.

Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Section 1295b(h) of title 46 App., United States Code, appointed the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Senator Peters (Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation), and Senator Schatz (At Large). **Page S3803**

Rao Nomination—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget. **Page S3796**

A motion was entered to close further debate on the nomination, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Thursday, June 29, 2017. **Page S3796**

Prior to consideration of this nomination, Senate took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Executive Session to consider the nomination. **Page S3796**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination at approximately 12 noon, on Wednesday, June 28, 2017. **Page S3803**

Messages from the House: **Page S3797**

Measures Referred: **Page S3797**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S3798–S3801**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S3801–02**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3802–03**

Additional Statements: **Page S3797**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 7:20 p.m., until 12 noon on Wednesday, June 28, 2017. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3803.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: EPA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Environmental Protection Agency, after receiving testimony from Scott Pruitt, Administrator, and Holly Greaves, Senior Advisor to the Administrator, both of the Environmental Protection Agency.

APPROPRIATIONS: SEC AND CFTC

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Security Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, after receiving testimony from Jay Clayton, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission; and J. Christopher Giancarlo, Acting Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Labor, after receiving testimony from R. Alexander Acosta, Secretary of Labor.

AUTHORIZATION: DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities met in closed session and approved for full committee consideration those provisions which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

AUTHORIZATION: DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel met in closed session and approved for full committee consideration those provisions which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

AUTHORIZATION: DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support met in closed session and approved for full committee consideration those provisions which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

AUTHORIZATION: DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity met in closed session and approved for full committee consideration those provisions which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee began consideration of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018, but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again on Wednesday, June 28, 2017.

MARINE SANCTUARIES

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard concluded a hearing to examine marine sanctuaries, focusing on fisheries, access, the environment, and maritime heritage, after receiving testimony from Vice Admiral Conrad C. Lautenbacher, Jr., USN (Ret.), former Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Ernest Weiss, Natural Resources Director, Aleutians East Borough, Alaska; Scott Hickman, Circle H Outfitters and Charters, Galveston, Texas; and Jeremiah O'Brien, Morro Bay Commercial Fishermen's Association, Morro Bay, California.

FISA AMENDMENTS ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act Amendments Act, focusing on reauthorizing America's vital national security authority and protecting privacy and civil liberties, including S. 1297, to make title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 permanent, after receiving testimony from Bradley Brooker, Acting General Counsel, Office of the Director of National Intelligence; Stuart Evans, Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Intelligence, and Carl Ghattas, Executive Assistant Director, National Security Branch, Federal Bureau of Investigation, both of the Department of Justice; Paul Morris, Deputy General Counsel for Operations, National Security Agency; Elisebeth B. Collins, Member, Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board; Matthew G. Olsen, former Director, National Counterterrorism Center, Fulton, Maryland; and Adam Klein, Center for a New American Security, Elizabeth Goitein, New York University School of Law Brennan Center for Justice Liberty and National Security Program, all of Washington, D.C.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 25 public bills, H.R. 3064–3088; and 6 resolutions, H. Res. 410–413, and 416–417 were introduced.

Pages H5231–32

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H5232–34**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 414, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3003) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify provisions relating to assistance by States, and political subdivision of States, in the enforcement of Federal immigration laws, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–195); and

H. Res. 415, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3004) to amend section 276 of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to reentry of removed aliens, and providing for proceedings during the period from July 3, 2017, through July 10, 2017 (H. Rept. 115–196). **Pages H5230–31**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Fitzpatrick to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H5183**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:54 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H5189**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rabbi Gary Klein, Temple Ahavat Shalom, Palm Harbor, FL. **Page H5189**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 178 nays with two answering ''present'', Roll No. 327. **Pages H5189, H5201–03**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Marino wherein he resigned from the Committee on Homeland Security. **Page H5192**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Palmer wherein he resigned from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. **Page H5192**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Chaffetz wherein he resigned from the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. **Page H5192**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Estes wherein he resigned from the Committee on Small Business. **Page H5192**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Rouzer wherein he resigned from the Committee on Natural Resources. **Page H5192**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 410, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Pages H5192–93**

Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 382, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1215) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system, by a recorded vote of 235 ayes to 186 noes, Roll No. 326, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 325. **Pages H5193–H5201**

Adjusting the amount of the Members' Representational Allowance: The House agreed to H. Res. 411, adjusting the amount of the Members' Representational Allowance. **Page H5202**

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 412, electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives. **Page H5202**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Santa Ana River Wash Plan Land Exchange Act: H.R. 497, amended, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain exchanged non-public lands, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 424 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 329; **Pages H5202–04, H5217–18**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: ''To direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal lands in San Bernandino County, California, to the San Bernandino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain non-Federal lands, and for other purposes.''. **Page H5218**

