



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 8, 2018

No. 95

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, June 11, 2018, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JUNE 8, 2018

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 8, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROGER W. MARSHALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

Monsignor Stephen J. Rossetti, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Good and gracious God, the psalmist reminds us that "The Lord's is the Earth and its fullness, the world, and those who dwell in it." Indeed, all of creation bears the image of Your beauty and Your love.

May Your spirit guide the work of our hands to nurture in love the people of this Earth and the beautiful world that sustains them.

We make this prayer in the power of Your spirit, and in Your holy name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

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

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. DUNN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

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

INTRODUCING THE FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND SERVICES ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, too many Americans find themselves in dangerous and life-threatening situations as a result of domestic violence.

Victims need access to emergency shelter, crisis counseling, and advocacy services.

That is why I was proud to introduce H.R. 6014, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act of 2018, with my colleagues, Representatives GWEN MOORE, ELISE STEFANIK, and LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER.

Since it was enacted in 1984, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act has addressed domestic violence through community-driven solutions and a network of programs and services dedicated to responding to domestic violence across the country.

One example is the National Domestic Violence Hotline. The hotline operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and is available in 170 languages. It provides crisis intervention, counseling,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4983

and safety planning, and can directly connect calls to a seamless referral system of more than 4,500 community programs across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation. Domestic violence has no place in our society, and we must stand up for victims and work to eradicate domestic violence for good.

CELEBRATING A TREMENDOUS VICTORY LAST NIGHT BY THE WASHINGTON CAPITALS

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is warm in here.

Mr. Speaker, there is joy in the Washington Capital Region today.

When I get up in the morning every day and I read the front page of the Washington Post, I say: Oh, my goodness.

Today, I read the front page of the Washington Post. "At last, Capitals," with Alex Ovechkin holding the Stanley Cup high, celebrates.

Mr. Speaker, I was in the Maryland State Senate in 1973, and one of the great citizens of our region, Abe Pollin, said to us, to me, and to others: We want to build an arena in Prince George's County. It was called the Capital Center.

And in 1974, Abe Pollin brought hockey to the Washington Metropolitan area.

Abe Pollin died not too long ago. Before he died, he sold the Caps to Ted Leonsis. Abe Pollin and Ted Leonsis are ecstatic today.

Forty-four years, and now we are the national champions. Mr. Speaker, I rise with great joy and excitement to celebrate the tremendous victory last night by the Washington Capitals in the Stanley Cup finals.

The Caps had an extraordinary season and brought home a victory for the national capital region; its first major sports championship since 1992.

When team captain Alex Ovechkin raised the Stanley Cup over his head last night, he did so on behalf of thousands upon thousands upon thousands of Caps fans across our region, including, of course, my district.

That moment came after a 4-3 victory over an extraordinary team, the Vegas Golden Knights, who, in their first season as an expansion team in the National Hockey League, became the first team to come to the finals in that status. They had a magnificent season and their own exciting path to the finals during their inaugural season.

As the celebrations continue from last night into today and over the coming days, I want to offer my congratulations to the players, coaches, managerial staff, and my thanks to all the fans who made the Caps' victory possible.

I hope my colleagues, dare I say even the ones from Nevada, will join me in congratulating them as well.

Alex Ovechkin was chosen as the most valuable player, having scored 15 goals in the playoffs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one last thing. My father was born in Denmark. Lars Eller, a member of the Washington Capitals, was born and lives in Denmark, scored the winning goal.

The colors of the Danish flag, as some of you may know, are red and white. How appropriate. How wonderful. How grateful we are for the vision of Abe Pollin and the sponsorship of Ted Leonsis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to appear on the floor in proper attire.

COMMEMORATING THE 136TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE YAKAMA TREATY

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 136th anniversary of the Yakama Nation Treaty of 1855.

On June 9 in 1855, the United States entered into an agreement with the confederated tribes and bands of the Yakama Nation. This treaty marked the beginning of a successful relationship between the Yakamas, the Federal Government, and the people of Central Washington State.

I am proud to display a copy of the treaty of 1855 in my office here in Washington, D.C. as a reminder of the Federal Government's obligations.

The Yakama Nation's presence and influence is evident in my district. The Yakama Nation Museum and Cultural Center provides students and visitors an inside look at the history and the values of the Tribes. The newly opened Yakama Warriors Association's Veterans Center provides resources and assistance to veterans on or near the Yakama Reservation. Events and celebrations bring communities together to honor and preserve the Yakama Nation's cultural traditions.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the Yakamas' input as I work to represent all of Central Washington, and I look forward to continuing to ensure their voices are heard on the important decisions that affect the land that we all love.

RENAMING THE OYSTER BAY NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE TO THE CONGRESSMAN LESTER WOLFF NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

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

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the illustrious public service career of a former Member of this body, Congressman Lester Wolff, who will soon be celebrating his 100th birthday.

In recognition of his monumental contributions to the preservation and protection of our environment, especially on Long Island's beautiful North Shore, I am proposing the renaming of the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge to the Congressman Lester Wolff National Wildlife Refuge.

These precious wetlands, at Congressman Lester Wolff's urging, were protected in 1968. In 1967, the New York state legislature had, at the insistence of then-Governor Nelson Rockefeller and master planner Robert Moses, authorized a bridge across the Long Island Sound.

Lester immediately saw this bridge would spoil the pristine and precious resource of the Long Island Sound, and soon found himself at the center of an enormous political fight. Lester won, and the Oyster Bay Wildlife Refuge was born.

Lester's efforts in 1968 are an important part of our Nation's environmental history. I urge my colleagues to support the renaming to the Lester Wolff National Wildlife Refuge, and I wish Lester a happy 100th year and many more.

SUPPORTING THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill.

Providing robust funding to the VA is a step in the right direction to ensure our veterans receive the best possible care.

This legislation increases funding to the VA to the highest level ever. That funding will go towards providing for America's heroes. We are increasing funding for homeless veterans' services, mental healthcare, suicide prevention, opioid abuse, traumatic brain injury research and treatments, and rural health initiatives, just to name a few.

As the son of an Army family and an Army surgeon, I have seen firsthand many issues that our veterans face. As chairman of the VA Subcommittee on Health, I am working to instill real changes at the VA. This means better care for our men and women who have served our Nation.

Funding these important initiatives is a crucial part of repaying those who fought for our freedoms. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

TODAY IS WORLD OCEANS DAY

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, in the time I make these remarks, 1 minute,

and every minute after, the equivalent of an entire garbage truck full of plastic will be dumped into the oceans. That is about 8 million metric tons a year, endangering marine life.

Today is World Oceans Day, a good time to recommit to protect, conserve, maintain, and rebuild our oceans and our ocean resources.

The health of our oceans reflects the health of our planet. We have work to do. Oceans absorb CO₂ produced by human activities, and increasing carbon emissions are stressing the oceans and threatening the livelihood of coastal communities.

As oceans become more acidic, shellfish struggle to build shells. Oysters and clams are especially vulnerable. Harmful algal blooms produce acid that accumulates in shellfish, like Dungeness crab, and can be poisonous to humans.

We must invest in research to better understand the challenges to ocean health, like ocean acidification, harmful algal blooms, marine debris, and overfishing.

The ocean is resilient, but we cannot afford to wait. On World Oceans Day, I invite all of my colleagues to join the bipartisan Oceans Caucus. The time to take action is now.

HONORING ISRAEL'S 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Israel's 70th anniversary of independence. The United States has no stronger ally in the Middle East than the State of Israel.

Our relationship is one rooted in shared values and a commitment to freedom and democracy. Israel's dedication to political and economic freedom, free and fair elections, and freedom of religion provides a stark contrast with other regimes in the region.

On this anniversary, I also want to recognize the important relationship between Israel and the State of Alabama.

Few people know that 5 years prior to Israel gaining independence, Alabama became the first and perhaps only State to call for the establishment of a Jewish state.

Seventy-five years ago, on June 10, 1943, in the midst of World War II, the Alabama legislature unanimously passed a joint resolution calling for a Jewish state, and for the Jewish people to have the right to self-government and self-determination.

Since that day, in acknowledgment and support of our mutual values, Alabama and Israel have maintained a special friendship. Indeed, Alabama and the United States are proud to call Israel our ally, and look forward to our continued support of Israel and our continued friendship.

□ 0915

LET'S WORK TOGETHER TO HELP AMERICAN FAMILIES HAVE HEALTHCARE

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, first, do no harm. That is rule number one for every doctor, and it should be rule number one for this President and this Congress as well. But because of the harmful, partisan healthcare politics in Washington, D.C., next year, a quarter million people in Washington State will have to spend 19 percent more per month on their health insurance.

That adds up for a lot of folks. It will add up to the difference between being able to afford healthcare or not. Families in Washington State will have less money in their pockets because of the choices to do harm by this Congress and this administration.

It is a choice to cut, as this administration did, the Federal payments that make healthcare cheaper for families. It is a choice to obsessively try to dismantle the Affordable Care Act, as this House and this administration have done, creating uncertainty and driving up costs.

Listen, the Affordable Care Act was not perfect, but it meant cheaper healthcare and more people with insurance. Let's fix it rather than harm people.

Rather than partisan attacks that do harm to the healthcare system and harm to family budgets, let's first do no harm, and then let's work together to actually help American families have healthcare.

JUNE 11 WILL BE THE FIRST DAY WITHOUT NET NEUTRALITY PROTECTIONS

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, Monday, June 11, will be the first day without net neutrality protections, thanks to the Trump administration.

For the last decade and a half, the internet has become the biggest driver of our economy, of education, access to information, and the conduct of commerce. It all happened under net neutrality, because each of us had the freedom to go where we wanted to go, see what we wanted to see, and read what we wanted to read.

On Monday, the rules to protect an open internet will cease to exist. Consumers will no longer be guaranteed that they can choose to go where they want to go or do what they want to do online. Businesses can be made to pay tolls to reach their customers. The huge internet service providers can reign with impunity over the most important tool in our economy and our democracy.

Over all the years I have represented my Silicon Valley district, I have

never had a constituent or a company ask me to turn total control of the internet over to the ISPs.

Congress can act to prevent this takeover. That is why I am a cosponsor of the Congressional Review Act, a bill to disable the administration's giveaway of the internet. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to stand on the right side of history with millions of Americans and do the same.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the further consideration of H.R. 5895, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 923 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5895.

Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) kindly take the chair.

□ 0919

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with Mr. MARSHALL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 7, 2018, amendment No. 27 printed in part B of House Report 115-712 offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in part B of House Report 115-712.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 131, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$8,000,000)".

Page 132, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to provide additional funding for the Veterans Transportation Program, which would provide additional resources for the Highly Rural Transportation Grants, Beneficiary Travel, and Veterans Transportation Service.

A major challenge facing veterans across the Nation, including the central coast of California, is the lack of access to transportation when trying to get their medical appointments. This is especially prevalent in districts like mine, where veterans don't live in close proximity to a major VA medical center.

Available local transportation to health appointments at the local community-based outpatient clinic is a constant challenge, as there are an insufficient number of buses and drivers. Currently, there is only one bus serving my district, and this one bus must make six stops before reaching the VA hospital in Los Angeles. Once there, veterans only have a short window of time to attend to all their appointments before needing to rush back to the bus to catch their transportation home.

In many cases, with these time constraints, veterans are unable to fit all of their necessary appointments into one day, and must again struggle with transportation to get back to the hospital.

Passage of this amendment would provide more transportation solutions for our veterans, allowing them to get to their medical appointments on time and receive proper medical care without the fear of being left behind, unable to get back home.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chair, we understand the gentleman's concerns, and we certainly will keep them in mind during conference.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in 2017, the VTP program transported a total of 557,331 veterans, of which 103,704 were disabled veterans.

The VTP office is the authoritative source for all veteran-related travel initiatives. Its core mission is to assist in the improvements of access to care and assist veterans in overcoming transportation barriers to accessing VHA services.

VTs has established a network of transportation options for veterans

through joint efforts with VA's Office of Rural Health and veterans service organizations.

This is a valuable program that has clearly been recognized and highlighted by the gentleman from California, that helps veterans who are visually impaired, elderly, or immobilized due to disease or disability, and particularly those living in remote and rural areas, to get to their medical appointments.

At a time with the VA where we are struggling to make sure both in terms of time that veterans have to wait to get an appointment and the difficulty in getting through a long distance to get that service, this is an important amendment.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman from California's contribution and I strongly support it.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I would just appeal to my colleagues that "thank you for your service" is just not enough anymore for our veterans. We need to step up. We need to make sure that they know we are here and we have their back when they need the services at the end of their tenure in the armed services.

Mr. Chair, this is an important amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in part B of House Report 115-712.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 132, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000) (increased by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would direct the VA to establish an opioid abuse kit for community healthcare providers.

We are fortunate to live in a time when, because of medical advancements, members of the military are surviving combat injuries at unprecedented rates. However, our duty of care for military veterans does not stop there.

As our Nation welcomes home thousands of veterans from missions all over the world, we must be better pre-

pared to provide those who suffer from chronic pain with the help that they need. It is the responsibility of this Congress to do our part to ensure they are receiving the level of healthcare they deserve.

According to VA data, despite the number of opioid prescriptions at the VA declining—and that is the good news—since 2012, the number of veterans with opioid use disorders has spiked 55 percent between 2011 and 2016.

Additionally, the American Public Health Association found that veterans are twice as likely to overdose on prescription opioids as the general population.

The Veterans Health Administration has taken initial steps to combat the growing opioid crisis by rolling out its Opioid Safety Initiative for VA health settings, and the VA has also begun to publish toolkits for its community health providers so they better understand why veterans are looking to them for help.

My amendment provides the resources for the VA to take their efforts a step further. It would direct the VA to utilize the opioid safety resources already available at the VA and create a similar opioid toolkit for healthcare providers at civilian facilities who help veterans with opioid use disorders. This is even more important, Mr. Chairman, because of the establishment of the Veterans Choice Program.

The toolkit will provide safe prescribing practices provide additional resources for effective pain management, and it will ultimately save lives.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of this.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I support the efforts by the gentleman from Massachusetts to combat opioid abuse, which really has been a scourge in every region of this country and has left almost no region in this Nation untouched.

The rates of prescription opioid misuse and overdose continue to increase sharply, and prescription opioids are now a leading cause of death in the United States. In fact, Mr. Chairman, we are about to reach the third year in a row that life expectancy in the United States will have gone down. That is the first time that has happened since all the way back to World War I, and it can be directly attributed to opioid abuse and the resulting deaths that has caused.

So I agree with my friend from Massachusetts that the VA should have a toolkit similar to the mental health toolkit and that it could save lives. I support the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to

the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chair, this bill includes \$387 million for opioid treatment and prevention efforts. We understand the gentleman's concern, and we will keep them in mind during conference.

May I say, having been a criminal trial judge for many years, dealing with prescription drug abuse and treating prescription drug abuse is one of the hardest things we have to deal with in criminal law. There is something about the mental attitude towards a prescription that causes people to think it is safe.

□ 0930

This abuse that is going on in this country, we have to do something about it, so I commend the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Texas and I will work together on this going forward and, hopefully, this amendment will move us in that direction further.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. KEATING

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in part B of House Report 115-712.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 132, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000) (increased by \$1,500,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that would direct healthcare providers with VA affiliation to continue their efforts at continuing education courses in specific areas to manage pain, opioids, and substance abuse disorders.

Nationally, about 30 percent of Americans have some form of chronic pain. However, the percentage of veterans who report chronic pain is significantly higher. Over 50 percent of elderly veterans report chronic pain, as do 60 percent of veterans returning from current conflicts. In fact, chronic pain is the most common medical problem experienced by returning combat veterans over the last decade.

Of course, pain is not a standalone problem. We are increasingly aware of

the mental health, the hidden wounds consequences stemming from time in combat. Veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder or brain trauma are more likely to report physical pain and, in turn, are more likely to receive a prescription for opioids. Likewise, approximately one out of every three veterans seeking treatment for a substance use disorder also have PTSD.

My amendment addresses this challenge by helping those who provide healthcare services to veterans to learn the latest pain management techniques, understand safe prescribing practices, and spot the signs of potential behavioral health conflicts and challenges, including substance abuse disorders.

Further, my amendment recognizes that VA healthcare providers already need continuing education credits to maintain their State-issued professional licenses. The amendment does not add to the total number of credits that prescribers already have to take. It simply makes sure that appropriate time is spent learning about this important issue.

My constituents are fortunate in Massachusetts because we have State laws that deal with this and require that kind of continuing education on this matter. However, in the other part of my district, in the southwestern portion, most of the veterans in that area go to the Rhode Island veterans center and, in Rhode Island, this is not covered by the State.

Healthcare professionals in Providence, Rhode Island, already have pain management education available, but there is no guarantee that they are taken. There is a recommendation, but no guarantee. My amendment simply makes sure that our veterans get that guarantee. I urge my colleagues to join in support of this amendment.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, pain management education for the prescription of opioids in the VA could help with opioid abuse; that is clear. The VA already has guidelines regarding the management of opioid therapy for chronic pain and provides clear and comprehensive, evidence-based recommendations incorporating current information and practices for practitioners throughout the DOD and the VA healthcare systems.

Mr. Chairman, these guidelines are provided to minimize harm and increase patient safety in patients who require opioid therapy, but these guidelines only work if the prescriber is adequately trained. And that is why the gentleman from Massachusetts' amendment would be so helpful, because we all know that the key to making sure that we can reach people and maximize the effectiveness of the program is to ensure that the appropriate and significant training is done

so that we can achieve those goals. So I support this amendment.

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

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I will not oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. I understand the gentleman's concerns, and I will keep them in mind during conference.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, it is another area where we can keep working together to help veterans, and this amendment will bring us forward in that task.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in part B of House Report 115-712.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 135, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member for her help on this issue.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak about an issue that is very important to my constituents and, of course, to me. I began my career as a nurse, where I provided hands-on patient care for 15 years at the Dallas Veterans Administration Hospital. I actually opened the psychiatric service.

I rise today regarding an issue that is prevalent in my district and, more likely, is coming around the country: the Department of Veterans Affairs delaying, sometimes for years, payments for services that have been authorized by the VA and performed subject to their requirements.

Small business vendors depend on timely payments in order to pay for their services, pay their employees, and conduct business that they have agreed to perform for the price the VA has agreed to pay.

Veterans and their care are very important to me, and one thing I have noticed in my career, both at the VA and

here in Congress, is that it is important that getting the payment, whatever and wherever it is owed, and whether that is the veteran, a physician, or a contractor, is important.

I could talk about a number of things about the VA, but one of the things that is really hurting veterans is the delay of payment of vendors that render service.

The other week, one of the small vendors came into my office and said he was still waiting for payment from 2015. These vendors, for the most part, offer services to the veterans away from the hospital. It should not take that long for them to be paid.

It is ruining the home healthcare program because they cannot continue, year after year, to deliver this care without getting paid; and many of the small vendors have stopped servicing the veterans because they never see payment in sight. So that is a major issue which I came to speak about today.

Fee-basis care is preapproved by the VA, and the veteran, VA facility, and provider are all aware of the costs of the care being performed. There should not be a delay in delivering payment for essential services provided to the veteran.

Many of these small businesses have to file lawsuits and get attorneys to retrieve their money. Many of them have been put out of business and made up their mind they cannot service veterans because they cannot get paid in a timely manner. Two or 3 years late for payment is a long time for small businesses.

My concern is this slow-walking of claim payments is endemic throughout the VA, and veterans are being held responsible for the delay. Not all contractors are as savvy as my constituent and might not know what the next step should be to resolve these issues.

My amendment is designed to encourage the VA to report on the number of vendors who are being held hostage to slow payment around the country and how much money is being tied up in these delays. These small vendors cannot survive these long delays in getting paid.

We need to know how big the problem is and how we can figure out how to fix it.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Texas has identified a very important issue, one that was brought to my attention in sharp relief by my own hospital association just yesterday.

In Florida, we are now the third-largest State in the Union, and the hos-

pitals in my home State are owed at least \$134 million in payments that have not been paid by the VA.

I mean, I don't care how big your operation is, that is a tremendous amount of money, and prompt payment is a critical issue because we need to make sure that the resources that are appropriated to our healthcare system and the revenue that we need generated to contribute to our economy and the care that we need provided is done so promptly.

What we don't want to have happen is healthcare providers deciding not to provide services outside the VA to VA patients. And my discussion with them yesterday was that there are healthcare providers in our State that are starting to decide not to take VA patients anymore, and that would be a travesty.

The gentlewoman is absolutely correct. Waiting 2 or 3 years for payment—that is the kind of length of time we are talking about here—can have a devastating impact, particularly on small business.

It is not a new issue at the VA. For example, former Secretary David Shulkin started rapid response teams whose goal was to settle the most substantial outstanding bills as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, the issue of prompt payments must be addressed as more veterans seek services outside of the VA. It is a tremendous problem, and I am really pleased that the gentlewoman has brought it to our attention, raised the issue, because we need to know the full scope of VA delinquent payments. So I support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the comments of the ranking member, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Chairman DENT agreeing to look into this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in part B of House Report 115-712.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 138, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, this simple amendment to H.R. 5895 would ensure sufficient funds for the Veterans Affairs Office of the Inspector General to provide rigorous oversight of the Washington, D.C., Veterans Affairs Medical Center, a center that has been plagued with management problems, many of which have been described in previous amendments here this morning.

The inspector general recently concluded a year-long investigation into the critical deficiencies at that center. In its final report, issued on March 7 of this year, the IG highlighted that leadership failures and pervasive understaffing underpinned widespread issues in inventory management, sterile processing, and patient safety itself. These are our veterans we are talking about.

The IG found continual mismanagement of protected information and significant government resources, putting them at risk for fraud, waste, and abuse. The report makes clear these failures have persisted for the better part of a decade. Entrenched problems like these will not be resolved overnight.

□ 0945

Following the final report's release, officials from the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs briefed House Veterans Affairs' Committee staff that delays in patient care and supply shortages were no longer occurring as of January 2018.

Yet recent reports show, contrary to that, that seven procedures were canceled due to supply shortages in February and March of this year, contrary to the Department's own claims. The VA inspector general has played a vital role in covering that crisis at the D.C. VA Medical Center, and we must ensure that the VA IG has adequate resources to carry out its essential mandate.

The bill before us today meets the President's 2019 budget request of \$172 million. However, the VA inspector general, Michael Missal, recently wrote that \$172 million will not be sufficient for the IG to fully meet its mission of effective oversight of the programs and operations of the Veterans Administration.

Furthermore, the IG said that an FY19 appropriation of \$172 million would actually likely require a decrease of about 28 OIG staff. This could not be a worse time to have that happen, and I know the chairman and the ranking member share in that view.

Across the inspector general community, the IG staffing at the VA is among the smallest ratio of oversight staff to agency staff, and the OIG budget represents less than 0.1 percent of the total Veterans Administration budget.

This week, the Senate Appropriations Committee voted to fund the IG at a level of \$192 million for FY 2019, and I hope my colleagues will support that higher funding level when this bill gets to conference.

We have a sacred obligation to ensure that the men and women, who sacrificed so much to defend our freedom, receive the highest quality care they can possibly receive. The IG's yearlong investigation revealed that the D.C. VA Medical Center has, at times, fallen far below that standard. We owe it to our veterans not only to address these problems, but also to understand how they were allowed to arise in the first place.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to this bill and to ensure the highest quality for our veterans who fought for their country, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, even though I am not in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, you just can't make this stuff up. The committee members have been to the D.C. VA Medical Center, and they put on a nice show when I first became ranking member. They leave a good impression. But the documented issues at the D.C. VA Medical Center are well known, and I want to just walk our colleagues through a few of them because this is how egregious it is. The gentleman's suggestion through this amendment to make sure that the IG takes a very close look at what is going on at this medical center is critical.

The D.C. VA Medical Center was found to have paid exorbitant amounts for supplies and equipment, including \$300 per speculum, which could have been purchased for \$122 each, and \$900 each for a special needle that was available for \$250. In one case, the medical center rented in-home hospital beds for three patients for 3 years at a total cost of \$877,000. The medical center could have bought the three beds for \$21,000.

A review of 124 veteran patient records found problems with supplies or instruments in 74 of the cases between 2014 and 2017.

One surgery was canceled after the patient was already under anesthesia because a retractor was unavailable because it had not been sterilized since its previous use a week earlier.

