



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2017

No. 21

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

February 7, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVEN M. PALAZZO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

SUPPORT COMPANIES THAT OPPOSE IMMIGRATION BAN

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, as we all learned on Sunday, Adolphus Busch came to America from Germany to make the king of beers. He didn't have a visa. He had a boat ticket and, of course, our country welcomed him. Well, not exactly.

In the Super Bowl ad that aired, Mr. Busch was told: "You are not welcome here. Go back home."

But then the young man eventually reaches St. Louis, meets Mr. Anheuser,

and Budweiser—one of the most unmistakably American brands around the world—is born.

All of us assumed that the President was watching the ad because it was, after all, the Super Bowl and it was broadcast by FOX network, his favorite. But I wonder if the message sank in.

Mr. Speaker, to borrow a line from a different advertiser: I don't always drink beer, but when I do, I think the next time it will be a Bud.

But then there was the little girl and her mom who walked to America from Latin America in the 84 Lumber ad. They didn't have a visa either because, well, we don't generally allow visas to people from Latin America who are seeking a better way of life here. If they did qualify for a visa, that little girl would be a grown-up adult by the time the visa was processed, given our broken immigration system. We learned that FOX television told the advertiser to edit out a border wall scene in the original version of the ad. I guess even FOX was worried about being attacked by the twitter in chief.

I am not sure what 84 Lumber sells, but I think I am going to go out and buy some. Mr. Speaker, I haven't had a cup of coffee in 30 years. I don't drink the stuff. You can bet, however, I am going to go find my way into a Starbucks sometime soon because they just announced—in the midst of all of this political turmoil—that they will hire an additional 10,000 refugees.

The CEO of Starbucks said in a letter recently: "There are more than 65 million citizens of the world recognized as refugees by the United Nations, and we are developing plans to hire 10,000 of them over five years in the 75 countries around the world where Starbucks does business."

Apple and Netflix were among the companies to strongly oppose the President's ban of travel from certain Muslim countries and the halt to the

refugee program. I know this because I googled it—and Google is another company that has stepped up as a corporate citizen to say that restricting legal immigration by visa holders is bad for their bottom line, bad for a nation built by immigrants, and bad for a nation that is a leader of and dependent on the world economy.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more iconic world brand—no commercial symbol more associated with America and Americans around the world than Coca-Cola. Unlike coffee, Mr. Speaker, I enjoy a Coke and a smile several times a day. The company issued a statement recently that said: "Coca-Cola Co. is resolute in its commitment to diversity, fairness and inclusion, and we do not support this travel ban or any policy that is contrary to our core values and beliefs."

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to advertise products or to tell anybody what to shop for or who to buy from, but it is a pretty important moment in our history when America's largest companies are going out of their way to say that this President's anti-immigration agenda runs contrary to core values of their corporation and core values of the United States of America.

When the CEO of Uber has to resign from a corporate advisory council because the President's policies are so toxic, you know there is some bad policy there. You see, the reality TV host in the White House who is all about burnishing his own brand, has damaged, Mr. Speaker, the most important brand in world history: the American brand, the Statue of Liberty, and the bald eagle.

Mr. Speaker, American consumers who drive our economy, the men and women who open up businesses that feed our economy, and those who wake up every day to make the products, at this moment they are being asked to get involved and to make their choices be known.

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.

H1015

As the Starbucks CEO said recently: "If there is any lesson to be learned over the last year, it's that your voice and your vote matter more than ever. We are all obligated to ensure our elected officials hear from us individually and collectively."

Here is my message: I am not handing over my money to people or companies that take that money and invest in hate, invest in bigotry, invest in discrimination; that destroy the image and the reputation of the United States of America. I am not putting one dollar into those companies. I am not going to use my money to support that.

I guess I am going to find myself a Starbucks and buy whatever they have there that is not coffee, Mr. Speaker.

RESOLVING THE MYSTERY OF RAOUL WALLENBERG'S FATE

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1944, President Roosevelt created the War Refugee Board in order to undertake efforts to rescue Jews from the Nazis and the atrocities of the Holocaust.

That same year, a young Swedish diplomat accepted an appointment to travel to Hungary on a humanitarian mission, in large part sponsored by our War Refugee Board, to help protect Hungary's Jewish community. This young diplomat, Raoul Wallenberg, risked his life to save tens of thousands of Jews, if not more, from almost certain death in Nazi concentration camps.

For his remarkable courage and humanitarian spirit, Wallenberg had been recognized and memorialized across the globe. In 1963, Yad Vashem recognized him as a righteous man among nations. In 1981, Raoul Wallenberg became the second person to be bestowed honorary United States citizenship. In 1995, Congress unveiled a bronze bust dedicated to Wallenberg here in the Capitol, and today, it can be found, appropriately, in Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center. Just 3 years ago, Mr. Speaker, Congress awarded the Congressional Gold Medal to Raoul Wallenberg—the highest civilian honor that can be bestowed by Congress.