Authorizing the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project: H.R. 220, amended, to authorize the expansion of an existing hydroelectric project, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 424 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 330; **Pages H5204–05, H5218–19**

Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to establish a structure for visitor services on the Arlington Ridge tract, in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial: H.R. 1073, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a structure for visitor services on the Arlington Ridge tract, in the area of the U.S. Marine Corps War Memorial; **Pages H5206–07**

Reauthorizing the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program: H.R. 1135, to reauthorize the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation program; **Pages H5207–10**

Bureau of Reclamation Pumped Storage Hydropower Development Act: H.R. 1967, amended, to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to authorize pumped storage hydropower development utilizing multiple Bureau of Reclamation reservoirs; **Pages H5210–11**

Solemnly reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty: H. Res. 397, solemnly reaffirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 423 yeas to 4 nays, Roll No. 328; and **Pages H5211–14, H5217**

Condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya: H. Res. 351, amended, condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya. **Pages H5214–17**

Clerk Designation: Read a letter from the Clerk wherein she designated Robert Reeves, Deputy

Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts in case of her temporary absence or disability. **Page H5230**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Robert Emmet Park Act of 2017: H.R. 1500, to redesignate the small triangular property located in Washington, DC, and designated by the National Park Service as reservation 302 as ''Robert Emmet Park.''. **Pages H5205–06**

Quorum Calls Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H5200, H5200–01, H5201–02, H5217, H5218, and H5218–19. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:16 p.m.

Committee Meetings

CLEARING THE NEXT CRISIS: RESILIENCE, RECOVERY AND RESOLUTION OF DERIVATIVE CLEARINGHOUSES

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Clearing the Next Crisis: Resilience, Recovery and Resolution of Derivative Clearinghouses''. Testimony was heard from Robert Steigerwald, Senior Policy Advisor, Financial Markets Group, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago; and public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS-UNITED NATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a budget hearing on the United Nations and International Organizations. Testimony was heard from Nikki R. Haley, Permanent Representative to the United Nations.

SELF-DRIVING VEHICLE LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection held a hearing entitled ''Self-Driving Vehicle Legislation''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

U.S. EQUITY MARKET STRUCTURE PART I: A REVIEW OF THE EVOLUTION OF TODAY'S EQUITY MARKET STRUCTURE AND HOW WE GOT HERE

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment held a hearing entitled ''U.S. Equity Market Structure Part I: A Review of the Evolution of Today's Equity Market Structure and How We Got Here''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ALLIES UNDER ATTACK: THE TERRORIST THREAT TO EUROPE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade; and Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats held a joint hearing entitled ''Allies Under Attack: The Terrorist Threat to Europe''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations held a hearing on H.R. 2851, the ''Stop the Importation and Trafficking of Synthetic Analogues Act of 2017''. Testimony was heard from Representative Katko; Demetra Ashley, Acting Assistant Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration; and Robert Perez, Acting Executive Assistant Commissioner, Customs and Border Protection.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee concluded a markup on H.R. 218, the ''King Cove Road Land Exchange Act''; H.R. 289, the ''Guides and Outfitters Act''; H.R. 597, the ''Lytton Rancheria Homelands Act of 2017''; H.R. 954, to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes; H.R. 1107, the ''Pershing County Economic Development and Conservation Act''; H.R. 1306, the ''Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act''; H.R. 1397, to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land, and for other purposes; H.R. 1399, the ''American Soda Ash Competitiveness Act''; H.R. 1404, the ''Pascua Yaqui Tribe Land Conveyance Act''; H.R. 1541, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property related to the Fort Scott National Historic Site in Fort Scott, Kansas, and for other purposes; H.R. 1719, the ''John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act''; H.R. 1731, the ''RECLAIM Act of 2017''; H.R. 1913, the ''Clear Creek National Recreation Area and Conservation Act''; H.R. 1927, the ''African American Civil Rights Network Act of 2017''; H.R. 2053, the ''Mining School Enhancement Act''; H.R. 2156, the ''Saint Francis Dam Disaster National Memorial Act''; H.R. 2370, the ''Escambia County Land Conveyance Act''; H.R. 2425, the ''Public Lands Telecommunications Act''; H.R. 2936, the ''Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017''; H.R. 2937, the ''Community Reclamation Partnerships Act''; H.R. 2939, the ''Water Rights Protection Act of 2017''; and S. 249, to provide that the

pueblo of Santa Clara may lease for 99 years certain restricted land, and for other purposes. H.R. 218, H.R. 597, H.R. 954, H.R. 1107, H.R. 1306, H.R. 1397, H.R. 1399, H.R. 1404, H.R. 1541, H.R. 1913, H.R. 2156, H.R. 2370, H.R. 2937, H.R. 2939, and S. 249 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 289, H.R. 1719, H.R. 1731, H.R. 1927, H.R. 2053, H.R. 2425, H.R. 2936, were ordered reported, as amended.