A surgeon had to improvise when a tool used to prepare a skin graft was broken and the graft failed. A surgical staff member had to run to a private sector hospital across the street to borrow mesh to repair a hernia midprocedure.

Investigators received more than 1,300 boxes of unsecured records from two warehouses, the hospital basement, and a large trash dumpster in April 2017. Of those records, 81 percent contained confidential patient information, including medical scans and records dating back to the 1970s. This

facility is failing the veterans in the Metro D.C. area who deserve better.

This is an important amendment, and making sure that the VA takes care of its patients and is not negligent or derelict in its duties at every single place that those veterans are serviced is critical.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I would conclude simply by thanking my friend from Florida for detailing that horror story. Unfortunately, these aren't isolated incidents. This is a pattern of shoddy care for our veterans at this center, and we need the IG to be doing his work over time to make sure that these deficiencies are corrected, and corrected as soon as possible. That is the intent of this amendment.

Again, I thank my friend from Texas, but I especially thank my good friend DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ from Florida for their support on this amendment.

I include in the RECORD two letters from the Department of Veterans Affairs inspector general.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,
INSPECTOR GENERAL,
Washington DC, March 23, 2018.

Hon. PHIL ROE, M.D.,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a response from the Office of Inspector General (OIG) to a question for the record received from Congressman Mike Bost following the February 15th hearing before the Committee on the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2019. We request that it be added to the hearing record.

Thank you for your interest in the OIG.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. MISSAL.

Enclosure.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FROM HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS HEARING ON U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BUDGET REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

65. The budget includes a request for \$172 million for the Office of Inspector General to strengthen accountability. Will this level of funding be sufficient to properly enforce accountability throughout the VA?

VA Office of Inspector General Response: The budget request for the Office of Inspector General (OIG) for fiscal year (FY) 2019 of \$172 million will not be sufficient for the OIG to fully meet its mission of effective oversight of the programs and operations of VA. While that amount would represent an increase over the OIG's funding of \$164 million for FY 2018, it falls short of even the OIG's actual FY 2018 operating budget of \$175.5 million (which includes \$15.9 million of carry-over due to a late hiring cycle that was out of synch with the budget cycle).

There will not be a carryover of that size for FY 2019 as those funds will have been expended led primarily on new hires to conduct our oversight work. In addition, we are now funding our Office of Contract Review approximately \$5 million that was previously paid by VA through a reimbursable agreement, and there are other increased costs in FY 2019. Consequently, an FY 2019 appropriation of \$172 million would require a decrease of about 28 OIG staff. This would result in a likely curtailment of some of our oversight

priorities if OIG staffing and resources decrease at a time when VA is experiencing growth, including large and complex projects such as VA's new electronic health records initiative, improving VA's financial systems, enhancing and consolidating VA's IT systems, and expansion of community care programs. The OIG will need additional funds to not only conduct oversight of these costly programs, but also to expand our investigations of other high-risk VA programs, such as construction, procurement, education benefits, and the delivery of timely and quality healthcare. The VA OIG's staffing is among the smallest ratio of oversight staff to agency staff across the Inspector General community. Moreover, the OIG budget represents less than .1 percent of VA's overall budget, which again is less than a significant number of OIGs at other cabinet level agencies. An FY2019 appropriation of \$172 million will undermine progress achieved to "right size" the OIG oversight capacity to the growth and demands of VA's new initiatives.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,
INSPECTOR GENERAL,
Washington, DC, April 3 2018.

Hon. PATTY MURRAY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Your question regarding the VA Office of Inspector General's (OIG) budget for fiscal year (FY) 2019 was referred to the OIG for a response. We appreciate your interest and are grateful for your support.

The budget request for the OIG FY 2019 of \$172 million will not be sufficient for the OIG to fully meet its mission of effective oversight of the programs and operations of VA. While that amount would represent an increase over the OIG's funding of \$164 million for FY 2018, it falls short of even the OIG's actual FY 2018 operating budget of \$179.9 million (which includes \$15.9 million of carry-over due to a late hiring cycle that was out of synch with the budget cycle).

There will not be a carryover of that size for FY 2019 as those funds will have been expended primarily on new hires to conduct our oversight work. In addition, we are now funding our Office of Contract Review approximately \$5 million that was previously paid by VA through a reimbursable agreement, and there are other increased costs in FY 2019. Consequently, a FY 2019 appropriation of \$172 million would likely require a decrease of about 28 OIG staff. This would inevitably result in a curtailment of some of our oversight activities at a time when VA is experiencing growth, including large and complex projects such as VA's new electronic health records initiative, improving VA's financial systems, enhancing and consolidating VA's IT systems, and expansion of community care programs. The OIG will need additional funds to not only conduct oversight of these costly programs, but also to expand our investigations of other high-risk VA programs, such as construction, procurement, education benefits, and the delivery of timely and quality healthcare. The VA OIG's staffing is among the smallest ratio of oversight staff to agency staff across the Inspector General community. Moreover, the OIG budget represents less than .1 percent of VA's overall budget, which again is less than a significant number of OIGs at other cabinet level agencies. A FY 2019 appropriation of \$172 million will undermine progress achieved to "right size" the OIG oversight capacity to match the growth and demands of VA's new initiatives.

We will provide a copy of this letter to Chairman Isakson and request that it be made part of the hearing record.

Again, thank you for interest and support of the OIG.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. MISSAL.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, the gentleman deserves credit for bringing this to the House's attention. The outrage at this medical center speaks for itself, and I look forward to making sure that the IG has the resources that are needed to be able to get to the bottom to help fix this problem.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in part B of House Report 115-712.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in contravention of subchapter III of chapter 20 of title 38, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, my first order of business is to thank both Judge CARTER and Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their leadership and, as well, for their shepherding this bill that is based and focused on help for our veterans.

This past month and coming into the Fourth of July and Veterans Day in November may be just one or two or three of the times that we acknowledge those who have fallen as well as our veterans, but it really is a responsibility of this country and this Congress to acknowledge and work on behalf of our veterans every single day.

I hold up a picture of and will include in the RECORD an article about Army Veteran Vivian Unce, Navy veteran Victoria Lewis, and Navy veteran Veronica Vernon. They met each other in a homeless shelter. They have come to know each other, and I would say to Mr. Chairman there are homeless veterans every night across this country.

[Wed., July 20, 2011]

MICHAEL E. DEBAKEY VA MEDICAL CENTER—HOUSTON, TEXAS GRANT PROVIDES MORE THAN \$666K FOR PERMANENT HOUSING FOR HOMELESS VETERANS

HOUSTON.—The Department of Veterans Affairs has announced the award of \$666,765 to the Harris County Housing Authority to

increase permanent housing and case management for area Veterans.

"This initiative will strengthen our ongoing efforts to eliminate Veteran homelessness and improve quality of life for Veterans," said Adam C. Walmus, M.H.A., M.A., F.A.C.H.E., director of the Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center. "Working with our partners at HUD, we continue to make good progress to reduce Veteran homelessness, though much work remains. VA is committed to providing Veterans and their families with access to affordable housing and medical services that will help them get back on their feet."

The funding, from Housing and Urban Development's Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing program (HUD-VASH), is a coordinated effort by HUD, VA, and local housing agencies to provide permanent housing for homeless Veterans.

Homeless Veterans are referred to the Harris County Housing Authority for "Housing Choice" Section 8 vouchers to assist with rent payment. With this latest grant, the Harris County Housing Authority will receive 125 additional housing vouchers.

Eligible homeless Veterans receive VA-provided case management, and services to support stability and recovery from physical and mental health, substance use, and functional concerns contributing to or resulting from homelessness.

Veterans participating in the HUD-VASH program rent privately owned housing and generally contribute no more than 30 percent of their income toward rent. VA offers eligible homeless Veterans clinical and supportive services through the Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center.

About one-third of the adult homeless population has served their country in the Armed Services.

Current population estimates suggest that about 107,000 Veterans (male and female) are homeless on any given night and perhaps twice as many experience homelessness at some point during the course of a year.

Many other Veterans are considered near homeless or at risk because of their poverty, lack of support from family and friends, and dismal living conditions in cheap hotels or in overcrowded or substandard housing.

If you know a Veteran who needs assistance, please call 1-877-4AID VET (877-424-3838) or the Health Care for Homeless Veterans Program at 713-794-7848. More information about VA's homeless programs is available online at <http://www.va.gov/homeless>.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, my amendment is an amendment to ensure that we will focus the VA on its obligation to provide our veterans the assistance needed to avoid homelessness. It will help to ensure the rate of homelessness among veterans in the United States does not increase, because I believe in reducing and eliminating homelessness among veterans. Those who risked their lives to protect our freedom should also be one of the Nation's highest priorities.

I am grateful that this particular legislation, likewise, recognizes the importance of dealing with homelessness and working with the VA and its public housing assistance. That is where these individuals were able to find housing, through the grant for the permanent housing for homeless veterans.

It is important to recognize that perhaps twice as many, 200,000, experience homelessness at some point during the course of the year. Today, in our coun-

try, there are approximately 107,000 veterans, male and female, who are homeless on any given night, even though communities are working very hard.

I know in my hometown of Houston, we work hard to reduce the numbers of homeless veterans. Many of us work with homeless veterans, attend what we call stand down, where we provide them with the maximum support on the street. We want them to get off the street, but we want to bring the services to them. In 2012 alone, 35,905 veterans lived in public housing provided by the VASH program.

So I want to continue this focus, and this amendment is to suggest that no matters in this bill, no language in this bill will be in contravention of our programs that deal with our homeless veterans.

Let me also make the point that Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center has been involved in changing lives in a mighty way by providing veterans and their families with access to affordable housing and medical services that would help to get them back on their feet.

I had the privilege of knowing Dr. Michael E. DeBakey and naming the hospital after him. His whole value and his whole purpose as he continued to do magical surgery was to remind us, as he created the MASH unit in World War II, that our veterans yesterday, today, and tomorrow should be our priority.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk, it is Jackson Lee Amendment No. 33, which simply provides that:

"None of the funds made available by this Act for the Department of Veteran Affairs—Benefits for Homeless Veterans and Training and Outreach Programs may be used in contravention of the title 38, Part II, Chapter 20, Subchapter II and III of the U.S. Code.

This amendment will help ensure that the rate of homelessness among veterans in the United States does not increase.

I thank Subcommittee Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their hard work in shepherding this important legislation to the floor.

I offer Jackson Lee Amendment No. 33 because I believe reducing and eliminating homelessness among veterans, those who risked their lives to protect our freedom, should also be one of the nation's highest priorities.

Homelessness among the American veteran population is on the rise in the United States and we must be proactive in giving back to those who have given so much to us.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 33 will help focus the VA on its obligation to provide our veterans the assistance needed to avoid homelessness, which includes adequately funding for programs Veterans Administration Supportive Housing (VASH) that provide case-management services, adequate housing facilities, mental health support, and address other areas that contribute to veteran homelessness.

VASH is a jointly-administered permanent supportive housing program for disabled Veterans experiencing homelessness in which VA

medical Centers provide referrals and case management while Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) administer the Section 8 housing vouchers.

Mr. Chair, our veterans deserve the best services available, and I believe that we could be doing much more for them.

Today, in our country, there are approximately 107,000 veterans (male and female) who are homeless on any given night.

And perhaps twice as many (200,000) experience homelessness at some point during the course of a year.

Many other veterans are considered near homeless or at risk because of their poverty, lack of support from family and friends, and dismal living conditions in cheap hotels or in overcrowded or substandard housing.

While significant progress has been made, ending homelessness among veterans remains a big challenge.

In my hometown of Houston for example, between the years 2010 and 2017, the number of homeless veterans increased from 771 to 1,162.

We must remain vigilant and continue to fight for those who put on the uniform and fought for us.

Providing a home for veterans to come home to every night is the very least we can do.

Mr. Chair, programs like VASH have succeeded in changing lives.

In 2012 alone, 35,905 veterans lived in the public housing provided by VASH.

I have seen the impact of such grants in my home state of Texas, and within my congressional district in Houston, and I am sure that this funding has positively impacted many communities across this country.

In Texas, there are committed groups in Houston, working to eradicate the issue of homelessness.

For example, the Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center has been involved in changing veterans' lives in a mighty way by providing Veterans and their families with access to affordable housing and medical services that will help them get back on their feet.

Mr. Chair, we cannot let this issue of homelessness continue.

I urge my colleagues to support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 33 and commit ourselves to the hard but necessary work of ending veteran homelessness in America.

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

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I don't intend to oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chair, we understand and commend the gentleman's concern about safeguarding the homeless programs. Looking at what we have done, we have gotten in this bill \$7.4 billion in homeless veterans' treatment services, housing, and job training, and we certainly are going to keep in mind, when we go to conference, what the gentleman has presented us here today.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me again express my appreciation.

As I indicated, there is a very solid and strong stand on this bill regarding providing for our homeless veterans. It is something that we contend with in our city of Houston, but we are grateful that the local officials are very concerned about it.

I want to make sure as we go to conference that our focus will continue to be on making sure that maybe in our lifetime we extinguish this concept of homeless veterans and homelessness among veterans by providing them with a pathway to opportunity and success.

So I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in part B of House Report 115-712.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—Information Technology Systems" (and the amount specified under such heading for operations and maintenance), and by increasing the amount made available in fiscal year 2019 for "Veterans Health Administration—Medical Services", by \$2,500,000 and \$2,000,000, respectively.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me explain the Jackson Lee amendment, which makes a modest but important improvement to the bill by increasing the amount of funding for the supportive services for veterans' families account by \$2 million, offset by a certain amount to the \$4 billion allocated to the VA's information technology systems.

Let me read a story that talks about Liz, who is an Army veteran and a single mom:

After losing her job, she struggled to pay the rent and provide for her daughter. Liz's landlord said she had always been an excellent tenant, but his patience was wearing thin as her recent rent arrears continued to increase. Disheartened with a fruitless job search and unsure where else to turn, Liz came to the Veterans Outreach Center. She was immediately connected with a case manager, an employment specialist, and an accredited State benefits counselor, and the

Supportive Services for Veteran Families team.

I include in the RECORD an article about Liz.

"HEROISM KNOWS NO GENDER"

Liz is an Army Veteran and a single mom. After losing her job, she struggled to pay the rent and provide for her daughter. Liz's landlord said she had always been an excellent tenant but his patience was wearing thin as her rent arrears continued to increase. Disheartened with a fruitless job search and unsure of where else to turn, Liz came to the Veterans Outreach Center (VOC). She was immediately connected with a Case Manager, an Employment Specialist, an Accredited State Veterans Benefits Counselor, and the SSVF team.

In order to avoid the immediate crisis of homelessness, the Services To Enable Positive Solutions (S.T.E.P.S) program at the VOC paid Liz's rent arrears, which had escalated to an amount that was insurmountable. Within a few short days of connecting with the team at VOC, Liz had a job interview that resulted in full-time, meaningful employment. In less than a week, she had a benefits review with an on-site counselor from the New York State Division of Veterans Affairs during which she applied for an increase in disability compensation. The payment of Liz's back rent allowed her and her daughter to keep a roof over their head. With a roof over their heads and their living situation stabilized, Liz was able to focus on her employment and securing her benefits, which are both components of an Individual Development Plan (IDP) that will help Liz sustain permanent housing in the future.

The VOC was able to stabilize Liz and her daughter while concurrently providing the supportive services necessary for her to maintain permanent housing. The temporary financial assistance was delivered to the landlord in a timely, efficient manner with the help of a S.T.E.P.S collaborative partner. Through coordinated case management, the aforementioned supportive services were provided quickly and effectively. The longterm result of this effort is yet to be determined, but at the 90-day benchmark, Liz has retained both her job and her home. She has realized this goal independently, without requesting any additional financial assistance. Consequently, the VOC was able to better the lives of a mom (a Veteran) and her child immeasurably through SSVF funding.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. This is a very conspicuous and daily occurrence that happens where our veterans are able to go to a supportive team that understands their service, appreciates their plight, and works to help them so that they do not go into the cycle of homelessness.

I think it is particularly important when we think about veterans and their families. They are many times single parents, many times disabled or with family concerns, mental health needs, and these services that are provided include healthcare, daily living, legal services, fiduciary and payee services, personal financial planning, childcare, transportation, and housing counseling.

Veterans like the Air Force veteran who, hoping to utilize the skills he learned in the service, instead bounced from job to job after being discharged, found himself sleeping at night on the cold cement under a bridge in Chicago. But, of course, he was able to get the

support from our veterans support services.

This is, again, a valuable statement made by this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to continue to support the services given by this particular program.

Again, I hope that we will see the end of homelessness among our veterans and the increase in support services to help them in their pathway to success.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

□ 1000

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, our bill includes \$340 million for the Supportive Services for Veteran Family Program, which is \$20 million above the President's budget request. But we understand the gentlewoman's concerns and we will certainly keep them in mind in conference.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me close by acknowledging and thanking the chairman and ranking member again for their leadership on this bill and to remind my colleagues that there are a series of stories of veterans who really needed these services.

Katie, an SSVF caseworker at the Salvation Army Bismarck, received a call from a veteran named Cherié. Cherié was referred by the family assistance adviser at the military service center in Bismarck. According to Cherié, she didn't know the Salvation Army had the veterans program until she inquired for help.

Cherié approached them. She had suffered a head injury resulting in a 3-inch blood clot, skull fracture, severe concussion. In short, she suffered traumatic brain injury. While on unpaid medical leave via physician's orders, she was terminated from her employer.

This is the kind of devastating news that will be heard from veterans who will seek and receive this kind of help.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD articles explaining the plight of a veteran in Bismarck:

HOW THE SALVATION ARMY HELPED A MOTHER AND HER CHILDREN KEEP THEIR HOME

On December 20, 2011, Katie, an SSVF Caseworker at the Salvation Army Bismarck Corps, received a call from a Veteran named Cherié. Cherié was referred by the Family Assistance Advisor at the Military Service Center in Bismarck, ND. According to Cherié, she "didn't know the Salvation Army had the Veterans program until [she] required help." Cherié approached the SSVF program because on November 19th, she suffered a head injury resulting in a 3-inch blood clot, skull fracture and a severe concussion; in short, she suffered a traumatic brain injury (TBI). While on unpaid medical

leave via physician's orders, she was terminated from her employer. A single mother of two, her biggest concern was maintaining her current residency.

On December 21st, when Cherié met with Katie, she was very emotional and had difficulty processing her thoughts. She was extremely overwhelmed with how to pay for her rent and utilities and provide for her children while unemployed. Katie provided emotional support as well as resources for a food box, an application for food stamps through the county, contact information for a Veterans employment team representative and lastly, information about a support group for women Veterans in the Bismarck community. In Cherié's own words, "The SSVF assistance provided peace of mind and helped keep me on my feet, especially with having kids. Katie has been such a calming influence, good about following up and very supportive."

Since Cherié has been involved with the Salvation Army, she has been able to focus on recovering from her TBI, has found temporary full-time employment for which permanent placement is promising, and is able to provide for her children and keep a roof over their heads. She's also spreading the word to fellow Veterans throughout the state about the SSVF program.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I ask my colleagues to support the program overall and my amendment.

Mr. Chair, thank you for this opportunity to briefly explain Jackson Lee Amendment No. 34.

Before I begin, let me express my appreciation and thanks to good friends, Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, for their hard and constructive work in shepherding this legislation to the floor.

Chairman CALVERT and I have worked together constructively for many years and he has always distinguished himself as one of the more bipartisan members of the House.

And Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ has for years been one of the ablest Members of this body; I thank them both for their commitment to the important work of ensuring that our veterans receive the care and support they have earned from a grateful nation.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 34 makes a modest but important improvement to the bill by increasing the amount of funding for the "Supportive Services for Veterans' Families" account by \$2 million, offset by a reduction of \$2.5 million to the \$4 billion allocated to the VA's "Information Technology Systems" account.

Today, in our country, there are approximately 107,000 veterans (male and female) who are homeless on any given night.

Any perhaps twice as many (200,000) experience homelessness at some point during the course of a year.

The VA's "Supportive Services for Veterans' Families" Program helps veterans, and their families, who may have fallen on hard times or hit a rough patch in life and need a little help from the country they selflessly risked their life to defend.

Homeless veterans or veterans facing homelessness who have minor age children are in need of special programs that allow housing that welcomes children.

Jackson Lee Amendment No. 34 will enable this vital program to serve more veterans' families in need of help by provide a bit more funding for grants to private non-profit organizations and consumer cooperatives that pro-

vide supportive services to very low-income veteran families living in or transitioning to permanent housing.

The SSVF Program ensures that eligible veteran families receive the outreach, case management, and assistance in obtaining VA and other benefits.

These services may include health care, daily living, legal services, fiduciary and payee services, personal financial planning, child care, transportation, housing counseling.

The SSVF Program enables VA staff and local homeless service providers to work together to effectively address the unique challenges that make it difficult for some veterans and their families to remain stably housed.

Many homeless veterans, including in my own state of Texas, lack housing because they lost their job or could no longer afford rent; many suffer from an untreated mental illness that keeps them from working.

Every day the SSVF program makes a real difference in the lives of real people.

Veterans like the Air Force veteran who, hoping to utilize the skills he learned in the service, instead bounced from job to job after being discharged and found himself sleeping at night on the cold cement under a bridge in Chicago.

Through the Thresholds Veterans Project, funded through the SSVF, this hero received steady community service support and eventually was placed in his own studio apartment.

He now says, in his own words: I have a home. I enjoy bein' inside."

Veterans like the one in Texas who because he lost his job at a manufacturing plant and was unable to pay the bills, was forced to seek shelter for himself and his family at a homeless shelter.

Fortunately, the homeless shelter was a SSVF grantee and was able to assist the veteran obtain employment and his family in securing affordable low-cost housing.

There are thousands of similar success stories made possible by the SSVF Program that I could share but all of them share a common theme: they involve veterans who served their country proudly, fell down on their luck, picked themselves back up, and found affordable and sustainable housing for their families because of the assistance and support made possible by the SSVF program.

Ensuring that veterans have a place of their own to call home is the very least we can do.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee Amendment and commit ourselves to the hard but necessary work of ending veteran homelessness in America.

I urge my colleagues to support Jackson Lee Amendment No. 34.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in part B of House Report 115-712.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to implement, administer, or enforce section 17.3240 of title 38, Code of Federal Regulations, as proposed in 82 Fed. Reg. 48018 (October 16, 2017).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my commonsense amendment to ensure our Nation's injured and amputee veterans will continue to have the ability to choose the orthotist or prosthetist that best meets his or her healthcare needs, whether that practitioner is a VA employee or a VA-contracted provider.

The VA currently is proposing a rule that I fear will reverse a decades-old policy of allowing injured and amputee veterans to choose who provides their artificial limbs and orthotic braces. The VA would have the sole authority to make what they describe as this "administrative business decision."

But choice of provider is a clinical decision and an important patient protection. These men and women have sacrificed greatly for our country and it is imperative we do everything we can to make sure they receive the timely and patient-centered healthcare they have earned and deserve.

O&P care is very intimate and specialized, and the correct practitioner for that veteran makes all the difference in the lifestyle the veteran leads. We should do everything we can do in our power to make the often difficult and frustrating transition from service to civilian life as easy as possible, especially when veterans have incurred a disabling condition.

This has been a very important issue to me, and I would like to take the time to thank my colleague, Representative RUTHERFORD, for working with me on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank both the Appropriations Committee and the Veterans' Affairs Committee for working with me on this important and timely issue.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" and empower our veterans in making their personal healthcare decisions, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we understand that to allay concerns regarding this proposed rule, the VA is planning to propose a supplemental rule to amend it. But we will monitor the situation. As we move to

conference with the Senate, we will keep this in mind and be glad to work the gentleman.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his commitment and I certainly respect his position and that he will carry that out. I have legislation to do this, but this is the opportunity to at least make the point and give some certainty to our veterans that their care has and will be taken in deep and grateful consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment and empower our veterans in making their personal healthcare decisions, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in part B of House Report 115-712.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be used to convey the 17.1 acres of land and the 126 existing housing units known as Shenandoah Square and located in Mountain View, California.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will prevent the Army from moving forward with its plan to sell 17 acres of Federal land and 126 military housing units known as Shenandoah Square in the heart of my congressional district.

Shenandoah Square is located next to Moffett Federal Airfield in Mountain View, California, and houses 108 military and civilian families serving in the Air National Guard, the Army National Guard, the U.S. Navy, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the U.S. Marine Corps.

Established in 2004, Shenandoah Square is part of the California Military Communities privatized military housing entity, which consists of 2,900 homes located at Fort Irwin, Camp Parks, Moffett Federal Airfield, and Shenandoah Square.

This entity is overleveraged and is in hundreds of millions of dollars in debt because of the Army's decision to overinvest in housing at Fort Irwin that assumed greater than realized gains in the Basic Housing Allowance provided to servicemembers.

Now the Army is justifying its sale of Shenandoah Square on the grounds that there is declining demand for military housing in the bay area, but this is hardly the case. In fact, it is absurd.

I have met with the families and servicemembers living at Shenandoah Square who serve in the region with the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and the Coast Guard. The residents have consistently raised concerns that the property management company contracted by the Army has been working to drive out the remaining military personnel living in the Shenandoah complex to artificially depress military demand for housing to justify its decision to sell the land.

My Silicon Valley district is facing one of the most severe housing crises in the country, and the 17 acres of land that Shenandoah sits on is some of the most valuable in our entire country. Clearly, the Army is selling Shenandoah Square to pay down the debt it created and keep the California Military Communities entity from going bankrupt. This is really wrong and does a huge disservice to the military families living in this housing.

This House is already on record expressing concerns about the Army's plans to sell Shenandoah Square. I offered an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for 2019 expressing the sense of Congress that the Army should explore all possible alternatives to a sale, including subleasing the property to an entity that can better develop affordable housing on the property, and the amendment was adopted by a voice vote.

The Army can pursue a win-win situation by subleasing this land to one of the many willing partners in Silicon Valley seeking to develop housing and generate a regular stream of income to make this LLC whole again, but they refuse to.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make something very clear. I would support new housing for our military families if they included our military families. They are offering housing for 8 families, when we have 109. I think that this is really unacceptable.

We can't allow military families to be left without housing as they serve our country in one of the most expensive housing markets in the country. That is why I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and support this amendment.

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

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I will not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the FY2018 omnibus included report language asking the Army to look at alternatives for conveying this property. We have yet to receive this report. This amendment has no effect, as

the underlying bill does not include any funding for the conveyance of this property.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason, I will not oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in part B of House Report 115-712.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to transfer funds made available for the following programs:

(1) The Homeless Providers Grant and Per Diem program.

(2) The Domiciliary Care for Homeless Veterans program.

(3) The Supportive Services for Veteran Families program.

(4) The Department of Housing and Urban Development Department of Veterans Affairs Supported Housing (HUD-VASH) programs.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to division C of the Appropriations bill related to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

In September 2017, the VA issued a plan to shift funding away from programs that helped homeless veterans. After national outcry, the proposal was tabled, but that attempt is the reason for my amendment.

Its goal is simple: It prohibits taking funding from VA programs that provide services to homeless veterans, including the Homeless Providers Grant and Per Diem program, a clinical rehabilitation and treatment program, the Supportive Services for Veteran Families Program, and HUD-VASH housing vouchers.

Congress has made money available in a bipartisan way to reduce homelessness for veterans. It is unconscionable that the VA would use funds specifically intended for that purpose on another purpose.

San Diego County has the third-largest veterans population nationwide, behind Los Angeles and Maricopa Counties. This is why, since being elected, I have worked with my colleagues to provide more funding and services to

veterans who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. I have furthered this work over the last year and a half as a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

These vets took an oath to protect our country, and now America must keep its promise to take care of them. They should not be struggling, and they most certainly should not be living on the streets.

San Diego has achieved some progress in getting vets off the streets and into housing in recent years. Other cities, like Salt Lake City, New Orleans, and Houston, have reached functional zero, which means that homelessness among veterans is rare, brief, and nonrecurring. But across the country, the problem is still far too prevalent.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment that will help protect valuable resources that our veterans desperately need, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to fund veterans homelessness programs and to make sure that Federal dollars committed to that purpose are used for that important need.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, the committee opposed the Department's tentative decision last fall to convert almost a billion dollars of funding for homeless programs from special purpose funding to general purpose funding.

This action would have been a fundamental change to the manner in which medical care funding is allocated to the field, and I support giving more local flexibility to Veterans Integrated Service Networks and medical center directors.

□ 1015

However, I strongly support transparency when it comes to changing the levels that Congress sets for VA programs.

We are the appropriations institution. We are the ones that make those decisions. The proposed realignment by VA would have potentially risked funding for essential programs such as the Supportive Services for Veteran Families Program.

Thankfully, after numerous discussions with the committee and public outrage, the Department decided not to move forward with its proposal in FY18. We fully expect for the VA to comply with the levels that we set for programs; and if the levels need to be adjusted, then the VA must consult with Congress before making changes.

I thank the gentleman from California for his amendment, and I believe

it sends a strong message to the Department that it must respect congressional priorities.

I urge all Members to support the gentleman's amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in part B of House Report 115-712.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of division C (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose, plan for, or execute a new or additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 923, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman CARTER and Ranking Member WASSERMAN SCHULTZ for their hard work on behalf of the 63,000 veterans in my district, as well as servicemembers and veterans across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to once again have the opportunity to offer this important amendment, which would simply prohibit any funds made available in this act from being used to propose, to plan for, or to execute a new or additional round of BRAC.

Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Texas, which is home to the Red River Army Depot. The Depot has supported the warfighter since 1941; and although the Depot community has weathered a lot of changes over the years, its commitment to mission has remained the same. On the placards inside of every vehicle are the words "We build it as if our lives depend on it. Theirs do."

The Depot is a vital job creator in northeast Texas, and it is a critical component, Mr. Chairman, of our national defense. In this fiscal environment, we have to be careful stewards of taxpayer dollars and focus our limited resources on addressing critical national security objectives and our military readiness. Having another round of BRAC simply won't help us achieve this goal.

To that point, the Government Accountability Office said that the last round of BRAC back in 2005 cost the American taxpayers over \$35 billion, which was 67 percent more than the original cost estimate.

Starting another round of BRAC would weaken our capabilities while

increasing our vulnerabilities in the face of critical threats facing our Nation right now.

I would like to thank my colleagues who have supported this important amendment for the past 3 years, and I look forward to having this amendment included in the MILCON-VA appropriations bill.

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, I do oppose this amendment. I, like many Members, have concerns and share the gentleman's concerns about another round of BRAC. I realize that this is a complex issue for all Members of Congress, especially those with military facilities in their district.

I know that previous rounds of BRAC have ended up being far more expensive and expansive than we were initially led to believe. However, I have concerns about maintaining the infrastructure that the Department of Defense doesn't need. For example, the estimate of excess capacity for the Army is 22 percent. The Air Force's estimate of excess capacity is roughly 30 percent.

I can tell you that, since I became the ranking member of this subcommittee, when I have traveled around the world, almost to a person, when we have spoken to a leader on a military base, they raise the issue of needing to go through another round of BRAC. Both the Army and the Air Force are strong supporters of another BRAC round.

While this amendment has no real effect, it does send a message that Congress is unwilling to tackle a tough issue. This amendment is an abdication of our duties as Members of this House to ensure taxpayer resources are being used in a wise and fiscally responsible way. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and have a serious conversation about another BRAC round.

While I am not suggesting that we support another BRAC round, we should not be tying our hands by taking it off the table.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chair, I yield to my colleague from Texas, Chairman CARTER.

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I want to reassure my fellow Texans that this subcommittee is committed to protecting the installations in the great State of Texas, and I will be on top of that.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, just to reiterate, we shouldn't be

taking any method that gives us an opportunity to be fiscally responsible and save money off the table.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle consistently talk a good game about being fiscally responsible, blow holes in the deficit by passing massive tax scam legislation of a \$1.5 trillion deficit expansion, and include amendments like this one that prevent the military, who have asked repeatedly to be able to at least engage in a discussion about another BRAC round, to save millions of dollars and close facilities that are no longer needed. Yet, the last several years, the majority has refused to make the tough decisions and at least have a discussion about this.

It is not responsible. Certainly not fiscally responsible. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, as we complete debate on these three bills and these amendments, I would like to say a few words in closing.

I know I join my ranking member, Mrs. LOWEY, in thanking our colleagues for the very constructive and civil debate over the last couple of days. I thank the chairman, certainly Judge CARTER, as well as Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and their counterparts for the other two bills, for being involved in work products that have been part of an open and collaborative process.

The Appropriations Committee received over 57,000 Member requests to our database and through our Member Day hearings, the majority of which are reflected in the bills that have been discussed over the last couple of days.

Secondly, now Members have the opportunity to further make their mark through the amendment process on the floor. The result, after two days here, is that we have legislation that truly represents the priorities of the American people. These priorities include caring for our veterans, our troops, and their families; rebuilding our Armed Forces; sustaining our national defense; and investing in essential infrastructure that grows our economy and creates jobs.

I urge all of my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to support these bills. These are bills that fund Federal programs that all Americans, especially our veterans and our troops, rely on to keep themselves safe, protect their lives and livelihoods, and preserve our Nation's ideals. These are programs that all of us can support.

H.R. 5895 begins the 2019 appropriations process on a strong footing and

fulfills our commitment to the American people that we will get our work done on their behalf, and I urge my colleagues to pass the bill as we go ahead to vote in the near future.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 39 will not be offered.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Ranking Member LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the full committee and our ranking member, Mrs. LOWEY, for the incredible work that they have done to get us to this point.

While in the minority we have had some concerns about the process, the opportunity to work closely side by side with our colleagues, the opportunity that I had to work with Chairman DENT and looking forward to working with Chairman CARTER, is really an example of how we should be working together throughout the entire legislative process.

I want to thank our staff for doing a remarkable job on this work product, and I look forward to continuing to conference.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Ranking Member LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chair, I acknowledge the work of the appropriators. As an appropriator myself, I have great respect for the work that they do. But I have concerns about the bill that is before us on the floor today.

Mr. Chair, as you know, a budget should be a statement of our national values. What is important to us as a Nation should be how we allocate our resources in that budget, and its manifestations in terms of appropriations bills should not be doing harm. This is really a partisan spending bill that tramples over some of our American values, gutting smart investments in our economy, hurting Americans' health, and endangering families.

The Republicans are pushing forward a minibus appropriations bill that fails to protect the interests of the American people.

Many of us have been attracted to the political process—as moms, as parents—to effect public policy to promote the well-being of our children in ways that are beyond our own control. We can give them all the love, attention, and care, but we cannot guarantee the quality of air that they breathe, the cleanliness of the water that they drink, and the world in which they live in terms of the environment.

So I have very serious concerns about the danger posed in the Energy and Water portion of this bill. It cuts vital clean energy initiatives, even as gas prices surge because of the President's reckless policies. It attacks job-creating investments in transformational energy technologies and slashes funding for critical nuclear nonproliferation priorities.

In terms of the children of whom I spoke earlier, this GOP bill also includes unacceptable poison pill riders that permit deadly firearms to be carried on public land, assaults the clean water our children drink, encourages pollution of our oceans, and pushes our Nation's already endangered species toward extinction.

This bad bill is a first step in the Republicans' plan to choke off funding—and this is really the critical part of it for me—for vital Democratic priorities for America's families later in the appropriations process. It paves the way for their plan to starve key investments in health, education, and good-paying jobs for communities across the country.

Mr. Chairman, the Republicans are wasting everyone's time when we should be focused on meeting the urgent needs of the American people. The majority has spent this entire Congress stacking the deck for special interests, as they do in these poison pills in this bill, while undermining the interests of families.

The Democrats are focusing on what matters in the lives of the American people. We are committed to giving the American people A Better Deal: Better Jobs, Better Pay, Better Future; and for our children, not to promote air pollution, which is what this bill would do, but to eliminate it.

I urge my colleagues to join in voting "no" on this bill for our economy. You know what the sad part of it is: it is so close to doing a better job for the American people. The poison pills take it in a bad direction. The process under which it was put forth is harmful to other priorities that I know we share in a bipartisan way across the aisle.

Hopefully we can work more closely as we go forward in a bipartisan way. That is the tradition of the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, with all due respect to the minority leader, the process has been collaborative, Republicans and Democrats. These are the three bills that have historically received both Republican and Democratic support. They embody American values.

What could be more important than looking after our veterans and their families? Energy and water, infrastructure. We are enormously proud of the

work of both the chairs and ranking members. I urge Members, both Republicans and Democrats, to support these bills, as they historically have done, and look after the interests of the American people, especially those who serve in our military today and those who have paid the supreme sacrifice.

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

□ 1030

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ZELDIN) having assumed the chair, Mr. BYRNE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 923 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5895.

Will the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) kindly take the chair.

□ 1046

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with Mr. YOUNG of Iowa (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 38 printed in part B of

House Report 115-712 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 115-712 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. GOHMERT of Texas.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. MEADOWS of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 16 by Mr. TAKANO of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. GOHMERT

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 201, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 253]

AYES—212

Abraham	Denham	Hultgren
Aderholt	DeSantis	Hunter
Allen	DesJarlais	Hurd
Amash	Donovan	Issa
Arrington	Duffy	Jenkins (KS)
Babin	Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (WV)
Bacon	Duncan (TN)	Johnson (LA)
Banks (IN)	Dunn	Johnson (OH)
Barletta	Emmer	Johnson, Sam
Barr	Estes (KS)	Jones
Barton	Ferguson	Jordan
Biggs	Fleischmann	Joyce (OH)
Bilirakis	Flores	Katko
Bishop (MI)	Fortenberry	Kelly (MS)
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Kelly (PA)
Black	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Blackburn	Gaetz	King (NY)
Blum	Gallagher	Kinzinger
Bost	Garrett	Knight
Brat	Gianforte	Kustoff (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	Labrador
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	LaHood
Buchanan	Gonzalez (TX)	LaMalfa
Buck	Goodlatte	Lamborn
Bucshon	Gosar	Latta
Budd	Gowdy	Lesko
Burgess	Granger	Lewis (MN)
Byrne	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Calvert	Graves (LA)	Long
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Loudermilk
Carter (TX)	Griffith	Love
Chabot	Grothman	Lucas
Cole	Guthrie	Luetkemeyer
Collins (GA)	Handel	MacArthur
Collins (NY)	Harper	Marchant
Comer	Harris	Marino
Comstock	Hartzler	Marshall
Conaway	Hensarling	Massie
Cook	Herrera Beutler	McCarthy
Cramer	Hice, Jody B.	McCaul
Crawford	Higgins (LA)	McClintock
Cuellar	Hill	McHenry
Culberson	Holding	McKinley
Curtis	Hollingsworth	McMorris
Davidson	Hudson	Rodgers
Davis, Rodney	Huizenga	McSally

Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moonenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher

Rokita
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—201

Adams
Aguilar
Amodei
Barragan
Bass
Bera
Bergman
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)
Khanna
Castro (TX)
Kihuen
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan

Norcross
O'Halloran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pallone
Pascarella
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Beatty
Brady (TX)
Cheney
Costello (PA)
Diaz-Balart

Kennedy
Noem
Palazzo
Polis
Sewell (AL)

Shuster
Tsongas
Walters, Mimi
Walz

□ 1110

Mr. RICE of South Carolina changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. WOMACK, SANFORD, CRAMER, BACON, and HILL changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 201, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

AYES—207

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Barletta
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais

Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gove
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)

Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Lowe
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moonenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palmer

Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Posey
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)

Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thornberry
Tipton

NOES—201

Adams
Aguilar
Banks (IN)
Barragan
Bass
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego

Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Handel
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildeer
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan

Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walorski
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Barton
Beatty
Brady (TX)
Cheney
Costello (PA)

Gutiérrez
Huffman
Kennedy
Noem
O'Halloran

Palazzo
Polis
Reed

Sewell (AL) Tsongas Walz
Shuster Walters, Mimi Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1115

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. REED. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 254.

Stated against:

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 254 on H.R. 5895, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yea” when I should have voted “nay.”

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. TAKANO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 217, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

AYES—195

Adams	Cummings	Hultgren
Aguilar	Curbelo (FL)	Jackson Lee
Amash	Davis (CA)	Jayapal
Barragán	Davis, Danny	Jeffries
Bass	DeFazio	Johnson (GA)
Bera	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Beyer	Delaney	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Keating
Blumenauer	DelBene	Kelly (IL)
Blunt Rochester	Demings	Khanna
Bonamici	DeSaulnier	Kihuen
Boyle, Brendan	Deutch	Kildee
F.	Dingell	Kilmer
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Kind
Brown (MD)	Doyle, Michael	Krishnamoorthi
Brownley (CA)	F.	Kuster (NH)
Bustos	Ellison	Lamb
Butterfield	Eshoo	Lance
Capuano	Español	Langevin
Carbajal	Esty (CT)	Larsen (WA)
Cárdenas	Evans	Lawrence
Carson (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Lawson (FL)
Cartwright	Foster	Lee
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Levin
Castro (TX)	Fudge	Lewis (GA)
Chu, Judy	Gabbard	Lieu, Ted
Ciçilline	Gallagher	Lipinski
Clark (MA)	Galleo	LoBiondo
Clarke (NY)	Garamendi	Loeb sack
Clay	Gomez	Lofgren
Cleaver	Gonzalez (TX)	Lowenthal
Clyburn	Green, Al	Lowey
Coffman	Green, Gene	Lujan Grisham,
Cohen	Grijalva	M.
Collins (NY)	Grothman	Lujan, Ben Ray
Connolly	Gutiérrez	Maloney,
Cooper	Hanabusa	Carolyn B.
Costa	Hastings	Maloney, Sean
Courtney	Heck	Matsui
Crist	Higgins (NY)	McCollum
Crowley	Himes	McEachin
Cuellar	Hoyer	McGovern

McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cole
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Correa
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer

NOES—217

Gowdy
Granger
Allen
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
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
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lynch
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaull
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)

Speier
Stefanik
Suozi
Takano
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Beatty	Huffman	Sewell (AL)
Brady (TX)	Kennedy	Shuster
Cheney	Noem	Tsongas
Collins (GA)	Palazzo	Walters, Mimi
Costello (PA)	Polis	Walz

□ 1120

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MARSHALL). There being no further amendments under House Resolution 923, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Mr. MARSHALL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 923, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution and by House Resolution 918, back to the House with sundry further amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any further amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. I oppose the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5895 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 135, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,200,000)”.

Page 131, line 9, after “September 30, 2020” insert “, and \$10,000,000 shall become available on October 1, 2018”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Hampshire is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill nor send it back to committee. If

adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have made robust funding for veterans' healthcare and benefits a top priority.

New Hampshire is one of only three States without a full-service VA Hospital, which creates unique challenges for Granite State veterans' access to care, particularly in the rural parts of my State.

Thankfully for the veterans of New Hampshire and the Nation, this Congress came together to pass historic bipartisan reform for the VA Community Care program, known as the Veterans Choice Program.

That program provided veterans a choice to see their preferred healthcare provider within their community. However, in the wake of the Phoenix VA scandal, the implementation of this program fragmented veterans' care, according to GAO reports, and even extended wait times for veterans using the Choice program.

Reform was much needed, and I was proud to cosponsor the bill known as the VA MISSION Act that would streamline healthcare and ensure continuity of care for those who have "borne the battle."

VA has some of the best healthcare in the country, healthcare that is specialized for the unique wounds of war, both seen and unseen, and healthcare that is provided by physicians experienced in understanding veterans. Integrating it with the rest of our Nation's healthcare is paramount to improving veterans' quality of life.

Yet, despite this historic act of Congress, the Trump administration has indicated that they would not only spurn the will of Congress, but undermine the very system of integrated healthcare that veterans have demanded. This last week, the administration has deemed it necessary to purposefully underfund portions of the reform because it did not meet their desired outcomes.

In other words, and let's be frank, the administration wanted to privatize the VA and was displeased that the Senate, the House, and a near unanimous group of veterans service organizations had worked together to create a common-sense, integrated healthcare system to ensure that veterans received the best care possible.

The possibility that the administration undermines the VA's Community Care program should not be taken lightly. And since the start of this administration, we have seen leaked memos that show the true intent to circumvent the will of Congress and, most notably, to slash homeless veterans' funding at a time when homelessness is on the rise.

My motion to recommit will provide additional funding to the VA medical services account, will ensure that VA hospitals will have the funding to help address the persistent provider shortages that stymie the delivery of qual-

ity medical healthcare for our veterans and will provide the resources they need to give veterans the healthcare they deserve.

It is unconscionable that this administration would purposefully pull the rug out from underneath our veterans by denying them access to convenient care and preferred medical providers. It is time we put partisan politics aside and come together to ensure that all veterans can go to the VA medical centers and receive the care they need.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, each year, it is our constitutional duty to provide funding for the Federal Government. We began that process on the House floor yesterday, considering three very important funding bills: Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs.

□ 1130

Mr. Chairman, these three bills focus on bipartisan values, caring for our veterans and military families, rebuilding our Armed Forces, strengthening our national security, and investing in critical and essential water and energy infrastructure. These are among the highest priorities as Congressmen and women. Please vote against the motion to recommit and support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

Passage of the bill; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 225, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—187

Adams	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Carson (IN)
Barragán	F.	Cartwright
Bass	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Bera	Brown (MD)	Castro (TX)
Beyer	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Bishop (GA)	Bustos	Cicilline
Blum	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Blumenauer	Capuano	Clarke (NY)
Blunt Rochester	Carbajal	Clay

Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Clyburn	Jones	Pelosi
Cohen	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Connolly	Keating	Peters
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Peterson
Correa	Khanna	Pingree
Courtney	Kihuen	Pocan
Crist	Kildee	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kilmer	Quigley
Cuellar	Kind	Raskin
Cummings	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Kuster (NH)	Richmond
Davis, Danny	Lamb	Rosen
DeFazio	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Lawrence	Rush
DelBene	Lawson (FL)	Ryan (OH)
Demings	Lee	Sánchez
DeSaulnier	Levin	Sarbanes
Deutch	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
Doggett	Lipinski	Schneider
Doyle, Michael	Loeb sack	Schrader
F.	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Ellison	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Engel	Lowe y	Serrano
Eshoo	Lujan Grisham,	Shea-Porter
Espallat	M.	Sherman
Esty (CT)	Luján, Ben Ray	Sinema
Evans	Lynch	Sires
Foster	Maloney,	Smith (WA)
Frankel (FL)	Carolyn B.	Soto
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Speier
Gabbard	Matsui	Suozi
Gallego	McCollum	Swalwell (CA)
Garamendi	McEachin	Takano
Gomez	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Gonzalez (TX)	McNerney	Thompson (MS)
Gottheimer	Meeks	Titus
Green, Al	Meng	Tonko
Green, Gene	Moore	Torres
Grijalva	Moulton	Vargas
Gutiérrez	Murphy (FL)	Veasey
Hanabusa	Nadler	Vela
Hastings	Napolitano	Velázquez
Heck	Neal	Visclosky
Higgins (NY)	Nolan	Wasserman
Himes	Norcross	Schultz
Hoyer	O'Halleran	Waters, Maxine
Jackson Lee	O'Rourke	Watson Coleman
Jayapal	Pallone	Welch
Jeffries	Panetta	Wilson (FL)
Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Yarmuth

NOES—225

Abraham	Culberson	Hartzler
Aderholt	Curbelo (FL)	Hensarling
Allen	Curtis	Herrera Beutler
Amash	Davidson	Hice, Jody B.
Amodei	Davis, Rodney	Higgins (LA)
Arrington	Denham	Hill
Babin	DeSantis	Holding
Bacon	DesJarlais	Hollingsworth
Banks (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Hudson
Barletta	Donovan	Huizenga
Barr	Duffy	Hultgren
Barton	Duncan (SC)	Hunter
Bergman	Duncan (TN)	Hurd
Biggs	Dunn	Issa
Bilirakis	Emmer	Jenkins (KS)
Bishop (MI)	Estes (KS)	Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (UT)	Faso	Johnson (LA)
Black	Ferguson	Johnson (OH)
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Bost	Fleischmann	Jordan
Brat	Flores	Joyce (OH)
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	Katko
Brooks (IN)	Fox	Kelly (MS)
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (PA)
Buck	Gaetz	King (IA)
Bucshon	Gallagher	King (NY)
Budd	Garrett	Kinzinger
Burgess	Gianforte	Knight
Byrne	Gibbs	Kustoff (TN)
Calvert	Gohmert	Labrador
Carter (GA)	Goodlatte	LaHood
Carter (TX)	Gosar	LaMalfa
Chabot	Gowdy	Lamborn
Coffman	Granger	Lance
Cole	Graves (GA)	Latta
Collins (GA)	Graves (LA)	Lesko
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Lewis (MN)
Comer	Griffith	LoBiondo
Comstock	Grothman	Long
Conaway	Guthrie	Loudermilk
Cook	Handel	Love
Cramer	Harper	Lucas
Crawford	Harris	Luetkemeyer