NO SANCTUARY FOR CRIMINALS ACT; KATE'S LAW

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 3003, the "No Sanctuary for Criminals Act"; and H.R. 3004, "Kate's Law". The Committee granted, by record vote of 6–3, a closed rule for H.R. 3003. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. The Committee granted, by record vote of 6–3, a closed rule for H.R. 3004. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. In section 2, the rule provides that on any legislative day during the period from July 3, 2017, through July 10, 2017: the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment. In section 3, the rule provides that the Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2. In section 4, the rule provides for consideration of concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July, 2017. In section 5, the rule provides that the Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, July 6, 2017, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018. Finally, section 6 of the rule provides that the Committee on Armed Services may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Thursday, July 6, 2017, file a report to accompany H.R. 2810. Testimony was heard from Chairman Black, and Representatives Lofgren and Johnson of Louisiana.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2997, the "21st Century AIRR Act". H.R. 2997 was ordered reported, as amended.

BUDGET HEARING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Department of Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture held a budget hearing. This hearing was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2018 for the Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation, 2:30 p.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services: closed business meeting to markup the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2018, 9 a.m., SR–222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Steven Gill Bradbury, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, and Elizabeth Erin Walsh, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider the nomination of Mark Andrew Green, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and routine lists in the Foreign Service, Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on North Korea, focusing on recent developments, 10 a.m., SVC–217.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Claire M. Grady, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security, and Henry Kerner, of California, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, 10 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Timothy J. Kelly, and Trevor N. McFadden, of Virginia, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, and Jeffrey Bossert Clark, of Virginia, and Beth Ann Williams, of New Jersey, both to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 1024, to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of David James Glawe, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security, 8:30 a.m., SH–216.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine Russian intervention in European elections, 10 a.m., SH–216.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, markup of Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2018, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, markup on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2018, 11 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2810, the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, hearing entitled ''Exploring Opportunities to Strengthen Education Research While Protecting Student Privacy'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 3043, the ''Hydropower Policy Modernization Act of 2017''; H.R. 2786, to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to the criteria and process to qualify a qualifying conduit hydropower facility; H.R. 3050, the ''Enhancing State Energy Security Planning and Emergency Preparedness Act of 2017''; H.R. 2883, the ''Promoting Cross-Border Energy Infrastructure Act''; H.R. 2910, the ''Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Pipelines Act''; H.R. 3017, the ''Brownfields Enhancement Economic Redevelopment and Reauthorization Act of 2017''; H.R. 3053, the ''Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017''; and H.R. 806, the ''Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2017'', 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing entitled ''The Federal Reserve's Impact on Main Street, Retirees, and Savings'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled ''Examining the BSA/AML Regulatory Compliance Regime'', 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Advancing U.S. Interests at the United Nations'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2826, the ''Refugee Program Integrity Restoration Act of 2017''; H.R. 1096, the ''Judgment Fund Transparency Act of 2017''; and H.R. 2480, the ''Empowering Law Enforcement to Fight Sex Trafficking Demand Act'', 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Examining Policy Impacts of Excessive Litigation Against the Department of the Interior'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Criminal Justice Reform and Efforts to Reduce Recidivism'', 1 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy; and Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled ''Material Science: Building the Future'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on Department of Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture, budget hearing, 10 a.m., HVC–304. This hearing will be closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Wednesday, June 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Neomi Rao, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, June 28

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Complete consideration of H.R. 1215—Protecting Access to Care Act of 2017. Consideration of H.R. 3003—No Sanctuary for Criminals Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barletta, Lou, Pa., E911
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E911
Bustos, Cheri, Ill., E908, E909, E909, E910, E911, E912, E912
Comstock, Barbara, Va., E909
Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E907
Costello, Ryan A., Pa., E908
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E912
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E907
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E909
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E909
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E912
Lipinski, Daniel, Ill., E908
Lucas, Frank D., Okla., E909
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E910
McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E910
Meng, Grace, N.Y., E911
Raskin, Jamie, Md., E907
Rooney, Francis, Fla., E907, E908
Roskam, Peter J., Ill., E910
Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E909
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E908
Stefanik, Elise M., N.Y., E911
Turner, Michael R., Ohio, E911
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E910

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.