MacArthur Reichert Smucker Huizenga McKinley Russell
 Marchant Renacci Stefanik Hultgren McMorris Rutherford
 Marino Rice (SC) Stewart Hunter McMorris Rodgers
 Marshall Roby Stivers Hurd McSally Schrader
 Massie Roe (TN) Taylor Issa Meadows Scott, Austin
 Mast Rogers (AL) Tenney Jenkins (KS) Messer Sessions
 McCarthy Rogers (KY) Thompson (PA) Johnson (WV) Mitchell Shimkus
 McCaul Rohrabacher Thornberry Johnson (LA) Moolenaar Shuster
 McClintock Rokita Tipton Johnson (OH) Mooney (WV) Simpson
 McHenry Rooney, Francis Trott Johnson, Sam Mullin Sinema
 McKinley Rooney, Thomas Turner Joyce (OH) Murphy (FL) Smith (MO)
 McMorris J. Upton Katko Newhouse Smith (NE)
 Rodgers Ros-Lehtinen Valadao Keating Norman Smith (NJ)
 Meadows Roskam Valadao Kelly (MS) Nunes Smith (TX)
 Messer Ross Wagner Kelly (PA) O'Halleran Smucker
 Mitchell Rothfus Walberg King (IA) O'Rourke Stefanik
 Moolenaar Rouzer King (NY) Olson Stewart
 Mooney (WV) Royce (CA) Walker Kinzinger Palmer Stivers
 Mullin Russell Walorski Knight Paulsen Taylor
 Newhouse Rutherford Weber (TX) Kuster (NH) Pearce Tenney
 Norman Sanford Webster (FL) Kustoff (TN) Peters Thompson (PA)
 Nunes Scalise Wenstrup Peterson Thornberry
 Olson Schweikert Westerman Pittenger Tipton
 Palmer Scott, Austin Williams Lamb Poe (TX) Trott
 Paulsen Sensenbrenner Wilson (SC) Wittman Turner
 Pearce Sessions Womack Lance Posey Upton
 Perry Shimkus Shuster Woodall Valadao
 Pittenger Shuster Simpson Yoder Vela
 Poe (TX) Smith (MO) Yoho Walden Wagner
 Poliquin Smith (NE) Young (AK) Lesko Walberg
 Posey Smith (NJ) Young (IA) LoBiondo Walker
 Ratcliffe Smith (TX) Zeldin Loeb sack Walorski
 Reed

NOT VOTING—15

Beatty Huffman Polis
 Brady (TX) Kennedy Sewell (AL)
 Cheney McSally Tsongas
 Costa Noem Walters, Mimi
 Costello (PA) Palazzo Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1136

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 179, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

YEAS—235

Abraham Carter (TX) Flores
 Aderholt Chabot Fortenberry
 Allen Coffman Foy
 Amodei Cole Frelinghuysen
 Arrington Collins (GA) Gaetz
 Babin Collins (NY) Gallagher
 Bacon Comer Garamendi
 Banks (IN) Comstock Garrett
 Barletta Conaway Gianforte
 Barr Cook Gibbs
 Barton Costa Gohmert
 Bera Cramer Goodlatte
 Bergman Crawford Gottheimer
 Bilirakis Crist Gowdy
 Bishop (MI) Culberson Granger
 Bishop (UT) Curbelo (FL) Graves (GA)
 Black Curtis Graves (LA)
 Blackburn Davis, Rodney Graves (MO)
 Blum Denham Griffith
 Bost DeSantis Grothman
 Brat DesJarlais Guthrie
 Brooks (IN) Diaz-Balart Handel
 Brownley (CA) Donovan Harper
 Buchanan Duffy Harris
 Buck Duncan (SC) Hartzler
 Bucshon Dunn Hensarling
 Budd Emmer Herrera Beutler
 Burgess Estes (KS) Hice, Jody B.
 Byrne Faso Higgins (LA)
 Calvert Ferguson Hill
 Carbajal Fitzpatrick Holding
 Carter (GA) Fleischmann Hudson

Adams Dingell Levin
 Aguilar Doggett Lewis (GA)
 Amash Doyle, Michael Lieu, Ted
 Barragán F. Lipinski
 Bass Duncan (TN) Lofgren
 Beyer Ellison Lowenthal
 Biggs Engel Lowey
 Bishop (GA) Eshoo Lujan Grisham,
 Blumenauer Espallat M.
 Blunt Rochester Esty (CT) Luján, Ben Ray
 Bonamici Evans Maloney,
 Boyle, Brendan Foster Carolyn B.
 F. Frankel (FL) Maloney, Sean
 Brady (PA) Fudge Massie
 Brooks (AL) Gabbard Matsui
 Brown (MD) Gallego McClintock
 Bustos Gomez McCollum
 Butterfield Gonzalez (TX) McEachin
 Capuano Gosar McGovern
 Cárdenas Green, Al McNerney
 Carson (IN) Green, Gene Meeks
 Cartwright Grijalva Meng
 Castro (FL) Gutiérrez Moore
 Castro (TX) Hanabusa Moulton
 Chu, Judy Hastings Nadler
 Cicilline Heck Napolitano
 Clark (MA) Higgins (NY) Neal
 Clarke (NY) Himes Nolan
 Clay Hollingsworth Norcross
 Cleaver Hoyer Pallone
 Clyburn Jackson Lee Panetta
 Cohen Jayapal Pascrell
 Connolly Jeffries Payne
 Cooper Johnson (GA) Pelosi
 Correa Johnson, E. B. Perlmutter
 Courtney Jones Perry
 Crowley Jordan Pingree
 Cuellar Kaptur Pocan
 Cummings Kelly (IL) Price (NC)
 Davidson Khanna Quigley
 Davis (CA) Kihuen Raskin
 Davis, Danny Kildee Rice (NY)
 DeFazio Kilmer Richmond
 DeGette Kind Rosen
 Delaney Krishnamoorthi Roybal-Allard
 DeLauro Labrador Ruppersberger
 DeBene Langevin Rush
 Demings Larson (CT) Ryan (OH)
 DeSaulnier Lawrence Sánchez
 Deutch Lee Sanford

NAYS—179

Beatty Kennedy Tsongas
 Brady (TX) Noem Walters, Mimi
 Cheney Palazzo Walz
 Costello (PA) Polis
 Huffman Sewell (AL)

NOT VOTING—13

Beatty Kennedy Tsongas
 Brady (TX) Noem Walters, Mimi
 Cheney Palazzo Walz
 Costello (PA) Polis
 Huffman Sewell (AL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1143

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for the vote on passage of H.R. 5895 (rollcall No. 257), but had I been present, I would have voted “no” on final passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable scheduling conflict, I was unable to cast my votes on time.

Had I been present, I would have voted “Yea” on rollcall No. 253, “Yea” on rollcall No. 254, “Nay” on rollcall No. 255, “Nay” on rollcall No. 256, and “Yea” on rollcall No. 257.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the day of June 8th, 2018, I was unavoidably detained and as a result, I was absent for rollcall votes 254–257.

Had I been present for the rollcall vote 254, on Agreeing to the Amendment, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present for the rollcall vote 255, on Agreeing to the Amendment, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present for the rollcall vote 256, on motion to recommit with instructions, I would have voted “aye.”

Had I been present for the rollcall vote 257, on passage of H.R. 5895, I would have voted “no.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 898 DIRECTING SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY TO TRANSMIT CERTAIN DOCUMENTS

Mr. KATKO, from the Committee on Homeland Security, submitted an adverse privileged report (Rept. No. 115–

714) on the resolution (H. Res. 898) directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to Department of Homeland Security policies and activities relating to homeland security information produced and disseminated regarding cybersecurity threats posed by the ZTE Corporation, headquartered in Shenzhen, China, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today. All of these bills will be focusing on one thing: fighting our Nation's opioid epidemic.

America has the greatest mission statement in the world: form a more perfect Union. This is our task here.

I am encouraged by all of the good things I am seeing around the country. We have 6.7 million jobs open. We have just created our millionth job since the tax cut has been passed. Unemployment is tying a 50-year low. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in the last 49 years, there has only been 7 months where unemployment has been below 4 percent, and two of those months were April and May that we just went through.

Americans' net worth has increased to \$100 trillion. That is \$7 trillion since the election, the highest we have ever seen. We also just passed last night, Mr. Speaker, the largest rescission package in the history of Congress.

But I also know that it is our responsibility to work every day to make our Nation even stronger. So, Mr. Speaker, we are in the middle of the deadliest drug crisis in history. For the first time, drug overdoses are now the leading cause of death for Americans under the age of 50. 174 of our friends and

family, our neighbors, are lost every day to substance abuse. Simply put, we need all hands on deck to attack this crisis.

That is why we will bring over 60 bills from eight different committees to the floor in the coming weeks to combat this crisis and save lives. This includes:

H.R. 5788, the Securing the International Mail Against Opioids Act, sponsored by Representative MIKE BISHOP. This bill will close loopholes in international shipping to stop the flow of synthetic opioids;

Next, H.R. 5735, the THRIVE Act, sponsored by Representative ANDY BARR, which would establish a pilot program for evidence-based transitional housing nonprofits that have experience in recovery and skills training;

H.R. 2851, the Stop Importation and Trafficking of Synthetic Analogues Act, sponsored by Representative JOHN KATKO. This bill will enable law enforcement to more swiftly respond to synthetic drugs and keep our communities safe.

Along with numerous other bills, passing these will truly help us form a more perfect Union.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my friend across the aisle. We are no strangers to droughts in California, but a 44-year championship drought is quite something. So congrats to my friend's beloved Washington Capitals on finally winning Lord Stanley's cup. It was a fun series to watch. It was a well-deserved victory for your team and for all of the fans of this region.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for the information he has given us, and I certainly thank him for his comments at the close of his initial statement on the colloquy.

We are all ecstatic, as I am sure the gentleman can understand, that after 44 years—and I might say I was an initial season ticket holder to the Washington Capitals, who started their career at the Capital Center in Prince George's County under the ownership and tutelage of Abe Pollin, an extraordinary member of our community who died, and then now under Ted Leonsis' leadership, and, of course, Alex Ovechkin's extraordinary accomplishments of his own, being named the most valuable player.

And I might say, as I know the gentleman would join me in saying, the Las Vegas team had an extraordinary accomplishment themselves, being the first expansion team ever to make it to the finals in the National Championship.

So, it was a wonderful night for those of us who live in the Washington National Capital area, and we thank the gentleman for his observation.

Let me say as well, that we share the gentleman's happiness that the economy is doing well. It is doing well.

What he did not observe, but we are happy about, is that President Obama, under his leadership, took this economy from the worst economy that the gentleman and I have experienced in our lifetimes to one of the best.

Now, it was not the best, because the best economy was under Bill Clinton in the late 1990s in terms of almost every indication. But it is certainly positive information, as the gentleman has pointed out, of where the economy is now.

So we all welcome that. We are hopeful, of course, that we will build on that.

The gentleman mentions there are over 6 million jobs available. One of the challenges, as the gentleman knows, is that we don't have the skill sets matching the jobs, and that is why they are vacant. That is why they are unable to fill them. We need to, I think, focus on that. We need to focus on investing in our infrastructure.

But as was mentioned on the floor yesterday in terms of a couple of the bills TIM RYAN, in particular, mentioned, there are still 4 in 10 adults who can't pay a \$400 bill if it came present. So we have work to do, and hopefully we can do that together.

But it certainly is good news that unemployment is down and the economy is moving along, continuing in the path that, from our perspective, was set by President Obama, and that President Trump, unlike President Obama, inherited a thriving, robust, growing economy. So I am pleased that we have gone to that place.

Now, I know the gentleman indicated that a number of opioid-related bills will be on the floor next week. I talked to the chairman of the committee yesterday, the gentleman from Oregon, and most of those are bipartisan bills. I hope all of them will end up, as they come to the floor, as bipartisan bills.

The addiction crisis, of course, requires that we invest in a comprehensive, long-term approach to expanding access to substance abuse treatment. I hope we can tackle this issue in a meaningful and bipartisan way. But I do want to address a number of other upcoming items for this work period, starting with the farm bill.

As the gentleman knows, last month, the farm bill failed on the House floor, and we have until June 22 to reconsider. My question is: Does the gentleman expect that we will see a farm bill on the floor by June 22?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The answer to the question is yes.

I believe the farm bill is incredibly important for so many reasons. The food and agriculture industry drive more than 43 million jobs, over a quarter of all American jobs.

And it is what you talked about earlier. Yes, the economy is moving so well after the tax cut: more than 3 million new jobs, more than 1 million just since the tax cut bill went through, we recently reached.

And the other challenge we now find ourselves in, and it is an interesting challenge we haven't found ourselves in in quite some time: there are 6.7 million jobs out there, but only 6.3 million people looking for them. It has been the reverse for quite some time, and we are actually in a stronger position, so we need to have job training.

The uniqueness of this farm bill, it provides those able bodies who do not have underage children, that we are going to give them the training to help them get into the workforce. So it is just more good news, and our intention is to pass that this month; and as soon as it is scheduled, I will inform all Members.

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

He talks about work. We are requiring those to work to work in order to get government benefits. What is controversial about that?

Democrats support work. We want to see people working. We oppose, however, your SNAP proposal because it is antiwork. You are taking a work requirement that is working and replacing it with one that won't work.

This is not about putting people to work. It is about pretending that you care about work as cover for taking assistance away from struggling families.

As a result of this bill, there will be fewer working—I know the majority leader wants to hear this particular piece of information.

As a result of this bill as it is currently written, there will be fewer working SNAP beneficiaries, not more, and millions more people going hungry. That is the working poor who are getting nutritional assistance for themselves and their families. There will be less of them under your bill.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Well, I thank my friend for yielding, and this is just a clear example of the difference in philosophical opinion.

□ 1200

We had this same debate when it came to the tax bill—that it was going to be Armageddon; if people got bonuses, it would be crumbs; and that we would be in a really worse position than we are.

Well, as we found out, Mr. Speaker, that is totally untrue. The economy is stronger. Again, in the last 49 years there has only been 7 months in the history of America where unemployment was below 4 percent. Two of those seven months are April and May of this year. We just hit 1 million new jobs, based upon that tax cut. More so since the election. Household wealth has increased by \$7 trillion just since the election.

Now, this is the philosophical difference. Currently, two-thirds of able-bodied adults report no earned income at all. Why?

Because the SNAP program is letting them down. Not a single child or family who currently qualifies will be cut

off. Our proposal only applies to those age 18 to 59. It exempts pregnant women, individuals who are mentally or physically disabled, and the primary caregivers of a child under the age of 6. What we do is give them the job training to get back into the workforce.

Because of that, according to the Foundation for Government Accountability, 83 percent of Americans support work requirements for SNAP. That includes 71 percent of Democrats. Unfortunately, when that bill came to the floor, every Democrat said no.

Mr. Speaker, that was the same thing that happened when we gave the American public tax cuts and created new jobs and the lowest unemployment—unemployment claims gives you the best projection of unemployment—in 44 years. Forty-four years, Mr. Speaker.

Do you know another statistic that just came out?

Small businesses are the greatest creators of new jobs. Since 1974 they have always surveyed them and they asked them this question: Is now a good time to expand?

Mr. Speaker, remember what a small business is. They don't have a great amount of capital. It is at its highest level since they took this poll.

So I don't mind having a philosophical difference of agreement, because there is a contrast between us. There is a contrast in philosophy. One believes it would be Armageddon if you let people keep more of what they earn. The facts don't pan out. Thankfully, we were successful, Mr. Speaker. The American people can keep more.

The other thing that happened, Mr. Speaker, is that 48 out of 50 States have a lower electrical bill. Also, in one company, 1.2 million of their employees have longer maternity leave.

The sad part is, I wish I could have sat here and said: As America, making it a more perfect Union, this whole body voted for it. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, one side had to carry the load.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is ecstatic about recent statistics. I think that he has, of course, warrant to be.

Let me read to the gentleman statistics over a 68-year period where Democrats have had the Presidency and Republicans have had the Presidency on and off. The gentleman's words are almost exactly the same words I heard in 2001 and 2003 when we were told and the country was told, if we adopted those tax bills that the gentleman is so very proud of—which is plunging our country \$1.8 trillion into additional debt, which he and his party wrung their hands about so repeatedly—and that the CBO says is a result of what I believe to be the most fiscally irresponsible Congress in which I have served.

Let me repeat that. I have served in 18 Congresses. I believe this past Congress to be, this Congress that we are in, the most fiscally irresponsible Congress in which I have served.

Yes, we have a philosophical difference. You gave 83 percent of your

tax revenues to the richest people in America. CBO says that; I don't say that. And 17 percent to all the rest; i.e., some 300 million-plus Americans.

Yes, we have a philosophical difference. We would have suggested that the mix be a little fairer to those in the middle and the bottom of the economic growth. But, no, you chose to give your benefits to the wealthiest in America. Not surprising. It is trickle-down economics one more time.

In 2001 and 2003, what happened? You did the tax cuts.

And what happened 6 years later? The country was plunged into the deepest recession you, Mr. Majority Leader, or me have ever experienced in our life. As a matter of fact, you have to be over 90 years of age to have experienced a deeper recession than was brought on by the Bush economic policies in the last decade, a depth of recession which the Obama policies brought us out of faster than any other nation in the world.

Those are the statistics. Faster than any other nation. The stock market—we are all about the stock market. The stock market went up almost 300 percent under Barack Obama. Now, when you get to 300 percent, we will about how well you have done. We will see what your trade policies that the President is imposing on the country do to employers and to employees and to consumers. We will see.

But let me tell you what has happened over the last 68 years under Democratic Presidents and under Republican Presidents. The gentleman wants to know about history. Under Republican Presidents over the 36 years that your party enjoyed control of the Presidency, the GDP grew by an average of 2.5 percent. Under Democrats for 32 years, by 4.1 percent.

Now, what did that 1.6 percent difference mean?

What it meant was, under Republican Presidents over the last 68 years, 35 million jobs were created. The gentleman talks about jobs. Under Democratic Presidents—4 less years, 32 years—there were 64.960 million jobs created.

Now, I hope, unlike your past performance, that the job growth continues, that the stock market increase continues, but that has not been the history. We will see.

So I hope that when you deal with the farm bill, notwithstanding your statistics, that you bring a bipartisan bill. Very frankly, the farm bill has historically been a farm bill. But what you did was passed a tax bill giving the rich 83 percent of its benefits. And in the farm bill you were taking nutritional assistance away from families and children. That is why you couldn't pass it, among other reasons. It was not bipartisan, as it was two Congresses ago when we reauthorized this. You tried to cut the SNAP program by \$40 billion.

The gentleman well knows the Senate is not pursuing your policies either

on the Republican side or the Democratic side.

You are missing a lot of good information.

The fact of the matter is, you know your farm bill is not going to pass the Senate.

Mr. Leader, on the farm bill I would urge you to come together with us. I don't know that there is a more bipartisan member of this Congress than COLLIN PETERSON, the ranking Democratic on the Agriculture Committee. Very frankly, the chairman was not interested in a bipartisan bill. I don't know whether it was by direction or his own view.

But let us come to a bipartisan agreement on this farm bill and pass it over to the Senate so that you can do something, not just talk about how you are reducing nutritional assistance to people that rely on it for their food every day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

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

I would be upset, too, if I voted against every economic bill brought to this floor that had the opportunity to grow America—and the statistics prove it.

It is not me saying it. It is *The New York Times*. To be frank, Mr. Speaker, I don't think they have ever said many nice things about Republicans. But this is what they said about the economics of today: "We ran out of words to describe how good the job numbers are. The economy is in a sweet spot, with steady growth and broad improvement in the labor market." That is *The New York Times*.

I don't have a problem if you are upset by the fact that the economy is exactly what we said would happen if we got the economic changes we desired. Just as when we looked at deregulation, we will continue to make this move forward.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard many times on the other side of the aisle in these colloquies: Work with us. Work with us on CHIP.

But, Mr. Speaker, they are being directed by people higher up not to work with us in the committee, just as they said not to work with us on the farm bill, when we were working together the whole time. But we kept the things they wanted inside that bill.

Just as we voted on this floor a little earlier today, there was a message that went out from the leader on the other side to not vote at all. So they held their votes until it passed, and 23 brave, courageous individuals on the other side broke from the letter that the leadership asked them not to vote for.

What was it about?

It was about VA and veterans.

I think you have got to stop playing politics.

Just last night on this floor, Mr. Speaker, I heard from my dear friend who was very concerned because there was an agreement and the trust was

going to be broken. Even though at the end of the day he couldn't vote for that agreement and trust that we worked so hard together on in an omni, that if we did anything in a rescission package to cut funding that the taxpayers would want us to do, that he couldn't deal with the omni.

So I took him at his word. He said: You had 1, 2, 3 years in these committees. They just sat there in these programs.

There is a program in there that has \$4.7 billion parked by the Obama administration to help fund electric cars. What was the one automotive company that went bankrupt and took the money as well? Fisker. That is \$4.7 billion. Nothing has been done on that since 2011.

So I took him at his word. We worked with the administration. We brought the largest rescission package here, because, yes, we want to take care of this debt. We think it is the responsibility of everybody here. But, no, those words rang hollow that day. There wasn't a vote for that, but we were able to pass it anyway.

I look right here at the Economic Cycle Research Institute in October 2016. It is their numbers. There was a 2 percent average growth under Obama versus 2.7 under Bush. In terms of average pace of GDP growth, Obama's was the slowest expansion on record. The numbers prove otherwise on what you say, but the most important thing it proves is that people are working. People care about the security of their job. People care about the security and safety of the country.

I feel very thankful that next week our President will be sitting down with the leader of North Korea with the hopes that we can make this world more secure.

We are building the security of jobs. We are building the security of the world. I would firmly believe: Let the American public judge whether they are better off today than they were a few short years ago.

I don't need numbers to show it. I can just see every statistic, the jobs, the people, and I am proud of that fact.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, the other side to follow through. I have heard time and again: I would never shut the government down; we wouldn't go that political. But when the day came, they did.

Politics and the election are over. Let's put people before politics. Let's make sure this country is secure economically and secure with safety around the world. And that is exactly what we are doing here.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I hear the words of the majority leader. He and his party, without exception, opposed President Obama's programs. Without exception.

We became the majority in 2007, and we worked with President Bush on a number of things, including a very substantiation environmental bill signed by President Bush, and other bills as well.

He mentions about the rescission package. Mr. Speaker, if you will recall, when we had this debate some weeks ago, he said everything in this rescission bill is what we don't need.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker? Ebola money was rescinded in that bill some weeks ago, but not in this bill. He changed it because, very frankly, Mr. Speaker, they found out, oops, we need the Ebola money. So they took it out of this bill.

We think you need the CHIP money. We think we need the CHIP money to make sure that if there is a happening or an occurrence that occurs, the CHIP money is needed either directly or indirectly to make sure that children, in fact, are taken care of.

□ 1215

Who has said that? Mr. TOM COLE has said that. We have used that money effectively and appropriately.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that if the Ebola money—which I was assured was not needed—that cut was restored by our Republican friends, Mr. Speaker, because they found out, yes, it is needed.

Now, in terms of wasting time, 65 votes over the last Congress to repeal the Affordable Care Act—65—with a full and unquestioned knowledge that none of those votes would result in something happening for our country in the United States Senate. They weren't going to vote for that. They knew that. So we spent a lot of time on that.

Let me also say: The gentleman says let's get about our business. Let me ask the gentleman: Does he expect a bill on the DACA protectees, the Dreamers, to come on the floor next week?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

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

I said it before, and I will say it again: Republicans are committed to solving this issue for good, not passing a bill and patting ourselves on the back, but for dealing with this issue in a meaningful way that is beneficial to hardworking Americans.

As you know, my door is always open. You have been there many times. I am committed to bringing all Members to the table and working together to solve this problem.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I need to go to a meeting dealing with this subject. I am late to it right now. But we will continue to work to solve this problem.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would only say, I appreciate his comments. But, Mr. Speaker, I have heard them a long time, many, many times: We are going to solve this issue.

Mr. RYAN came to the floor and said: We are going to solve this issue. You vote for this caps bill, and we will get an immigration bill on the floor that will solve this issue.

That was some 2½ months ago. It is not solved yet, Mr. Speaker. I hope the

leader does, in fact, bring a bill to the floor quickly.

In fact, the suggestion that had been made by many Members of his party and mine to bring four options to the floor seems absolutely consistent with the Speaker's pledge to take the tough issues head-on; and that is, bring the Democratic bill that is cosponsored by one of the senior Republicans, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, to the floor; bring the Goodlatte bill, which has been reported out of the Republican Judiciary Committee, to the floor; bring a bill cosponsored by Mr. HURD and Mr. AGUILAR to the floor.

Then what we provide, Mr. Leader, is that the Speaker can bring a bill to the floor of his choosing. What could be fairer than that to let the people's House speak on this critically important issue? So I would hope the gentleman would facilitate that coming to the floor.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, let me say that this is the most closed Congress in history. He talks about coming to his office, and I have. We have worked constructively and positively together, and I have great respect for the majority leader. I know he is very close to President Trump, and he has talked about his working with President Trump to move forward.

Let us hope that the talks with Korea bear fruit. We have had a lot of talks with the Koreans. They have made a lot of pledges, and they haven't followed them. We will see what happens. We are hoping for the best.

In coming to your office, we have had some discussions. We have had discussions about DACA. But, very frankly, when we come to this floor, this is the most closed Congress, Mr. Leader, in recent history, if not history. We have had 85 closed rules. Zero, not a single open rule have we considered.

Over 2,000 germane amendments have been blocked by the Rules Committee. Mr. Speaker, that is amendments that are in order, and they have been blocked. In fact, 194 Republicans—Republicans—have been refused the opportunity to move forward on their amendments.

Now, I know that the leader's schedule is such that we can conclude this debate. I have other things to say. But I am hopeful that, frankly, whatever we bring to the floor, bring it on a rule that provides for full consideration, bring it that reflects facing the tough issues, bring it so the House can work its will on these bills, including the farm bill, including an immigration bill that protects the Dreamers, and including other legislation so critical to this country. Let the House work its will through the amendatory process.

Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman wants to say something, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JUNE 8, 2018, TO TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 2018

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, June 12, 2018, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Northern California Power Agency, also known as NCPA, on its 50th anniversary.

NCPA was established in 1968 by a consortium of locally owned electric utilities to make joint investments in energy resources that would ensure an affordable, reliable, and clean supply of electricity for customers in its member communities.

The agency's mission is to provide members with reliable, efficient, and cost-effective wholesale power and energy-related services. I can tell you that, during my time in Congress as well as my time in the California State Legislature, the agency meets that mission with flying marks.

They also own and operate nearly 260 megawatts of in-state hydropower resources that generate carbon-free electricity for Californians while also providing many outdoor recreational benefits, helping to meet the renewable mandate for electricity in the State.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commending the NCPA for 50 years of invaluable service to its public power members and their respective communities.

SENTENCING REDUCTION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to serve on the Judiciary Committee for a number of years. It is a committee that has almost two-thirds of the jurisdiction of the United States Congress. What I love about it: It is a protector of the rights of the American people through the Bill of Rights and the Constitution.

The pardon is an act of mercy, and this past week I applauded the act of mercy that was generated for a woman in Alabama who had a sentence of 100 years for a small, nonviolent drug offense. That woman became a minister and worked on degrees while she was incarcerated.

I think we can expand on this concept of mercy and pass sentencing reduction, which goes to the reflection on sentencing that has been done under mandatory minimums for nonviolent offenses where individuals are incarcerated across the Nation for 25, 30, 40, 50 years, and even life. If we do that through the legislative process, we will have a structure that will look at these individuals to make sure that they can contribute to society.

We need the National Sheriffs' Association, the National Association of Law Enforcement, the evangelicals, people of all faiths; we need lawyers; we need social workers; we need physicians to look at how this impacts families. We can do this with the House and the Senate. I commit to this Congress the interest in sentencing reduction.

CLEAN WATER PROVIDES CHILDREN WITH A CAREFREE RECESS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for most students here in the United States, recess is a time for recreation. For the pupils of Balkumari Primary School in Kathmandu, Nepal, recess is the only opportunity for them to get water.

For decades, the school relied on a tiny stream as its only source of drinkable water, a 20-minute walk away. In 2013, however, the stream dried up, leaving the school without access to drinkable water. So the education stopped.

Mr. Speaker, the story has a happy ending because the Balkumari Primary School received U.S. aid for water. Now with water access, students scramble out of the schoolyard, learning and developing with an education, as normal kids should.

This is why the Water for the World Act that Representative BLUMENAUER and I authored is so important, which is now the law of the land. The legislation requires a comprehensive plan for the United States to aid other countries in securing clean water.

We have it within our power to help kids like the Balkumari Primary School because, Mr. Speaker, water is life.

And that is just the way it is.

WORLD OCEANS DAY

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, water is life. Growing up in Hawaii, we have a unique appreciation for the protection of our resources, from our mountains all the way down to our oceans. It is something that we grow up with, that we have a responsibility to take care of our home, to keep it clean, not only for us, but for future generations.

Today is World Oceans Day, and we have the opportunity to celebrate the beauty of our world's oceans and also commit to keeping them clean.

Right now we see all over the world that our oceans are under siege. Temperatures are rising, pollution riddles our waters and beaches, coral reefs are dying off, and marine life are being killed.

So as you recognize World Oceans Day, we can think about how, in our own lives—individually, as a family, as communities—we can do our part to take care of our planet by changing things like making sure we are not using toxic sunscreens that kill off our coral reef or the single-use plastics that pollute our waters.

We cannot wait for the tide to change. We have got to take action to make sure that our oceans and our planet are safe and clean for all life for generations to come.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

AZERBAIJAN'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 100-year anniversary of the independence of Azerbaijan and to highlight the significance and importance of the U.S.-Azerbaijan relationship.

Throughout its history, Azerbaijan has resisted invasion from the Soviet Union. They were pioneers in advancing the cause of women's suffrage. Day in and day out, Azerbaijan cooperates on defense, counterintelligence, and counterterrorism activities. Azerbaijan established the first secular parliamentary democracy in the Muslim world. They have offered unconditional support to the United States after 9/11.

Here is to another 100 years of great prosperity for the people of Azerbaijan and a strong relationship with the United States.

CONGRATULATING LIEUTENANT COLONEL SEAN MORROW

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate Lieutenant Colonel Sean Morrow, a constituent of the Sixth District of Illinois.

On June 19, Sean will be taking command of the United Nations Security Battalion in the Joint Security Area of the Demilitarized Zone on the Korean Peninsula. This unit is the most forward-

ward-deployed on the peninsula and stands on the front lines of freedom 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, facing the North Korean People's Army eye to eye in defense of democracy and our way of life.

As the son of a Korean war company commander myself, I am honored that my constituent is taking the helm of this command at such a crucial time. Sean is a warrior-scholar. A Ph.D. candidate in international relations at the University of Chicago, he is committed to protecting the United States on the battlefield but also rigorously studying the pressing national security challenges we face and their solutions. He has dedicated his life and his career to keeping our Nation safe.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Sean, his wife Meghan, and their three children God's very best, and I thank him for his service.

□ 1230

HONORING WILLIAM "BILL" HAMILTON, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Bill Hamilton, Jr. of Overland Park, Kansas, who passed away on January 4, 2018. Bill was born in Dallas, Texas, on February 18, 1918. In 1940, he graduated from the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, now known as Texas A&M University, with a degree in civil engineering.

In World War II, Bill served as a lieutenant in the Army. He was in command of an antiaircraft unit in the Philippines at Corregidor Island. Bill was part of the American defensive forces trying to hold Corregidor Island from the Japanese.

Fighting valiantly, the American forces held the island for 5 months, only surrendering to Japanese forces after all ammunition and supplies were exhausted. The Japanese had expected to take the island in 3 weeks.

On April 21, 1942, while defending Corregidor, he and approximately 24 other Texas Aggies gathered together at The Rock, as Corregidor is now known, to observe Aggie Muster. While Japanese bombs fell on the island, those Aggies participated in this proud tradition and called the roll for those Aggies who had lost their lives during the preceding months. This event during wartime brought the solemn Aggie Muster tradition to the attention of the entire world.

With the passing of Bill Hamilton, we have lost the last of the survivors of the 1942 Muster at The Rock.

After being captured at Corregidor Island, Bill spent 3½ years as a prisoner of war, being held at camps, including Camp Cabanatuan in the Philippines and Camp Fukuoka in Japan.

Amazingly, Bill was a passenger on three Japanese prisoner ships that were struck by the U.S. Army Air Force, yet he survived all three incidents.

In August of 1945, he was finally liberated by the American forces from Camp Hoten in Manchuria. For his honorable and distinguished service, Bill received many honors, including a Bronze Star, a Purple Heart, the Distinguished Unit Badge, three Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Prisoner of War Medal.

After the war, Bill resumed life in America, and he married the love of his life, Margaret Jacobs, in 1946. He also began working for the Santa Fe Railroad as a bridge engineer. Bill worked for the Santa Fe Railroad company for 38 years and was known as an exemplary employee.

A man of great character, Bill was an integral part of the veterans community and was a member of the Reserve Officers Association, Defenders of the Bataan and Corregidor, and American Ex-Prisoners of War.

Mr. Speaker, selfless service to those around him defined Bill Hamilton's life. He worked tirelessly to defend our freedom and to better communities in which he lived. He is loved by his community, and he certainly left an enduring impression on our Nation. He will be forever remembered as a selfless soldier, community member, husband, father, friend to hundreds, and an honorably fighting Texas Aggie.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Hamilton family. We also lift up the family and friends of Bill in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over the Capitol to honor the life and legacy of Bill Hamilton, Jr.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

HONORING WILTON A. LANNING

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Wilton Lanning of Waco, Texas, who passed away on January 10, 2018.

Wilton was born on June 12, 1936, in Waco. He graduated from Waco High School and would go on to graduate from Baylor University and would be a proud Baylor Bear for the rest of his life. At Baylor, Wilton met his wife of 57 years, Lanell "Lee" Lanning.

Wilton was a lifelong Waco resident, a proud advocate for Waco businesses, and an avid amateur historian of the city. He worked for 40 years at Waco's then oldest business, Tom Padgitt, Inc., where he served as president and CEO.

Always looking for ways to push development in Waco, he served as the executive director of the Waco Business League, chairman of the Greater Waco Chamber of Commerce, and he was a member of the Baylor Waco

Foundation. He also served on several boards, including the Hillcrest Baptist Medical Center, the Waco Industrial Foundation, the Waco Mammoth Foundation, the Brazos Higher Education Service Corporation, and as president of the board of the Waco YMCA.

Upon his retirement from the Waco Business League, Wilton received the Waco Business League Lifetime Achievement Award. He was also the recipient of awards such as the James H. Lockwood Masonic Lodge 1343, the A.F. & A.M. Community Builder Award, the National Philanthropy Lifetime Achievement Award, and the Silver Eagle Award from the Boy Scouts of America.

Wilton built his life on a foundation of serving and giving back to others, a value he learned as an Eagle Scout and certainly reenforced by his father who served as a captain in the United States Army.

Wilton was a lifelong supporter of Baylor University and an active member of the Baylor Alumni Association. In recognition of this, his family has received the Baylor Alumni Association's First Family of Baylor Award.

Wilton also held a special place in his heart for the Waco-born soft drink, Dr Pepper. As a result, he cofounded the Dr Pepper Museum in Waco, which details the origins of this famous soft drink.

When he became a grandfather, he asked to be called "Dr Pepper" by his grandkids. When he was rebuffed, he settled on being called, simply, "Pepper."

Mr. Speaker, Wilton Lanning worked tirelessly to better the Waco community. From his 40 years at Padgett's to his time with the Business League, Wilton certainly left an impression on central Texas. He will be forever remembered by his passion for Waco as a great philanthropist, a businessman, a husband, a father, a grandfather, and a friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Lanning family. We also lift up the family and friends of Wilton in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over the Capitol to honor the life and legacy of Wilton Lanning.

As I close, I urge all Americans to continue praying for their country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

HONORING BEATRICE RODRIGUEZ

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Beatrice Rodriguez of Bryan, Texas, who passed away on February 28, 2018.

Beatrice was born in Somerville, Texas, in 1941. Her father was a railroad worker, who was paralyzed on the job while he was in his thirties. Her mother took care of the home and her father after he was paralyzed.

Beatrice was one of nine children and learned to cook at an early age to help

her family. She also worked as a waitress, picked cotton, and worked at a grocery store to earn money for the family.

When Beatrice was 18 years old, she met the love of her life, Richard Rodriguez, at a dance in Caldwell, Texas. After the dance, Richard and Beatrice became inseparable.

Richard asked Beatrice's father for her hand in marriage, but her father refused. The couple then decided to elope, which they did on October 31, 1960. They were married for 57 loving years and had three daughters.

In their thirties, the couple started their first restaurant and named it the Buccaneer. When a chance to move the business to downtown Bryan came up, the couple took the opportunity and named the new restaurant Casa Rodriguez. Opened in 1978, the restaurant serves authentic home-style Mexican cuisine and has repeatedly been voted as one of the best restaurants in the Brazos Valley.

Beatrice was a local celebrity in our Brazos Valley community. She was known to always keep up a distinguished appearance in public, and she owned a large collection of hats, which earned her the nickname "The Hat Lady" around town. She had a warm and fun-loving demeanor, which helped her easily connect to those who encountered her.

Her caring heart came, in part, from her deep faith in God. She was a devout Catholic and attended Santa Teresa Catholic Church in Bryan. You could often find her in the church praying for loved ones.

She was also a loving grandmother and affectionately called Grandma Bea by her seven grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, selfless service to her community and to our community defined Beatrice's life. She worked tirelessly to uphold the values of Bryan College Station and brought smiles, great food, and love to those around her. She is loved by our residents and certainly left an enduring impression on our Brazos Valley community. She will be forever remembered as a selfless community leader, a wife, a mother, a grandmother, and a dear friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Rodriguez family. We also lift up the family and friends of Beatrice Rodriguez in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over the Capitol to honor the life and legacy of Beatrice Rodriguez.

As I close today, I ask all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our families, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

HONORING JOE RODRIGUEZ

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Joe Rodriguez of Waco, Texas, who passed away on March 15, 2018.

Joe was born in 1941 in Ansonia, Ohio. His family soon moved to Texas, where he grew up under difficult circumstances in a tough neighborhood between Bellmead and Waco. The neighborhood was known as No Man's Land, where residents were known to dig their own wells for water. Joe attended La Vega High School and went on to attend McLennan Community College in Waco. During that time, he also met and married the love of his life, Alice Martinez.

Overcoming his difficult upbringing, Joe became a leader in the Waco area. He served two terms as mayor of Bellmead and was a union leader at the General Tire and Rubber Company plant. He also served as the director of the Economic Opportunities Advancement Corporation's Head Start program. In one of his more prominent roles, Joe also served as the CEO of the Cen-Tex Hispanic Chamber of Commerce for over 20 years.

Always sticking to his principles and looking for ways to better our community, Joe was committed to providing equal opportunities for all, empowering youth, and helping Hispanic-owned businesses in the area succeed. He was a strong advocate for minority communities and believed that there was strength in diversity, and he advocated for higher education as a way so that anyone could make it in America.

Mr. Speaker, selfless service to those around him defined Joe's life. He worked tirelessly to better our community, and he built strong relationships throughout Waco. He is loved by his city, and he has certainly left an enduring impression on our central Texas community. He will be forever remembered as a selfless community member, leader, husband, father, grandfather, great-grandfather, and friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Rodriguez family. We also lift up the family and friends of Joe in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over the Capitol in honor of the life and legacy of Joe Rodriguez.

As I close today, I ask all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

HONORING ARNOLD MATHIAS

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my dear friend, Arnold Robert Mathias, of Waco, Texas, who passed away on April 27, 2018.

Arnold Mathias was born in 1922 in Copperas Cove, Texas. While born in very modest circumstances, his parents would raise both him and his brother in a loving and nurturing family during the Great Depression.

After graduating from Copperas Cove High School, Arnold attended the University of California at Berkeley and Texas Tech University, from which he received a bachelor of business administration.

Shortly after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Arnold volunteered for the U.S. Army. While initially, as an 18-year-old, the bombing meant little to him, he ultimately experienced a surge of patriotism for our great Nation, and he felt committed to serve. That patriotism and commitment stayed with him throughout his lifetime.

During World War II, Arnold was the leader of a tank platoon in the 13th Armored Division, 24th Tank Battalion that was incorporated into General Patton's 3rd Army. He was wounded in the battle for the German Ruhr Valley when his tank exploded while under heavy fire from the Germans.

After recovering from his wounds, he returned to the front lines. Once victory was declared in Europe, he was told to prepare for the Japanese invasion. He was spared from being deployed to Japan after President Truman ordered the use of atomic bombs to achieve victory over Japan.

After the war, Arnold married Margie Dane Calhoun in 1950. Their 68-year marriage produced a loving family with three daughters who blessed him with four grandchildren and three great-grandchildren.

Upon leaving Active Duty, Arnold began a long and fruitful career of public service. He managed a couple of community chambers of commerce in central Texas before becoming a district manager for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce headquartered in Houston. He also served as chairman of the zoning commission and was elected to the city commission and served as the mayor of a small city in Harris County, Texas. He then served as the southwestern regional manager for the U.S. Chamber in Dallas.

Upon retiring from the U.S. Chamber, Arnold served as district director for the 11th Congressional District, which at the time included Waco and other portions of central Texas. He then went on to continue working in politics and public affairs as a consultant.

□ 1245

In addition to his professional career, Arnold served and participated in many civic and service associations, including central Texas chairman of the Girl Scouts of America, chairman of the United Way, board member of the Lions Club, the Downtown Dallas Rotary Club, the Waco Rotary Club, a Paul Harris Fellow, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Cameron Park Zoological Society, Keep Waco Beautiful, and the Waco Historic Foundation.

Arnold's Christian faith was also very important to him and his family. At one time or another, he headed nearly every office in the local congregation of which he was a member. He also held leadership positions as the president of the Lone Star District of the Walther League, as state treasurer of the Lutheran Laymen's League, and as a member of the Board of Directors

of the Texas District of the Lutheran Church.

As a veteran, Arnold's post-military affiliations included the Disabled American Veterans, the American Legion, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

In 2012, Arnold was nominated by members of our community to receive the Texas 17th Congressional District Veteran Commendation. It was an honor to bestow him with this unique award that recognized not only his selfless service to our Nation, but also a community volunteer to our central Texas community.

Even after Arnold's death, his service continued as he had his body sent to the Anatomical Board of the State of Texas for use in teaching and scientific purposes.

Mr. Speaker, selfless service to those around him defined Arnold's life. He worked tirelessly to better our community and built strong relationships in Waco. He is loved by his city, and certainly left an enduring impression on our central Texas community. He will be forever remembered as a selfless community leader, a war hero, a veteran, a husband, a father, a grandfather, a great-grandfather, and a dear friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest condolences to the Mathias family. We also lift up the family and friends of Arnold in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over the Capitol to honor the life and service of Arnold Mathias.

As I close today, I ask all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

HONORING EMILY TOOKER-BLAKE

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Emily Tooker-Blake of Waco, Texas, who turned 100 years old on March 18, 2018.

Emily was raised during the Great Depression, and worked as an assistant to her father, who was a dentist in Waco. Money was difficult to come by, and her father used to trade dental work for eggs or chickens to feed their family.

Graduating from Waco High School, Emily soon married Leslie Tooker, who worked for his father and who owned an ice cream shop in town. Leslie eventually learned the dental tradecraft from his father-in-law and followed in his footprints to become a dentist in Waco. Emily worked alongside her husband, working as a part-time dental assistant until her retirement at age 60.

Emily and Leslie raised three children: Max; Leslie, Jr.; and their daughter, Leroy. Emily and Leslie also had a knack for adventure and followed their son, Leslie, Jr., to South America, living there until moving back to Texas in 1990.

Today, Emily lives with her daughter in Waco. She still makes her own food

and her mind is super sharp. She listens to talk radio daily and is a strong Republican. She loves to tell stories about her colorful past to friends and family, and she is surrounded by a community who loves her.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Emily Tooker-Blake on this joyous occasion, and I know that her family and friends love her and are proud of her. I wish her many more years of health and happiness.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over the Capitol to honor Emily Tooker-Blake on the occasion of her 100th birthday.

As I close today, I ask all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

HONORING THE BRAZOS COUNTY WORLD WAR I CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the men and women who trained in Brazos County, Texas, who defended our freedom during World War I. I also rise to recognize the Brazos County World War I Centennial Committee, who are making sure these veterans are honored on the 100-year anniversary of the United States entering World War I.

Brazos County has a deep history with World War I. In 1917, the United States Council of Defense selected Texas A&M University as one of the six colleges in the United States to host training for a division of the United States Army Signal Corps. Signal Corps members received instruction in: electrical engineering, telegraphy, radio work, induction sets, pack sets, field work, visual signaling, telephony, dry and storage batteries, outside wiring, switch boards, and construction of lance pole and tripod lines.

Texas A&M University was also the only Allied training location for meteorology, and trained nearly 4,000 troops and mechanics.

The Brazos County World War I Centennial Committee has identified over 800 veterans buried in Brazos County, and it is committed to honoring their memory as the centennial of their service approaches. Among those veterans buried in Brazos County are men, women, African Americans, Jewish Americans, Hispanics, and first-generation Americans.

It is an honor to recognize their distinguished service to our country during our time of great need, and to recognize the Centennial Committee for their work to make sure that these veterans' legacies are honored and remembered not only on the centennial anniversary, but for generations to come.

Our Brazos County cities of Bryan and College Station have each joined with the Brazos County World War I Centennial Committee to proclaim

April 17, 2017, as World War I Remembrance Day. I encourage other communities in our great country to consider taking similar actions.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over the Capitol to honor the life and legacy of those World War I veterans who trained in the Brazos Valley, and to honor the Brazos Valley World War I Centennial Committee.

As I close today, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country, for our military men and women who protect us from external threats, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

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

EMPEROR OF THE SWAMP

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, in Trump's "Cabinet of corruption," one individual stands head and shoulders above the rest. He is a man that Senator UDALL crowned "the Emperor of the Swamp."

If we created a Mount Rushmore of American corruption, his face would be carved into it. His scandals are so outrageous that even Sarah Sanders has stopped defending him and just started telling jokes at his expense.

I am speaking, of course, about EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt.

I will give you an example. Pruitt tried to use his office to get his wife a Chick-fil-A franchise. When he was questioned about it, the EPA chief said:

It is one of the best restaurants in the country. We need more of them in Tulsa and we need more of them across the country. Anyway, it is an exciting time.

Mr. Speaker, don't get me wrong, I enjoy a chicken sandwich just as much as any other person, but Scott Pruitt talks about Chick-fil-A like they are some kind of social service or some group that hands out food to the homeless. He thinks it is an organization setting up soup kitchens and homeless shelters.

Frankly, this is probably one of the weakest excuses I have ever heard from any administration, but this administration seems to specialize in weak excuses.

Scott also rented a Washington, D.C., apartment from a lobbyist with matters before the EPA. And it won't surprise you at all that he got a really good sweetheart deal. Pruitt was paying \$50 a night and was only charged the days he actually slept there.

Now, for everybody back in Arizona who may not understand this, the D.C. rental market is really high here. Let just assure you, what he did was not normal and probably illegal. I am not a lawyer or a law enforcement officer, but this arrangement definitely looks like a bribe to me.

And that is not all. This week, we learned that Pruitt ordered his government bodyguards to seek out a luxury moisturizer that is exclusively offered to patrons of the Ritz-Carlton Hotel.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), my friend and colleague.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GALLEGO for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what Congressman GALLEGO didn't say is, first of all, both of us are veterans, and we serve on Active Duty in the United States military because we believe in this country, we believe in America, we believe we are an exceptional nation.

But Scott Pruitt has made a joke of Federal service. He is under 12 investigations. He has wasted taxpayers' money, he has used taxpayers' money to enrich himself, and he has used taxpayers' money to help his wife.

Based on what Congressman GALLEGO said about this lotion thing, he had his personal security detail, paid for at taxpayer expense, drive around to Ritz-Carltons to try to find lotion. That is why I have a picture here of the Ritz-Carlton lotion.

There is also this thing, by the way, known as the internet. You can just go on the internet and search for Ritz-Carlton lotion. The first link will take you to the Ritz-Carlton shops, and he could have just ordered it without using his taxpayer-funded staff to drive around to find this lotion. This is just an example of the joke he has made of Federal service.

Mr. GALLEGO and I are going to break down for the American people today the top 10 scandals of EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, before we go into the top 10, I think one of the pretty scandalous other abuses of taxpayers is the fact that he had his personal detail asking and searching for used Trump mattresses.

Now, this is not a joke, this is not from an episode of "Veep." Your EPA Administrator, a supposed adult in the room, is using taxpayer dollars to try to find used Trump mattresses.

Right now, all I can think of are two things. Number one, this person is just egregiously using our taxpayer dollars in the worst possible manner. And, number two, he is trying to set up one of the weirdest bed and breakfasts in the history of Washington, D.C.

But this is actually real. This is not TV. This is actually happening in your government.

Mr. Speaker, let me go into the top 10 things that EPA Administrator Pruitt has done to embarrass this country, and possible corruption. And 10 is what we have. There are a lot more than that, but we have to at least keep this somewhat biteable for everybody else.

Let me start with number 10, as recently reported: the mess hall. Pruitt has overused his privileges at the swanky, but affordable, White House mess hall, despite being warned against doing so.

Now, the mess hall is basically a cafeteria for the top officers of the White House. I have been in it. I was there under the Obama administration. It is an honor to be invited to go, and it is great food at a very low price.

Pruitt has misused this privilege so much so that he has been asked to not come back. You are that egregious that, as a sitting member of the Cabinet, you have been told by White House staff to not come back to the cafeteria. That tells you a lot.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU) to tell us about number nine.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, number nine is the dinner reservation. It was publicly reported that EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt asked the security detail to turn on lights and sirens so that they could drive him down the crowded traffic streets of Washington, D.C., and get him to dinner at Le Diplomate restaurant.

That is an abuse of taxpayer funds, and that is not what sirens are for. They are for actual emergencies, not to make sure that a Trump Cabinet official can make his dinner reservation on time.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I also recommend just taking the Metro. It is much quicker, but that is just me.

Number eight, \$130 fountain pens: Scott Pruitt has spent over \$1,500 taxpayer dollars on personalized \$130 fountain pens. Now, I recommend the BIC pen. It does the job well.

But, more importantly, it seems like, on one hand, he doesn't seem to mind spending taxpayer dollars on really expensive things, such as these really fancy pens, and then personally, in his own personal life, he is really cheap by looking for cheap used Trump mattresses. So he is, essentially, using the taxpayer dollar as his personal piggy bank so he can live the lifestyle he wants.

On to the mattress. Pruitt used his EPA staff to help him look for a discount Trump Home Luxury Plush Euro Pillow Top mattress. It is apparently his favorite.

He also inappropriately used aids to look for apartments and help arrange family vacations to the Rose Bowl.

TED and I are lucky to have some very smart, young staff, and they work hard, but they are not here to be our personal valets. They are here to make sure we do our job well, we get to our meetings, and we have the resources that we need to make the right decisions.

They certainly aren't there to help you find the right type of Trump Home Luxury Plush Euro Pillow Top mattress. I definitely don't recommend that. Or, as TED LIEU has said, there is the internet. You can find it there also.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, number six is the lotion, which we have already talked about. But what we didn't talk about is, in

using his security detail, you should know, this is a really expensive security detail 24/7. They have already spent \$3.5 million on that security detail in 2017.

□ 1300

This is, again, just a waste of taxpayer funds. No other Cabinet official has this kind of security, and it is something that we really should look at if we had a functioning GOP House oversight structure.

Unfortunately, the majority here in the House has refused to look at EPA's Scott Pruitt scandals, and I don't even know how they can defend him at this point.

Mr. GALLEG0. Number five, first class travel: Pruitt has spent over \$100,000 on first class commercial travel since entering office, citing security concerns, apparently not satisfied with his \$3.5 million currently spent on security escort.

Let me tell you, number one, unfortunately for, I think, many Americans, nobody knows who Scott Pruitt is. You do not need to be flying first class for, quote/unquote, security reasons, and you certainly should not be making the American public be paying for your first class tickets.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Number four, the \$43,000 soundproof phone booth: So EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt is so paranoid that he wasted \$43,000 of your taxpayers' money to build a soundproof phone booth for him to make phone calls.

So if the President doesn't want to fire EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt for his corruption, I think the President should just fire him for being super weird, right? You have got Scott Pruitt using a security detail to get location at the Ritz-Carlton, to have his staff trying to find used Trump Hotel mattresses, and he has built this private phone booth. That is just creepy and strange.

Mr. GALLEG0. Number three, unsanctioned raises: In a time in America where every American is hoping to just get a pay raise next month, Scott Pruitt was told: You are not allowed to give your employees—the certain employees that he wanted to give—a pay raise.

He was specifically told: They do not deserve that pay raise. You will not give them a pay raise.

So instead, he used an obscure provision of the Safe Drinking Water Act to actually find a way to give them a pay raise in spite of the White House saying: You will not give them a pay raise.

Now, this would be actually somewhat okay, in my opinion, if he was actually trying to protect safe drinking water, but, in fact, he is not doing that. He is actually only using the fund to pay for these increases for his well-connected friends and get them higher pay.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Number two is the sweetheart condo deal with lobbyists.

So Scott Pruitt got this deal with lobbyists that no ordinary American could have gotten. It was a \$50-a-night deal on a condo in Washington, D.C., near the Capitol, and market rates were much higher than \$50 a night.

But in addition, he structured a lease so he only had to pay for the nights that he was there. So many nights that he wasn't there, the landlord just had to eat those costs. That is not a lease that any normal American could have gotten.

The reason that Scott Pruitt got this is because he was dealing with these lobbyists, who also lobbied on issues before him. This is what most people would call corruption.

And before we go to the last one, which is about the Chick-fil-A restaurant, I just want to say the fact that Chick-fil-A—I can't even say this without laughing. Maybe RUBEN GALLEG0 can talk about this with a straight face.

Mr. GALLEG0. Look, you have an EPA Administrator who is literally using his staff to go track down and try to speak to the CEO of Chick-fil-A to try to get a very hard-to-get franchise, essentially using his public office to put pressure on them to get a very, very hard-to-get and lucrative franchise.

In any world, if we had just told you that this was being done by 1 or 2 or even 10 people, this all would not just be really, really, really weird, but really, really, really corrupt.

But the fact that there is one person that is doing this, and consistently doing this, and has not been fired by the man who said he enjoys firing people, by the man who had a show for so many years about firing people, and yet for some reason, he cannot find a reason to fire this weird, corrupt EPA Administrator, that is the problem here.

You have a corrupt Cabinet official and you have a Presidency that will not keep him in check.

I yield to my good friend, TED LIEU, to close.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Again, Congressman GALLEG0 and I served on Active Duty in the military. We are veterans. We believe in this country. That is why we are up here.

Some of the things we said today may have sounded funny, because we are trying to point out the absurdity of why EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt is still in office.

Scott Pruitt has wasted taxpayer funds, he has abused taxpayer funds for his personal profit, he has abused his relationship with lobbyists to personally profit, he has also abused his relationships to help his family profit.

Scott Pruitt, at the end of the day, is not just an embarrassment to us, he is an embarrassment to the Republicans in this House, to the Democrats in this House, to the Trump Cabinet, and to the United States of America.

Scott Pruitt has to go.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative LIEU for his comments during this Special Order.

To finish, we had a President who said he was going to come and drain the swamp. Scott Pruitt is the swamp. He is the biggest swamp monster there is right now when it comes to the culture of corruption here in Washington, D.C.

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

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SHOULD BECOME THE 51ST STATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time on the floor to speak about making the District of Columbia the 51st State.

I am not going to simply glow about how important that would be for my district, because we have found that most Americans believe we already have the same rights they do.

I want to describe one of the oldest cities in the United States, a city that is bigger than two States, that is to say, has more residents than two States, more residents than Vermont, more residents than Wyoming, and about as many residents as seven States of the Union.

The people I represent, 700,000 of them, are number one in taxes paid to support the Government of the United States, yet they have no representation whatsoever in that body down the hall, the Senate of the United States.

In fact, I am grateful that the House understands that I should vote in committee, where most of the work is done, but when a bill comes to the House floor, even if that bill singularly affects the residents of the District of Columbia, every Member of this body, except the Member who represents the District of Columbia, can vote on that bill.

That is not justice, that is un-American, and it offers strong evidence, I think, of the underlying reasons why the District of Columbia should become the 51st State of the Union.

We are making progress. We have got almost all the Democrats on our statehood bill. And if there is Democratic control of the next Congress, I will seek a vote on D.C. statehood on the House floor.

I got a vote on D.C. statehood when I first came to the Congress. It is time to have another vote on D.C. statehood.

We have more than half of the Democrats in the Senate, and I will get all the Democrats in the House and all the Democrats in the Senate before the end of the 115th Congress.

Most Members of the House come to this place knowing little about the Capital City. I don't blame them. I don't see why they should know much about it, except that it is the tourist mecca of our country; that 30 million

people from around the world, including from their States, come to see the extraordinary monuments in our city.

So Members shouldn't know any more about my district than I know about their districts, and yet Members come to this floor to not only vote on matters affecting my district, but on laws that would take away or overturn laws passed by the legitimate government of the District of Columbia.

When Members come, I greet them, offer them help in finding housing and the rest, and that is about the end of it.

So if they come to the House to vote, they don't know anything more about the city, except if they happen to stay here, and we welcome them, than they did when they walked in the door.

But every Member needs to know that 700,000 Americans host them, and they need to know, when they are called upon to interfere with the local laws of the District of Columbia, they should treat our local laws the way they would have their local laws treated.

I particularly speak of my Republican colleagues, who are the chief proponents of local control. They don't want the Federal Government into not only their business, but sometimes they try to get the Federal Government out of Federal business, and yet it is my Republican colleagues who are the chief abusers of what we call District Home Rule, what Americans call the right to self-government.

I need to give you examples of what I mean when I say Members try to overturn our laws, and I need to say that I often am able to keep them from doing so, even without a vote on this House floor, because of the way I think through what my role is.

I have got to think of a way to keep people who overwhelmingly outnumber me, obviously, and are the majority in this House, from overturning my own local laws. We have barely succeeded in doing so, but I will give you an idea of what I mean.

I should begin by saying that because this is a city, a big city, that its laws would be more progressive than in many other parts of the United States.

For example, the District of Columbia government has passed a Death With Dignity Act. This is a controversial bill. Six States have passed it, including States represented by the Republican leadership of this House. It is a bill that allows a person to take his own life with minimal help from a physician. It is very controversial. Six States have passed it; so has the District of Columbia. It is nobody's business but theirs.

I have kept this law from being overturned, but I have had to fight to do so for at least three years.

Let me give you another example: the Local Budget Autonomy Act. Why would there be a Local Budget Autonomy Act? Everybody knows that if you levy your own local taxes, no one should have anything to do with that, but the District of Columbia does not

have the right to have the final say on its own budget, because any Member of the Congress can try to overturn the District's budget.

Are they interested in the budget? Do they try to overturn the budget itself? No. But when the budget comes here, Republicans use it as a vehicle to overturn laws that they don't agree with, and that is why our budget is here, this budget that was raised by the residents of the District of Columbia, this local budget.

□ 1315

In order to keep our budget from coming here at all—what is it doing here—a referendum overwhelmingly passed by residents called the Local Budget Autonomy Amendment Act essentially said, that is it. It shouldn't come here.

The House has tried to repeal that at least three times. I have saved it from being repealed largely from marching over to the Senate.

Perhaps the most persistent attempt on the part of the Congress are efforts to wipe out the District's gun safety laws. It is a big city and, yes, big cities are where you have most of the gun violence, so the District has tough gun safety laws. And yet, every single year I have to protect our gun safety laws from Members of Congress who are not answerable, are in no ways responsive, to the people of the District of Columbia.

Our residents can't vote them out of office. They can vote only me out of office. They can't touch them. If that doesn't fly in the face of American democracy, I can't tell you what does.

Senator MARCO RUBIO has introduced a bill to wipe out all of our gun safety laws since 2015. I have saved D.C. gun laws from being eliminated. But Senator MARCO RUBIO from the State of Florida, where the Parkland youngsters are, who have taken nationwide their own campaign to get this Congress to pass sensible gun laws.

Yet Senator RUBIO, aided by Representative TOM GARRETT of this body, would eliminate all of the District's gun safety laws, including the District's ban on guns in schools; including making the District of Columbia a unique exception to a Federal law called Gun-Free School Zones Act, which means you cannot have a gun within a school zone. Everybody could have that except the District of Columbia.

Senator RUBIO and Representative GARRETT would repeal the District's ban on assault weapons and large-capacity magazines. Assault weapons in the Nation's capital? Imagine who would be endangered if there were assault weapons here? And I do not refer to the residents of the District of Columbia alone.

Anyone who visits our city will often find traffic stopped while caravans of high-level officials go by. Sometimes they will be Members of Congress. More often they will be world figures.

Imagine if just anybody could have an assault weapon in the Nation's capital, particularly today.

Yes, I have been able to stop it. But why should I have been put to that effort when I represent 700,000 tax-paying citizens of the United States who had already done it?

I do have to show you how low or laughable these efforts can become. I have stopped a bill that prohibited my city from using its own funds to keep certain kinds of flushable products from being sold in the District of Columbia. They stop up toilets.

The Member who proposed this, Representative ANDY HARRIS of Maryland, perhaps because it is so laughable, ultimately withdrew it. We came on the House floor to expose it.

But I cite the flushable wipes amendment to show these anti home rule efforts know no bounds. You might ask, well, why would Representative ANDY HARRIS want to do this? I don't know for sure, except that there is a manufacturer of those wipes that has surfaced and, as you may know, many Members get campaign funds from people who ask them to place matters in bills. They don't ask them to put them in our appropriations, but that is what happened, and I had to get that one out. I do want to publicly thank Representative HARRIS for withdrawing his amendment.

To give you some sense, though, of how the District of Columbia has to pay attention, not only to its own local laws and preserving them, but has to ask its Member to do what every other Member does a lot on national matters. So while I am working on national bills, during the first year of the Trump Presidency, I had to defeat 15 bills to overturn the District's gun laws.

I had to block bills that would gut the public school system laws by making D.C. use its own local funds for private schools. Yet Congress has defeated an education bill that defeated amendments to an education bill that would have allowed school districts to spend its own money on private schools.

They took private school vouchers out of the national bill, but a Member tried to put vouchers on the District. Defeated that one. And there are others, but I won't go down the list of them all.

Understand that that work is important to my District, but it is work that no other Member has to pursue because you cannot interfere with the local laws of any other Member.

At the same time, however, for example, I had and did get full funding to rehabilitate the Memorial Bridge. That happens to be important because millions of Americans use that bridge. They come to Arlington Memorial Cemetery and use that bridge to get there. They come to the Nation's Capitol to see our iconic sights, and they use that bridge. Now that was a national bill. That is the kind of bill, Federal bill, that most Members work on that they are proud of.

I bring it up because that work, which as a Member of Congress I must do for the Nation, as well as my city, is quite apart from protecting the local laws of my city.

Let's take the affordable healthcare act. Virginia has just signed on, belatedly, to the affordable healthcare act. I am in the national fight with most Members, certainly on my side of the aisle, to maintain that law. And we have maintained that law. In spite of President Trump's attempt to overturn it. In spite of more than 40 attempts by my Republican colleagues to overturn it.

D.C. needed it, because with the ACA, 96 percent of D.C. residents are now covered by healthcare. That means virtually everybody. But in that effort I am in league with other Members on a national law. That is what I should be paying attention to, first and foremost.

Another example of a national law which is important to the Nation and to me is passage of the Dream Act, to protect these children who were brought to the United States as infants or small children by their parents, who know no other country, and now face deportation because technically they, of course, are not citizens; even though they don't know El Salvador or Mexico or any other of the countries from which they would have come.

Of the 800,000 Dreamers, 800 of them are in the District of Columbia, so I am like many Members who come to the floor on that issue. But that is a national bill. That is what I am supposed to do in the Congress.

In our city, if somehow we could not save the Dreamers, that would be \$50 million annually gone from our economy; that is how productive they are. I have had a town meeting with them. These are the most impressive young people I have ever seen speak to our residents.

Mr. Speaker, could I ask how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 27 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. After you have heard all of these abuses of American democracy, you may have some understanding why I believe that the District of Columbia should become a State, and why statehood is the only remedy for the abuses that I have described.

But, do not think that there are no Republicans who understand some of the issues I have described. I regret that my good friend, a conservative Republican, Representative DARRELL ISSA—and I say I regret, because I don't think that every Republican should be put in the same category.

I cite Rep. DARRELL ISSA, because he was chair of a committee on which I serve, and decided to have a hearing on our local jurisdiction. He asked the Mayor to come, the chair of the City Council, and those who handle the budget. He listened and he indicated

his surprise to know that the District's financial condition and reserves and its growth as a local economy, were among the best in the Nation.

After that hearing, learning, for example, that our budget was the envy of the States, Representative ISSA himself endorsed budget autonomy and worked tirelessly with me and with local officials, as well as Republican interest groups, to try to secure at least the autonomy over our budget; at least over our budget. These are what we call the components of statehood.

So even if my Republican friends are not for statehood, there is no reason not to be or to stand against the elements of statehood. And we certainly may well get those before we get statehood itself.

For example, clemency. The President has the authority of clemency over the District of Columbia. Well, he doesn't know a thing about the District and, as a result, when clemency comes out, normally the District inmates are not even included. That is a classic matter for local governments.

Yes, budget autonomy is one of them. Even the District's local laws have to come here and sit for 60 days, 30 days, or for criminal laws, 60 days, to see if anybody wants to overturn these laws. This is a remnant of more than 200 years ago, when the District had no home rule, as we called it, or self-government.

Of course the Congress doesn't choose to use that section, so they could get rid of this legislative autonomy because they reserve their energy for the budget. With a budget here, they use that as the vehicle to overturn the District's laws.

□ 1330

What I think most Members of Congress do not know is that the District's local economy is one of the strongest in the Nation, and let me prove that.

It has got a \$12.5 billion budget. That is larger than the budget of 12 States. My district has a \$1.75 billion surplus. That kind of surplus, that large surplus, almost \$2 billion, is the envy of the States.

My district has a per capita income higher than that of any State, higher than that of California, of Massachusetts, of New York. That is one of the reasons why the people I represent pay the highest taxes per capita in the United States.

The total income of the residents of the District of Columbia is higher than the income of seven States. Its consumption, given its income expenditures, is higher than those of any State. And, of course, what we are seeing is a city that is flourishing. Its population growth rate is the highest since the 2010 Census. In fact, the District now has a larger population, as I indicated, than two other States that have representation to vote on this House floor.

DC would only qualify for one vote, and Vermont and Wyoming, have two

Senators as well—even with fewer residents than the number who live in the Nation's Capital.

One way to understand why the residents of the District of Columbia resent being treated as second-class citizens is to understand its highest tax rate, Federal tax rate—the highest in the Nation—amounts to \$12,000 per resident, more per capita than any residents of any States. Yet no matter what the bill, no matter how impacted the District is, I will not vote on that bill.

What hurts more than the failure to allow the District to vote on most bills is the failure to allow the District to vote on bills to go to war. The residents of this city have fought and died in every war, including the war that created the United States of America.

Please remember the slogan that the Framers and the residents threw up to win their freedom. It wasn't, "Freedom in the large." It was, "No taxation without representation."

We ask for statehood based on the original understanding of the Founders of our Nation who were willing and, indeed, did go to war for the principle of no taxation without representation. Well, the people I represent have gone to war without a vote to go to war and without a vote upon returning from war.

The sacrifices should be clear to see. World War I—and here we are talking about casualties—more than three States. World War II, more casualties from the District of Columbia than four States. And then it only goes up. The Korean war had more casualties than eight States. And, of course, the Vietnam war had more casualties than 10 States.

That ought to be reason enough for the District of Columbia to be made the 51st State. More important than paying the highest Federal taxes per capita, more important than being excluded from a vote on the floor of the Senate, it is the sacrifices our residents have made for their country that speak loudest, most prophetically, about the right of residents to be treated equally.

May I inquire of the time remaining, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 15½ minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is not as if the Congress of the United States has never understood the injustices before you. The reason I come to the House floor today is because there is turnover in the House all the time and many Members have never heard this until now.

And why not? Because you don't listen to what happens to somebody else's district. You are too busy dealing with your own district.

That is how we like it, and that is how we would like to make it for every Member of the House.

Yes, almost 45 years ago, the House understood the injustice of what was then the case. The District had no self-

government. It intermittently had some self-government in the 19th century—and may I add, that the height of that self-government was about the same as the District has now: a Delegate Member of the House and the right to local government.

And who gave them that? It was the post-Civil War Congress, which was a Republican Congress.

The Republicans lost their way, and they are chiefly responsible now for the District's not having what their own party understood should happen after the Civil War. They had fought a Civil War for democracy for everyone, and they, indeed, began the home rule process that was lost after Reconstruction and renewed again almost 45 years ago with the 1974 Home Rule Act.

Here again in the 20th it wasn't the Democrats who were solely responsible. Yes, it was a Democratic Congress, but it was a Republican President, President Richard Nixon. He said, in signing the Home Rule Act: "As a longtime supporter of self-government for the District of Columbia, I am pleased to sign into law a measure which is of historic significance for the citizens of our Nation's Capital."

Remember, this is President Nixon talking, saying: "I first voted for home rule as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1948, and I have endorsed the enactment of home rule legislation during both my terms as President."

Then he went on to say: "... it is particularly appropriate to assure those persons who live in our Capital City rights and privileges which have long been enjoyed by most of their countrymen."

That was a Republican President and a Democratic House acting in a bipartisan way to give the District self-government, a self-government which it has handled better than most of the State and city governments since.

And that is not the only example of Republicans working with us to do what almost surely will take some bipartisanism. Representative Tom Davis of Virginia worked with me on a bill that, in fact, got a vote in both houses and, indeed, we would now have in the District, a House vote if that bill had passed.

I was in the minority. Representative Tom Davis was in the majority as a Republican. I regret that he has resigned from Congress to go on to higher and better things, as he saw it. He worked with me and had hearings. What he discovered was that the State of Utah, a very Republican State, had missed getting a vote it thought due that State, and Representative Davis discussed with me the possibility of pairing the District of Columbia with Utah—one Democratic vote and one Republican vote—and nobody would gain if the District got a House vote.

Now, Representative Tom Davis was not for statehood, but he did not believe that we would call it the people's House without giving the residents of

the District of Columbia a vote in that House.

The Governor of Utah came to testify for it. The Republican Members from the House and the Senate voted for it. It was a one-to-one, and it was perhaps the best chance for voting rights, certainly, that we have had since the creation of the Republic.

Well, if we got that kind of bipartisan support for at least the House vote, why doesn't the District of Columbia have a vote on the House floor as I speak? The answer is that the National Rifle Association succeeded in getting a Member to attach to the bill, in the House, an amendment that, in exchange for the House vote, the District would have had to give up all of its gun safety laws.

I have just indicated to you the kinds of sacrifice that would have meant. The assault weapons ban would be gone, just to name, perhaps, the worst of them. That is an offer we had to refuse, and it is the closest we have come to equal rights as a Federal district.

But it is not the closest we will ever come. We will give priority during the next Congress to budget autonomy, autonomy over our own budget; legislative autonomy, to keep our legislation from having to come to this floor.

A local prosecutor—the DA who everyone associates with your local jurisdiction is not who enforces criminal law in the District of Columbia. It is the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia who does both local law, local criminal law, and, of course, Federal law.

Mayoral control over the National Guard; your Governor can call out your National Guard because only he knows the ins and outs of safety when there are issues affecting the National Guard. The National Guard is usually used for things that are local in nature, such as hurricanes and flooding.

□ 1345

The President knows almost nothing about that or about the authority to grant clemency, as I mentioned earlier in these remarks. Also, of course, control over the appointment of local judges and the operations of the local courts. Yes, D.C. courts are title I courts. What that means is that these judges who handle only local matters—local criminal and civil matters—are appointed by the President of the United States and have to stand in line to get approved by the Senate of the United States.

I have simply summarized some of the hardships of not being treated as an equal jurisdiction under the Constitution of the United States and some of the benefits of citizenship that the District would obtain if such equality were indeed granted.

It is true that the District has never achieved this equality, but I do not fret that it is out of hand. When the next Congress resumes, I have indicated any number of things I will pursue. In addition,

if my party controls this Chamber, I will ask for a vote on the House floor. I will ask for that vote, even though I am not certain by any means that that vote would result in statehood. I will ask for that vote, because I want to put it to this body exactly what it means not to have the same rights they have.

When my party controlled this House, I did not get statehood, but I was able to get what is called the vote in the Committee of the Whole. That is a vote on some business on the House floor.

My Republican friends actually sued the House for allowing the District of Columbia, whose residents are number one per capita in Federal taxes, this vote on the House floor. They went to the Federal District Court, then to the Court of Appeals, but they did not have the gumption to go to the Supreme Court.

So I voted for my District at least on some matters in the Committee of the Whole. And I will seek that vote, even short of statehood.

I represent one of the Nation's oldest cities. I represent 700,000 residents who have overpaid their dues—have overpaid them in war, have overpaid them in taxes. We are overdue as we pursue democracy for other people around the world in assuring that there is democracy for everyone in our own country. We should begin with the residents of our own proud Nation's capital.

I ask the House to think deeply about what lies in your hands, and that is not only the ability, but the obligation to make the 700,000 residents of the District of Columbia whole by making the District of Columbia the 51st State of the United States of America.

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

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS AND POLICIES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF BELARUS AND OTHER PERSONS TO UNDERMINE DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES OR INSTITUTIONS OF BELARUS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115-131)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the

emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine democratic processes or institutions of Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2018.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons to undermine Belarus's democratic processes or institutions, to commit human rights abuses related to political repression, and to engage in public corruption continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 8, 2018.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

I would say, first of all, I want to compliment the gentleman on the selection of his tie—the nice Washington Capitals red tie that he has on. Everybody behind me who is dressed in red and up there dressed in red, Mr. Speaker, has to be celebrating the jinx being broken and the Washington Capitals winning the Stanley Cup last night. The streets were full of people celebrating.

By the way, it was fairly calm, considering the exhilaration that drove all of that. A few people came here a little tired today, but with a big smile on their face. So a lot of happy, tired people in Washington, D.C. My congratulations goes out to them.

I came here today speak about a topic that has been essentially consuming a lot of our time here in these debates, Mr. Speaker, and that is this topic of immigration.

We had a 2-hour conference on Thursday morning from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m.—it may have gone after that a little ways—to try to reach a resolution. It seems as though we got about the same kind of conclusion with our effort to reach a resolution as they did in the United States Senate when they debated on the floor of the Senate for 4 days on immigration issues, trying to get a consensus to bring any single bill out of the Senate that could get enough votes to pass. They fell short and nothing passed. That was Feb-

ruary. I think some people have a sense of a consensus from the meeting yesterday, but I do not believe that we have anything that gets to 218 votes.

So, generally, Mr. Speaker, the conservatives and Republicans would agree with four of the five pillars that President Trump has laid out. I don't know if I will get them exactly right, but one is to build the wall. Another one is to secure the border. Another one is to end chain migration. Another one is to establish merit-based immigration, instead of having it be the chain migration that we have experienced.

I recall witnesses before the Immigration Committee years ago who testified that between 7 and 11 percent of our legal immigration in America—the legal immigration in America—only between 7 and 11 percent is based upon anything that we have control over, which presumably would be merit.

The balance of the legal immigration, then, is really not in the control of the American people or in the control of the United States Congress. It is in the control of the people who are, I will say, utilizing the current policy that we have, that we can't find the consensus to reverse. And those who are coming in the country sometimes by hook, by crook, and shenanigan, and sometimes just simply exploiting the laws that we have.

So it has always been very simple for me, Mr. Speaker; that is, we need to secure the border. Without a border you don't have a nation. Any sovereign nation has to secure its borders and has to control those borders. That goes for any sovereign nation all over the world, including the Vatican.

I look at that big, 30-foot-tall wall around the Vatican and understand that they don't have an open borders policy there. Neither do other countries around the world, except for the United States of America, who, under the 8 of years of Barack Obama, watched the rule of law be so eroded that it has clouded the minds of a lot of Republicans here in the House of Representatives.

There was a question asked yesterday that I wrote down here that I think is really important to contemplate. I hadn't put it in those kind of words before, although I had thought about it and I actually did research on it. And the question is this: I'll put it this way—this discussion, by the way, on immigration, the sticking point is about DACA, Deferred Action For Childhood Arrivals.

So the question that was posed was this: We stopped the entire political world for these people, DACA recipients. So the question was posed: Who are they? Who are they?

We hear continually they are valedictorians or they came across the border on their mother's arm when they were 3 years old. They know no country but this one. They only speak one language: English. They don't have a memory of any other country. They study hard and work hard and get good

grades. Some of them even say that they are as fine a group of people as we can select out of American citizens.

So I began asking some of those questions of our bureaucracy. I had actually begun asking those questions as far back as last September and intensified the request in January and focused on it very hard.

With a lot of work to try to get to the bottom of it, I found out a number of things about who are the DACA recipients. First, I want to characterize, just a little bit, about how we got here.

Barack Obama made DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, made it his tool for an unconstitutional amnesty. We should not forget, Barack Obama, on at least 22 different locations and times, said on videotape that he didn't have the constitutional authority to create this DACA policy.

He said at a school here in Washington, D.C., not that long ago, before he left office, before he implemented the DACA policy, he said: You are smart students here; you understand this. He said: I can't write the laws. Congress writes laws. The President and the executive branch carry out those laws, execute those laws, and the court interprets the laws. So it is up to Congress to change the policy.

But just a couple of months after that statement, President Obama implemented by executive edict a DACA policy that no thinking constitutionalist can really take the position that it is anything other than utterly, blatantly, and self-confessed by Barack Obama unconstitutional.

Yet, we have had a couple of Federal Judges who say that President Trump, who was elected to end the DACA policy—and we all expected that January 20, 2017, at noon, when President Trump took his oath of office, he would have already had the order ready to go that would have ended the DACA policy and stopped any new permits from being issued and stopped any renewals of existing permits, and perhaps even cancel the existing ones that were there, but that didn't happen.

Five to six weeks later, Mr. Speaker, we learned that the Trump administration was still issuing new DACA permits in just as unconstitutional a fashion as Barack Obama was. He just wasn't the author of it. He wasn't the creator of it. President Trump wasn't the creator of it. He was the continuer of the unconstitutional DACA policy created and established by Barack Obama.

So there were extensions, renewals of existing, and there were creations and new permits handed out for DACA. We all knew it was unconstitutional.

Then, as we went along, I want to really thank a number of States, but in particular, Texas, who put together a lawsuit, to file a lawsuit, on the unconstitutional policy of DACA, which is costing Texas taxpayers money and opportunity and every other State in the Union, as far as I know, money and opportunity.

Ken Paxton, the Attorney General of Texas, prepared a lawsuit that he had, I believe the number were 12 states that agreed to join with that suit, and they were prepared to file that suit last September 5, was the date.

Yet, they negotiated with the White House. So, President Trump agreed to end the DACA policy. He took this action last September 5. Part of that negotiation was so that the lawsuit would not be filed by Texas and other states. Because clearly, they would prevail. DACA is unconstitutional.

President Trump conceded, apparently, that point and ended the DACA policy effective in 6 months, which would be the 5th of March this year.

□ 1400

Then he challenged Congress to pass legislation that would resolve the DACA issue and resolve the balance of the immigration issues that we have. That deadline, presumably, was March 5.

However, there were a couple of Federal judges who decided that they were legislators, and they came to a decision, an order, that said that President Trump couldn't cancel the DACA policy, that he is compelled to continue it, to issue new permits, and to extend existing permits, for no constitutional reason that I am aware of and no statutory reason that I am aware of, just activist judges who are seeking to legislate from the bench and impose their personal policy preference on the rest of America.

Well, that can't stand, Mr. Speaker. We know that can't stand. It has got to get to the Supreme Court. And the Supreme Court, in nobody's imagination, is going to come down with a decision that says that a preceding President can implement a blatantly and clearly and, I said, self-confessedly—that is a word, I hope, “self-confessedly”—illegal policy, unconstitutional policy.

Barack Obama established that policy.

No Supreme Court is going to say: And by the way, every succeeding President has to accept the executive actions of his predecessor no matter how unconstitutional they are; that he can't end, by executive action, something that was unconstitutionally implemented by the executive action of his predecessor, Barack Obama.

But that is the decision that we have right now before the courts. Thankfully, Attorney General Ken Paxton of Texas ramped this back up again, and they are going back to court now. This goes before Judge Hanen, who has been a stellar constitutionalist, an originalist, and a textualist.

I appreciate the work he has done in the past. I can't speak to his decision coming up on this, except this, that we have the rule of law sitting here hanging in the balance. That is what has been pushed into the middle of the table. That is the bet, the rule of law, up or down.

And if the court is allowed to resolve this issue, whether it is before Judge

Hanen's circuit court or whether it goes on to the Supreme Court, which I expect it would, the Supreme Court will come down with a decision that allows and recognizes that the Chief Executive Officer of the United States of America—right now, President Donald Trump—has the authority to reverse any executive action of any of his predecessors.

That is how our Constitution is structured. And if it is any other way, if a President can, by executive action, visit a horrible policy on the American people and we don't have a way to undo that, our Founding Fathers didn't serve us up a document like that. They gave us a document with checks and balances and the authorities to be set up in a proportional way.

So DACA, if it is allowed to continue through the litigation process, will be thrown out by the Supreme Court. Let's let that happen. Let's find out. I am willing to take a Supreme Court decision on this, because if it goes the other way, our Republic is essentially lost anyway.

So who are these people? Who are they?

Well, Barack Obama made this a tool for his unconstitutional method of getting people, I will say, quasi-legalized. When that happened, specifics went out the window. When you read through these documents—and I have finally gotten my hands on the documents, Mr. Speaker. Each one of the applications is a 7-page application.

Altogether, there are about 2 million applications. Roughly half of them are renewals. That means there are 14 million pieces of paper, a lot of them filled out by hand, in fact, most of them filled out by hand. They only went electronic in 2015, I believe November 1 of 2015. So it is hard to pull the data out. That is why we had to work so hard to get it.

Some other things that came along that we are learning from reading through the press:

We are finding more and more DACA recipients who are MS-13. We shouldn't be surprised at that. A lot of them came in as unaccompanied alien minors. Then they get recruited into gangs, or they came in as a member of a gang.

They weren't all 3-year-old girls brought across the Rio Grande River by their mother. A whole lot of them were unaccompanied alien minors. And some of them who were accompanied went right into the highest gang areas in the country, MS-13 gang areas.

There is a large percentage of them who are also prime gang-age recruitment. Out of 817,000 DACA recipients, that universe who are currently under DACA, there are about 135,000 who were prime gang-age recruitment from that 13-, 14-, 15-year-old age.

To remind folks, Mr. Speaker, we had the Drug Enforcement Administration Chief Administrator there, Robert Patterson, before the Judiciary Committee a couple of weeks ago. I asked him a se-

ries of questions. Here is one of the things that he concurred on: 80 percent to 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America come from or through Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, 80 percent to 90 percent of those illegal drugs.

We have had 64,000 Americans die because of drug overdose, primarily opioid abuse, and at least two-thirds of that are illegal opioids.

The physicians are getting this under control, tightening down their prescriptions. They addressed this some time ago.

But the illegal drugs are killing Americans, and those illegal drugs are coming from or through Mexico, 80 percent to 90 percent of them.

It is a matter of note that—I will find this along the way. But over a period of about 3 years, from 2013 until 2016—and that is the first year, 2013 was the first year after the DACA announcement—the Mexican poppy fields tripled in acres. They tripled in size.

We wonder why we have a heroin problem and an opioid problem in the United States and where it comes from: from or through Mexico, by the testimony of Robert Patterson.

We also have that the drug crisis is directly related to the growth of MS-13. That is a statement that was made by Commissioner Geraldine Hart, Commissioner of Suffolk County, Long Island, New York. That is some of the information that is in here.

So who are they? Who are the DACA recipients, Mr. Speaker?

As I dug through the records and finally got my hands on the data, one of the hardest pieces of information I have ever had to work for in this town—and the nature of this town makes you work for information that politically they don't want you to have. Well, I have it now in my hands. And I will say no other Member of Congress has this information, and it has not been shared outside of a very tight circle in my own shop.

Here are some things:

The overall number of DACA recipients, 817,798 is the overall number—817,798.

I began looking down through those records, and of those who even filled out the form, that they came in too early, that they would be disqualified because they came in too early or they would be disqualified because they came in too late, the initial entry dates disqualify, of the 817,798, 8,964 of them because they didn't fit the parameters of the dates that they had to have come into the United States, some for the first time.

Another 2,100, their records are not available. They just simply don't have those records. If we are going to make sure that they are getting an education and learning English and working and that whole list of meritorious things that you always hear about when people talk about DACA, the least they could do is fill out the form. So there are 2,100 records that are not available.

Then they transferred the application form into form N-400 about that time in late winter of 2015, early winter of 2016. They transferred it over to form N-400. That is a foundational document that can be transferred into citizenship. So they set up the bookwork to turn them into citizens clear back then.

It always was the unconstitutional, lawless plan of Barack Obama to push this all on us. I will say I thought Republicans were stronger than they seemed to be. He must have had them judged just about right, because he thought he could feed this to us, but he also believed that Hillary Clinton would be the President of the United States.

How many of them traveled out of the United States?

"They are afraid to go back home." "They don't know any other country but this country." We have heard this over and over again. But 775 confessed on the form that they had gone back to their home country. That should disqualify them.

Of those who already reported that they were too old to qualify, over age 31 by the closing date, there were 2,464 who were too old to qualify.

And here is the number of those who were prime gang recruitment age: 135,250 of them. But that also includes boys and girls. Of the boys and girls, more boys get recruited, of course, by far, but the girls are being recruited, too. We know how bad that can be.

That is just up to age 16. The legislation that they want to bring to this floor takes it to age 18, and that adds about another 33,000 or 34,000 for each year. So that number, then, would go to 100—let's see. Well, 66,000 to 68,000 more on top of that, so just round that up. It would be 200,000 would be the universe from which MS-13 and other gangs would recruit while they waited for the younger kids to get a little older.

They are growing up in these MS-13 neighborhoods. They are being delivered to MS-13 neighborhoods. We are eroding the culture of the civilization of America with this policy, and everybody is afraid to say who they are. Nobody is even asking the question. They are just saying, "valedictorian," "3-year-old girls."

There are a few who are. I found them in this data, too. Actually, they are a little better represented than I expected they would be, but that is only my judgment, not the data.

On education: They are supposed to be getting an education. Here is what I found out from looking at the education: no data available.

We are out of this universe of 817,798, Mr. Speaker. Out of that universe, there were 564,103 where there was no data available at all in their application on education.

Were they going to school or weren't they? Did they have an education of any kind? Where did it take them to? Was it sixth grade? third grade? 11th grade? No data available.

That is 68.9 percent of the DACA recipients we don't have even a record that they ever went to school.

I have to believe a good number of them went to school but not long enough, apparently, to write that down on this form. And most of them had help filling out the applications. That is those where the records were not available.

Then they have this mushy question in there that is designed—this whole thing is designed to grant amnesty, so the questions are asked in such a way, when you read through there, that it was never designed to understand and get an honest reporting that came out.

Regardless, those who have no diploma and may or may not be in school, that is another 179,719, or 21.9 percent. They say, well, they don't have a degree, they don't have a diploma, they may or may not be in school, by the way the question was asked.

In any case, if you add together those with no data available and those with no verification of any kind of educational experience, that comes to 90.8 percent of all of the DACA recipients without a validation of their education. Of those who attest that they qualify—now, remember, there is no verification here. All the stuff on this 7-page document they attest to, but the verification is almost nonexistent, although there is a little bit. Of those who attest they are qualified by education, that is 9.2 percent is all.

So I found myself adding up these things and seeing what is the worst-case scenario.

Oh, the best-case scenario is believe everything and expect that there is an excuse for 564,000 not even putting out a number on the form.

So I began to add this up. I think I left some things out, though, Mr. Speaker. I will start this way.

Of 817,798, you would subtract from that the 564,103 that they had no data on for education at all, because they would have been disqualified by the requirements of the program.

The second group, you can't tell whether they went to school or not. That is 179,719. Subtract that. They are disqualified, also, because you can't tell.

Oh, here is a really interesting one. Of those who confessed to being criminals, 66 percent of those who self-reported that they are criminals, they received their DACA permit. Two-thirds of those who said "I am a criminal" got their DACA permit anyway.

Those are the initial applications. Then, once their status was up for renewal, of the group who said they—that was a much bigger group then, those up for renewal. 31,854 of them were granted. The 94 percent of the roughly 33,000 or so altogether, 94 percent of them got renewed even though they said, "I am a criminal."

So we are not really cleaning out the folks that we wouldn't want in this group, and it is getting harder and

harder to find the ones you would want in this group.

Then, of those based upon the data entry I mentioned earlier, 8,964, they would be out, disqualified; 2,100 with no data available, they would be disqualified; And of those who went back home, it disqualifies them, also, because they knew when they came back in that they were violating the law. It wasn't through no fault of their own. That is 775.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you have added this up in your head, as I have run through these numbers, and the conclusion you will have drawn is that, of the 817,798 DACA recipients on record at the time we pulled this data off last month, there was 789,851 of them who would be disqualified on the records because they didn't meet the standards that were put down by Barack Obama that were designed to give amnesty in the first place. That is how bad these records are.

I can't believe these people are these bad, but the records certainly are horrible, and we are here pontificating as if we know what we are doing. Statesmen and women here are deciding: Oh, yeah, I can give amnesty to DACA recipients because it is the humane thing to do. It is the right thing to do for the country. Don't call it amnesty because it hurts my feelings. And, by the way, we need to do this because if we don't give amnesty to DACA recipients, we can't get the money for the wall, and we can't pass the border security, and we can't end chain migration, and we can't pass Kate's Law, and we can't pass Sarah's Law, and we can't end sanctuary cities.

Really? This United States of America, this shining city on a hill, this stellar country that has eclipsed anything that any country has ever done before, we can't restore the essential pillar of American exceptionalism called the rule of law? In fact, Mr. Speaker, when Ronald Reagan spoke of the shining city on a hill, I always thought a little bit differently. I was always inspired by the image that he drew, but America is, instead, a shining city built upon pillars, and those pillars are the pillars of American exceptionalism, and most of them are in the bill of rights.

You have a pillar for freedom of speech, a pillar for freedom of religion, a pillar for freedom of the press, a pillar for freedom of assembly. We have a pillar for Second Amendment rights to keep and bear arms, and then we have a pillar for property rights and one for no double jeopardy and a jury of your peers and the enumerated powers in the Constitution, the framework of the intergenerational contractual guarantee, which is our Constitution, all of that is there.

It leaves out a couple of things in the Constitution. It doesn't point out that this is a Judeo-Christian society with a belief and a moral foundation that

guides us in our everyday life and a level of expectations of living up to American standards, that is not there. But it is a pillar of American exceptionalism. It is a pillar of the shining city on the pillars. And free enterprise, capitalism, is another component.

All of these things come together to make America great. You know, you can maybe wound two or three of those pillars, and we would still be a great Nation. But the central pillar—think of these others that I have described all around a circle holding up that city, but the middle, the important one, the central pillar of American exceptionalism is the rule of law. It is sacrosanct to a free people. If we don't live by the rule of law, our country collapses, our other pillars fall, and we fall into the Third World.

And yet, this Congress is in the business right now of negotiating away the rule of law under some myopic belief that if we just reward this group of people for breaking the law, somehow the rest of those folks that are out there in other sympathetic categories are just going to go away and say: Sorry, I guess I missed the boat; I wasn't DACA; I was a parent that brought DACA in; or I got in too early and so I was disqualified; or I got in too late and I was disqualified. These are all illegal entries, by the way. Or I came into America, had a baby with an anchor baby. Now I am a parent of an American. How do we split up families?

You have to draw a line. The only place to draw the line is right down the rule of law, and we cannot be supporting amnesty. To grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crime.

What nation does that? What thinking nation would do such a thing when we have got so much at stake; and how this multiplies itself throughout the generations?

1986 Ronald Reagan made one mistake. He signed the amnesty act of 1986. We have been paying for that ever since because it created the expectation that there would be other amnesties.

There have been at least six other minor amnesties since then. This is the big one. This is at least as big as Ronald Reagan, and it sets the stage for another 10 to 20 million people rewarded for breaking American law. And what do we tell our children and what will our descendants think if we can't think any more clearly than we appear to be doing right now?

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

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, just to follow up on what my good friend from

Iowa (Mr. KING) was saying, there is an article here from this week—Hans A. von Spakovsky says: "Alabama is arguing that by including illegal immigrants in its count of the population, it deprives the State of representation in the U.S. House of Representatives. The key to Alabama's case is the definition of 'persons' who should be counted and thus used in apportionment. This is not an issue the court has addressed before."

That is interesting.

"Alabama has filed an unprecedented but little-noticed lawsuit against the U.S. Census Bureau. If the State wins, it could have major political ramifications and restore fundamental fairness in political representation in Congress."

And I might insert parenthetically here, I heard my friend, the delegate from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) was talking about hoping to have a vote, whether it was making D.C. a State or whatnot. But in the little research that I ended up doing after I got here is I have seen the license plate, "Taxation without representation." I thought: Well, you know, of course, that was something that was said during the Revolution, "Taxation without representation is tyranny." Ben Franklin said, if we don't get to elect even one of the members of parliament that put taxes on us, then they should not be able to put taxes on us.

So I am familiar with that situation, but I didn't know, until after I had been here awhile, I find out that territories, like—or any U.S. property that is not part of a State, they do not have a U.S. representative because the Constitution is very clear, very succinct, it says that the representative shall come from the several States.

In the late 1970s, all of the proponents of giving Washington, D.C. a representative, a U.S. representative, they understood there is only one way to do that, and that is to have a constitutional amendment to amend where it says the representative shall come from the several States and include, and the District of Columbia, something like that.

Well, they passed it with a significant percentage in the House and the Senate that allowed it to go forward as a constitutional amendment, but they never got—in the late 1970s, they never got the requisite number of States because I guess, from the State standpoint, they are thinking: Well, if we ratify this as a constitutional amendment, it slightly, but still does, dilute a little bit of our power in the House of Representatives. So it didn't get the requisite number of States.

But, again, after I was here, I was talking to a friend from Puerto Rico, and I said: I know there have been votes in the past about whether Puerto Ricans want to be a State or not. Why has that not passed previously? This is several years ago.

And he said: Well, there are people that kind of like the current situation

in Puerto Rico. It is the same as in Guam or the Mariana Islands or the U.S. Virgin Islands—all the areas that are not States, they are territories—because in those, as in Puerto Rico, because they do not elect a full voting representative into the U.S. House or Senate, then the Founders, up through the current time, have said it is not fair. Just like Ben Franklin said, it is not fair to make them pay Federal income tax, Federal tax, if they don't elect a full voting representative.

So there is no U.S. territory, no non-State U.S. property that has to pay Federal income tax if they are not a State that elects a representative, except for the District of Columbia.

And once I realized that, I went: Well, it may not seem to people to be a Republican issue, but that really is not fair for the District of Columbia, because the people in the District of Columbia pay Federal income tax.

So if we are really going to be consistent, we are really going to be fair to the people of the District of Columbia, there is only one thing to do: Either make them a State, which a form of that was tried in the 1970s and it didn't work, or the other—actually there are three things. The other is to make the law as it is for every other non-State, that the residents of that non-State do not pay Federal income tax.

So I filed that bill in a number of the Congresses, including this one. It was very basic, you know—residents of Washington, District of Columbia, will not pay Federal income tax, just like all the other territories. And I have been intrigued that I have not gotten support from Democrats, including the delegate from the District of Columbia.

I understand, you know, folks like my colleague want to have a full voting U.S. representative. Fine. But why not let your constituents at least be treated like every other resident U.S. citizen of a non-State. Don't make them pay income tax until you get what you want. Maybe some day you'll get it, but until you do, why don't you join forces with me and just say: We want to pass this law; we are going to be fair to the residents of Washington, D.C. just like we are to all the other non-States that are U.S. territories; we are going to say you don't pay Federal income tax.

But I have been amazed that I am still not getting support from the other side of the aisle, just to be fair, until they—I am not in favor of making the District of Columbia a State. I like what the Founders did, with that one exception, they should not have to pay tax since they don't elect a full voting representative.

So, anyway, I am hoping that at some point at least one or more of my Democratic friends will join forces with me and maybe we can push that issue to the floor so we can treat the residents of the District of Columbia fairly. But until the person representing the people here in the District of Columbia disagree, then it is

doubtful the Speaker would ever bring my bill to the floor so we could treat them fairly.

Now, there is one other way that that could be handled, and I did file this bill some Congresses back, but it had even less support, so I didn't bother to file it again. So one way to be fair to the residents of the District of Columbia would be to say: No Federal income tax, since you don't elect a full voting representative.

The other would be to do what was done in the late 1840s when there were major complaints from residents of the District of Columbia. They were part of the 10-mile-by-10-mile square District of Columbia, but were on the western side of the Potomac River. They were protesting. They were upset. Look, you are not using any of our land as Federal land, so why don't you just cede the land west of the Potomac back to Virginia and then we can participate in the election of not only representatives, but also two Senators? We will get to participate in that since you are not using the land.

□ 1430

Well, of course, nowadays, the Federal Government is using a lot of that land. You have not only Reagan National Airport, you have Arlington National Cemetery, the Pentagon, and so many other things across the river.

But back in the late 1840s, that was ceded back to Virginia. That is why when people look at a map of the District of Columbia, it is no longer a 10-mile-by-10-mile square. It is uneven on the west side because it follows the Potomac, going back to that ceding of land back to Virginia.

So I have filed a bill before, and I am not planning on filing it again because it just didn't get any real support at all. But we drew a line with a metes and bounds description around all of the nonresident Federal buildings in the District of Columbia. We keep those as Federal enclaves, and then cede all of the other land east of the Potomac back to Maryland.

I remember my friend from the District of Columbia, across the aisle, asking me one time on this floor, when I was talking about this bill: But what if Maryland didn't want to take this land back?

And I looked at my friend, Mr. HOYER from Maryland, and I said—I am sure that our friend here, Mr. HOYER, would say—any State would be thoroughly pleased to have you and your constituents as residents of their State. I didn't get an “amen” or “sure, of course” from Mr. HOYER, but I am sure, deep in his heart, he felt that way. But, like I said, I never got any real support for that.

So I am hoping, at some point, my friend from the District of Columbia will join me and say: Okay, at least until—and even if it doesn't happen—at least until it did happen, the residents of the District of Columbia should be treated fairly, like we do those from

any other non-State, and don't pay income tax.

I appreciate bringing those issues back up again. It is an easy solution. And I just feel like if we had a bipartisan effort to pass that, then we could get that done on behalf of the residents of Washington, District of Columbia.

But, anyway, back to this article from the Heritage Foundation, June 5, talking about the lawsuit about counting illegal immigrants in the Census. It says: “Conversely, the lawsuit argues, the practice of counting illegal immigrants in the Census gives States that protect them (California, for example) seats and votes they are not entitled to have.”

“The 14th Amendment to the Constitution provides that Representatives in the House ‘shall be apportioned among the several States . . . according to their respective Numbers’”—just like I was talking about—“with the ‘Numbers’ determined by ‘counting the whole number of persons in each State.’”

“After every Census, House seats are reapportioned according to the population of each State. Electoral College votes are reapportioned according to the number of each State's congressional Representatives.”

“Alabama is right about the unfairness of the current system. Illegal immigrants, by definition, have no right to be in this country. It is unjust to allow States to gain a political advantage over other States by flouting Federal immigration law.”

“The number of Representatives in the House—435—has been fixed by the law since 1910. So as Alabama says in its complaint, apportionment is ‘a zero sum proposition: Each State's gain is another State's loss.’”

“Alabama argues that by including illegal immigrants in apportionment, congressional seats and Electoral College votes are unfairly distributed.”

“Based on the 2010 Census, Louisiana, Missouri, and Ohio each lost a seat in the House and a vote in the Electoral College, while Montana failed to gain a seat and an electoral vote. By contrast, California gained two House seats and two Electoral College votes. And Florida and Texas each gained one seat and one vote.”

“As a result, says Alabama in its lawsuit: ‘four House seats and four Electoral College votes were redistributed by the inclusion of illegal aliens in the apportionment base in the 2000 Census.’”

“Alabama claims that including illegal immigrants in the 2020 Census will likely cause it to lose a congressional seat and an Electoral College vote. It says this ‘will rob the State of Alabama and its legal residents of their rightful share of representation.’”

“This also violates the ‘one person, one vote’ equal representation standard of the 14th Amendment. According to Alabama, ‘the gains from including illegal aliens in the apportionment base flow to citizens who live in State with large numbers of illegal aliens.’”

“Why? Because it means that ‘in a State in which a large share of the population cannot vote, those who do vote count more than those who live in States where a larger share of the population is made up of American citizens.’” Which is an interesting argument.

“This results in ‘representational inequality’ by devaluing the vote of Alabama's legal residents. This redistribution of political power ‘disincentivizes States with large illegal alien populations from cooperating with Federal immigration authorities (lest they lose political power that comes with additional Representatives and votes in the Electoral College),’ Alabama argues.”

“Moreover, including illegal immigrants in the Census ‘punishes States who do cooperate with Federal immigration authorities in the identification and removal’ of illegal aliens, Alabama's lawsuit states.”

“Alabama's final complaint is monetary. Including illegal immigrants in the Census, it says, will likely cause it to lose its fair share of the almost \$700 billion distributed annually by the Federal Government in grants and other funds.”

“The key to Alabama's case is the definition of ‘persons’ who should be counted and thus used in apportionment. Alabama argues the term ‘persons’ was understood at the ‘time of the founding and when the 14th Amendment was ratified’ to mean the ‘inhabitants’ of a State.”

“Furthermore, ‘in the public law of the founding era, the term ‘inhabitant’ did not encompass unlawful residents because inhabitance was a legal status that depended upon permission to settle granted by the sovereign nation in which an alien wished to reside,’ Alabama argues.”

“In other words, ‘persons’ does not include individuals who are in the U.S. illegally, without the permission of the Federal Government.”

“The ‘Residence’ rule adopted by the Census Bureau for the 2020 Census stipulates that foreign nationals will be counted and allocated to the State where their ‘usual residence’ is located, regardless of whether they are legally present.”

There is some hypocrisy, I have noticed, among some of our friends here. On the one hand, they are constantly saying: We have to bring these illegal aliens, undocumented people, whatever they want to call them, we have to bring them out of the shadows.

And I remember, on one occasion, we had a bunch of folks claiming to be illegal aliens in the gallery right here. They were shouting and proud to be illegal aliens at some point. I looked up, looked around the gallery at all of these people making noise, have T-shirts, and I thought: It doesn't look like they are in the shadows to me. I mean, it looks like there is plenty of light up there.

They keep using the term that they are “in the shadows,” yet Alabama has

this lawsuit and they are saying: We need to know who is in the country illegally and who is not so we can get a fair count.

And people that have been saying, on the one hand: We want everybody that is coming into the country illegally to come out of the shadows; when it comes to apportionment, they are saying: No, no, no, no, we want them counted, but you can't ask them whether they are here illegally or not. So we want their status to stay in the shadows. We want to keep their status secret.

Sanctuary cities are basically doing the same thing. They might as well put the Statue of Liberty out in San Francisco harbor saying: Give us your tired, your poor, your felons, your people that like to shoot other people and rob them, because that is basically what San Francisco has been saying: We don't care if you are a felon, we don't care if you kill people, you rape women, or raped anybody, we want you here, and we won't tell on you, so you come right in here.

I am going to file a bill. I have been working on it too long. I haven't gotten the cooperation I thought I should from some folks. But, anyway, basically, I think it ought be a civil right living in a city in the United States that is violated when a city says: We are going to welcome, encourage, really try to recruit people to be in our city who are felons, who are here illegally and felons.

And when that kind of action under State law robs people of their lives or their sexual purity or any other thing, there ought to be a cause of action against that city or that State that is saying: We encourage people that are here illegally and who are committing felonies, we want you here.

That really ought to be a right of the others who are U.S. citizens that is being violated by the sanctuary city or the sanctuary State. So if a State or city wants to keep encouraging felons to live within their bounds and it costs people their lives or their property, there ought to be a civil rights lawsuit lodged against that State or city government, or county government for that matter.

So we will get it done and we will get it filed. That way it is fair. So, say, if San Francisco, for example, wants to keep encouraging people, like the guy that shot Kate Steinle, to come into the city, and that way others may be similarly situated, as was Kate Steinle, and get shot and killed as they beg their daddy to help them, I mean, I just can't imagine anything much worse than that as a father.

The father should not have his lawsuit thrown out of court, as happened in the Steinle case. We ought to give the means to the aggrieved party to say to San Francisco, or say to the city or State when they are acting as a sanctuary city or State: Do you know what, you can do that if you want, but you are going to monetarily pay to the

people who are harmed under your State or city color of law. It just seems fair.

So, hopefully, we will get something done on that and let the lawsuits commence against the sanctuary cities. As a former lawyer who tried a lot of cases, I have seen the good that can come. Sometimes there are places where the litigation system is abused, often a topic on FOX News, but there are some laws we don't really have to pass if you have a good court system that aggrieved parties can come in and they can sue and collect.

And just the threat of that suit and collection voids the needs for us to come in here or run in and pass a law every time there is some illegality or impropriety or some damage done to other parties. Let the courts mete it out.

When somebody is penalized financially in a sufficient amount, then it will change their conduct. I think you would see sanctuary cities change once their taxpayers realize they are going to keep paying out multimillion dollars or hundreds of millions of dollars constantly in court costs and damages assessed.

□ 1445

I bet you would see a whole lot of folks say: Do you know what? Maybe it is time that we quit having a sanctuary in our city for people who came in illegally and who also commit violent felonies or property theft or whatever it is. Let's protect people and give them that right through litigation.

Now, this article from Bob Price says: "Border Patrol Agents Arrest Sex Offenders, Gang Members in South Texas." It points out that: "Border patrol agents assigned to the Rio Grande Valley Sector stopped sex offenders and gang members from making their way to their U.S. destinations over the weekend. During a 4-day period, agents arrested four child molesters and three gang members after they illegally crossed the border. The arrests include fugitives who fled the country to avoid prosecution and previously deported criminal aliens."

"Rio Grande City Station agents arrested a man who illegally crossed the border near Roma, Texas, on Sunday. During processing, agents learned the Salvadoran national was convicted in Angleton, Texas, in February 2015 for a 2014 charge of sexual assault of a child. The Salvadoran national received a 5-year prison sentence and was deported after being released early by prison officials."

And then obviously coming back, some other child was probably saved from another sexual assault, because I know from my experience as a prosecutor and a felony judge, when somebody is that kind of evil that they would commit that kind of assault on a child, it just seems to be the kind of evil that they keep coming back to.

So it is something that needs to stop. Thank God we have Border Patrol officers who are protecting us.

I would just encourage our own Republican leadership, what got President Trump elected was he was promising that we would build a wall. He was promising an end to the unconstitutional DACA that Obama did. He was promising no amnesties. So I think in the time we have left in this year, wouldn't it be a good idea if we as Republicans in the House quit worrying about a discharge petition and started being concerned about keeping our promises to the American people?

Let's get the wall built where it is needed, but for heaven's sake, get the border secure. Secure the border so people coming in are coming in lawfully.

We should not have to process anybody who comes in anywhere except through an authorized entry point into our country. If you try to come in another way, the Federal officers ought to do like the State of Texas officers do, and that is stand in the way: You are not coming into our country. You are not putting a foot on American soil until you come in legally.

But the Federal officers haven't been doing that, and we need to make that happen as well. That is what we do. Once we have secured the borders, then we can work something out about who is here and who stays, who goes.

But until then, the border patrolmen again reaffirmed for me this last week, every time we mention DACA, amnesty, any kind of legalization, any kind of stay, any kind of path to this, that, or the other, there is another surge of people illegally coming into the country. Let's stop the surges. Let's do whatever it takes to secure the border. Let's forget about discharge petitions.

Concentrate on that secured border. That will keep our oath. That will keep our promise. That defends the Constitution, and it also actually helps people get reelected, because we kept our promises.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 12, 2018, at noon 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:

5083. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Threshold for De Minimis Activity and Exemptions From Licensing Under the Animal Welfare Act [Docket No.: APHIS-

2014-0059] (RIN: 0579-AD99) received June 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5084. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Tree Tomatoes From Ecuador Into the Continental United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0072] (RIN: 0579-AE23) received June 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5085. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures [Docket No.: APHIS-2013-0049] (RIN: 0579-AC60) received May 25, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5086. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's proposed rule — Standards of Conduct and Referral of Known or Suspected Criminal Violations; Standards of Conduct (RIN: 3052-AC44) May 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5087. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Removal of Certain Capital Rules That Are No Longer Effective Following the Implementation of the Revised Capital Rules (RIN: 3064-AE51) received May 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5088. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Control of Communicable Diseases; Technical Correction [Docket No.: CDC-2016-0068] (RIN: 0920-AA63) received May 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5089. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — 340B Drug Pricing Program Ceiling Price and Manufacturer Civil Monetary Penalties Regulation (RIN: 0906-AB18) received June 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5090. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — State of Iowa; Approval and Promulgation of the State Implementation Plan, the 111(d) Plan and the Operating Permits Program [EPA-R07-OAR-2017-0470; FRL-9979-10-Region 7] received June 1, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5091. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to New Mexico [EPA-R06-OAR-2016-0091; FRL-9978-89-Region 6] received June 1, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5092. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ethoxylated Fatty Acid Methyl Esters; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0666; FRL-9976-39] received June 1, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5093. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Infrastructure and Interstate Transport for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R06-OAR-2015-0843; FRL-9978-48-Region 6] received June 1, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5094. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; PA; Emissions Statement Requirement for the 2008 Ozone Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2017-0739; FRL-9978-98-Region 3] received June 1, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5095. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alpha-cypermethrin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0234; FRL-9976-73] received June 1, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5096. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval and Air Quality Designation; SC; Redesignation of the Greenville-Spartanburg Unclassifiable Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2018-0017; FRL-9978-93-Region 4] received June 1, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5097. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Additional Air Quality Designations of the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0548; FRL-9977-72-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT94) received June 1, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5098. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pydiflumetofen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0775; FRL-9976-66] received May 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5099. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0760; FRL-9977-86-Region 9] received May 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5100. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Louisiana; 2008 8-

hour Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision for Baton Rouge [EPA-R06-OAR-2018-0111; FRL-9978-44-Region 6] received May 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5101. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Rhode Island; Enhanced Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [EPA-R01-OAR-2009-0436; FRL-9978-30-Region 1] received May 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5102. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; OR; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide, 2010 Sulfur Dioxide, and 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2016-0056; FRL-9978-47-Region 10] received May 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5103. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Volatile Organic Compounds Definition [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0323; FRL-9978-45-Region 5] received May 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5104. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Nonattainment Plans for the Lemont and Pekin SO₂ Nonattainment Areas; Correction [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0138; FRL-9978-43-Region 5] received May 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5105. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Desert Hills, Arizona) [MB Docket No.: 18-27] (RM-11796) received June 6, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5106. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — National Industrial Security Program [FDMS No.: NARA-16-0006; Agency No.: NARA-2018-032] (RIN: 3095-AB79) received May 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5107. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of Justice Programs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program [Docket No.: OJP (BJA) 1722] (RIN: 1121-AA85) received May 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5108. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ocean Disposal; Temporary Modification of an Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site in Massachusetts Bay [EPA-R01-OW-2017-0528; FRL-9978-51-Region 1] received May 22, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5109. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Debt Refinancing in 504 Loan Program (RIN: 3245-AG79) received May 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Small Business.

5110. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update of 2018 Standard Mileage Rates Notice [Notice 2018-42] received May 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5111. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Credit for Renewable Electricity Production and Refined Coal Production, and Publication of Inflation Adjustment Factor and Reference Prices for Calendar Year 2018 [Notice 2018-50] received May 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5112. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule -Indexing Adjustments for Certain Provisions under Section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code (Revenue Procedure 2018-34) received May 24, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2851. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify how controlled substance analogues are to be regulated, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-713, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H. Res. 898. Resolution directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to Department of Homeland Security policies and activities relating to homeland security information produced and disseminated regarding cybersecurity threats posed by the ZTE Corporation, headquartered in Shenzhen, China; adversely (Rept. 115-714). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5685. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide educational resources regarding opioid use and pain management as part of the Medicare & You handbook (Rept. 115-715, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5583. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require States to annually report on certain adult health quality measures, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5800. A bill to require the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission to conduct an exploratory study and report on requirements applicable to and practices of institutions for mental diseases

under the Medicaid program (Rept. 115-717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROYCE of California: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 5480. A bill to improve programs and activities relating to women's entrepreneurship and economic empowerment that are carried out by the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5735. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to establish a demonstration program to set aside section 8 housing vouchers for supportive and transitional housing for individuals recovering from opioid use disorders or other substance use disorders, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 115-719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3331. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to promote testing of incentive payments for behavioral health providers for adoption and use of certified electronic health record technology; with an amendment (Rept. 115-720, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALDEN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5582. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study and submit a report on barriers to accessing abuse-deterrent opioid formulations for individuals enrolled in a plan under part C or D of the Medicare program; with an amendment (Rept. 115-721, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5788. A bill to provide for the processing by U.S. Customs and Border protection of certain international mail shipments and to require the provision of advance electronic information on international mail shipments of mail, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-722, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5582 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3331 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Homeland Security discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5788 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 5788. Referral to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform extended for a period ending not later than June 11, 2018.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 6049. A bill to remove the limitation on large accelerated filers qualifying as an emerging growth company, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6050. A bill to allow all individuals purchasing health insurance in the individual market the option to purchase a lower premium copper plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 6051. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to apply certain annuity benefits to Federal Protective Service law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr.

TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 6052. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare Program of hearing aids and related hearing services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 6053. A bill to prohibit the modification of civil penalties under export control and sanctions laws of the United States with respect to Chinese telecommunication companies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 6054. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalty enhancements for committing certain offenses while in disguise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOMEZ (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 6055. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to indemnify government employees, and employees entities that have contracts with such governments, from certain judgements for acting within their capacity to comply with their official duties and responsibilities, and other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 6056. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish rules for payment for graduate medical education (GME) costs for hospitals that establish a new medical residency training program after hosting resident rotators for short durations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 6057. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for enhanced penalties for trafficking in fentanyl, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 6058. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to make grants for the establishment of pilot programs to advance high-definition road mapping in order to further the safe deployment of highly automated vehicles; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 6059. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 51 Willow Street in Lynn, Massachusetts, as the "Thomas P. Costin, Jr. Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 6060. A bill to assist in the conservation of the North Atlantic right whale by supporting and providing financial resources for North Atlantic right whale conservation programs and projects of persons with expertise required for the conservation of North Atlantic right whales; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6061. A bill to require the head of each agency to submit to the Government Accountability Office a monthly travel log, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 6062. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Medicare program for FDA-approved qualifying colorectal cancer screening blood-based tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 6063. A bill to enact certain existing laws relating to domestic security as title 6, United States Code, "Domestic Security", and to make technical amendments to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 6064. A bill to rename the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Congressman Lester Wolff National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 6065. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to limit eligibility for essential air service for certain locations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 6066. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the productivity of the management of Department of Veterans Affairs health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H. Res. 928. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Attorney General to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives

relating to the President's use of the pardon power under article II, section 2 of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H. Res. 929. A resolution recognizing World Oceans Day and the necessity to protect, conserve, maintain, and rebuild the ocean and its resources; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. BASS (for herself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Res. 930. A resolution encouraging reunions of divided Korean-American families; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. ROSKAM):

H. Res. 931. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the 85th anniversary of the Ukrainian Famine of 1932-1933, known as the Holodomor, should serve as a reminder of repressive Soviet policies against the people of Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H. Res. 932. A resolution expressing solidarity with the Tuidang Movement whereby Chinese citizens renounce their ties to the Chinese Communist Party and its affiliates, and calling for an immediate end to the campaign to persecute Falun Gong practitioners; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 6049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional Authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate in commerce in and among the states, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has

been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3:

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 6051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 6052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 6053.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 6054.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"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." United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GOMEZ:

H.R. 6055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 6056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 6057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has 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 any Department or Officer thereof".

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 6058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 6059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 6060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. NORMAN:

H.R. 6061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 6062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 6063.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to certain provisions classified to title 34, United States Code, as necessary to keep the title current and make technical corrections and improvements. Codifying Federal statutes is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the legislative branch of the United States.

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 6064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has 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 any Department or Officer thereof”

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 6065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 6066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 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. 53: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 333: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 398: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 489: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 778: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 795: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 912: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 959: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 992: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1100: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 1156: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 1205: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LAMB, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. FASO.
H.R. 1298: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1318: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. ROYCE of California.
H.R. 1377: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1409: Mr. EVANS and Mr. REICHERT.
H.R. 1606: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1615: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HECK, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1683: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2077: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2119: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 2151: Mr. KHANNA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 2215: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 2295: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2306: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2315: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2345: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2452: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 2491: Mr. GOMEZ and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2556: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2598: Mr. WELCH, Mr. O’ROURKE, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 2651: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 2652: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 2790: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2827: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2917: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 2918: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 3032: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3077: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 3086: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 3192: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 3272: Mr. HIMES and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3330: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 3410: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3692: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 3780: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 3891: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3919: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 3945: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 3960: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 4107: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 4202: Mr. KILMER and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 4253: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 4265: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 4268: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 4506: Mr. DENHAM and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 4518: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 4732: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 4760: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. COMER.

H.R. 4861: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 4898: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 5002: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BUCK, Mr. HILL, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5009: Mr. HILL and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 5036: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 5041: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 5058: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 5065: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 5129: Mr. KILMER, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5161: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 5167: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 5191: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 5199: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 5222: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 5248: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 5281: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 5329: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5339: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 5343: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 5353: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5385: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 5477: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 5480: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 5534: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 5539: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 5590: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 5640: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 5671: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 5684: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 5701: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 5728: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 5735: Mrs. HANDEL and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 5774: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 5780: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. MOORE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 5788: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HILL, and Mr. FASO.

H.R. 5795: Mr. MAST, Mrs. NOEM, and Ms. ROSEN.

H.R. 5812: Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 5861: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, and Mr. BANKS of Indiana.

H.R. 5876: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 5889: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 5890: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 5891: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 5892: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. ROSEN, and Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 5899: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 5924: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. BACON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 5963: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 5977: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BASS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 5988: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 6012: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 6033: Mr. WELCH, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 6043: Mr. AMASH and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 6048: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. SOTO.

H.J. Res. 95: Mr. COHEN and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 129: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.

H.J. Res. 135: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. GAETZ, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. MEEKS.

H. Res. 401: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H. Res. 405: Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BASS, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. CRIST, Mr. O’HALLERAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H. Res. 864: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. SUOZZI.

H. Res. 896: Mr. ESPAILLAT and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 915: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H. Res. 926: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. PALONE.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—

ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 10 by Mr. CURBELO of Florida on House Resolution 774: Mr. Vela, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas.

Petition 11 by Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania on House Resolution 873: Mr.

June 8, 2018

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H5023

Heck, Mr. Clay, Mr. McEachin, Mr. Meng, Mr. Johnson of Georgia, Mrs. Bustos, Florida, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Delaney, Mr. Krishnamoorthi, Mr. Soto, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Espaillat, Mr. Ben Ray Luján of New Mexico, Mr. Ruiz, Mr. Peterson, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Mr. Suozzi, Mr. Higgins of New York, Mr. Kihuen, Ms. Wasserman Schultz, Mr. O'Rourke, Ms. Mrs. Napolitano, Ms. Barragán, Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Bera, Miss Rice of New York, Mr. Cárdenas, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Gomez, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Kilmer, Mr. Himes, Mr. Castro of Texas, Mr. Norcross, Mr. Sherman, Ms. Frankel of