Yet, for all of these memorials and all of these tributes since Raoul Wallenberg was last seen as a free man on January 17, 1945, his true fate remains a mystery. For 72 years now, the truth has eluded us and, worse, Raoul's family, loved ones, and the countless that he saved have been unable to receive the closure they deserve.

For many years, my good friend and colleague, the late Tom Lantos took up the mantle of resolving the Wallenberg mystery. Not only was Tom the only Holocaust survivor to ever serve in Congress, but he managed to escape the horrors of the Holocaust, thanks to the actions of Raoul Wallenberg.

It was Tom who introduced the legislation that became law bestowing honorary citizenship to Wallenberg; Tom who kept the focus on this case, never allowing it to be cast aside. It has been 72 years, Mr. Speaker, yet we still do not have the answers. It is now our turn to be asking the unanswered questions. We have a responsibility, indeed an obligation, to do the right thing.

It was the United States Government and the War Refugee Board, along with the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee that largely sponsored Wallenberg's work in Hungary. We named him an honorary citizen and we bestowed upon him the highest honors. Yet, we have not done what needs to be done to resolve the questions surrounding his disappearance.

When proclaiming Raoul Wallenberg a United States citizen, President Reagan asked: How can we comprehend the moral worth of a man who saved tens and tens of thousands of lives, including those of Congressman and Mrs. Lantos?

We cannot possibly comprehend Raoul Wallenberg's moral worth, Mr. Speaker, but we must ask ourselves what our moral worth is if we don't do everything in our power to end this 72-year search for answers.

I have presented a bipartisan resolution, H. Res. 58, which seeks to raise awareness of the Wallenberg case. This resolution builds upon the tireless efforts of so many: Wallenberg's parents; his half-brother, Guy; Guy's daughters, Marie and Louise; and Raoul's half-sister, Nina.

It was Nina, Mr. Speaker, who served as guest of honor at the Congressional Gold Medal ceremony in this building in 2012. This resolution builds upon the tremendous research by the scholars and volunteers over the years by raising outstanding questions that linger to this very day.

The resolution also urges the administration, from the President on down, to raise the case of Wallenberg to their Russian counterparts, and it calls upon Russia to open its archives so that we can finally get some answers.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution. Remember, H. Res. 58. I urge all of us to show just a little bit of courage—the same courage that Raoul Wallenberg exemplified—by taking action. It is our duty to remember Raoul's heroic actions, his sacrifice, and to build upon his legacy, Mr. Speaker. It is also our duty to bring an end to this tragic injustice and to finally resolve the mystery of the fate of Raoul Wallenberg.

DENOUNCING HOLOCAUST DENIERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to denounce this sad reality: the depraved beliefs of Hol-

ocaust deniers have somehow crawled into our national conversation. What is worse is that it is occurring at a time when our government has decided to turn its back on refugees fleeing violence and oppression.

What is deeply concerning is that all of this is emanating from the White House, clearly directed by President Trump's top political strategist, Stephen Bannon. Mr. Bannon was the force behind Breitbart News, an alt-right outlet that traffics anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, and White nationalism.

When President Trump picked Mr. Bannon as a chief strategist, countless groups condemned it. The Anti-Defamation League's Jonathan Greenblatt warned us that Bannon's views were "hostile to core American values." That concern was made crystal clear by the statement President Trump issued on International Holocaust Remembrance Day, about 10 days ago.

The statement inexplicably left out the defining aspect of the Holocaust—the systemic murder of 6 million Jewish people. It is crucial to understand why this global day of remembrance even takes place. The United Nations created this calendar event in 2005, partly because fewer Holocaust survivors with personal accounts of the horror they experienced were still alive.

Another reason was to combat the smoldering bigotry that still attempts to minimize the death of millions of murdered European Jews. The failure to mention this basic fact on such a day—as all past administrations have—is unbelievable and unacceptable.

What is bone-chilling in its insensitivity and callous indifference is that, when questioned about the omission, President Trump's White House spokeswoman acknowledged it was intentional. His spokeswoman said in defense of leaving out any reference to Jews or anti-Semitism in the statement: "Despite what the media reports, we are an incredibly inclusive group and we took into account all of those who suffered."

Compounding this refusal to acknowledge that Jews were the main target of the Holocaust, the White House spokesman called critics of the statement "pathetic" and "nit-picking." He tried to gloss over it by suggesting a Jew helped prepare the statement.

The fact is, undeniably, that the Holocaust was about the Jews. Hitler established what he called the final solution, a state-sponsored policy to exterminate the Jews and rid them from the planet.

Omitting any reference to Jews as the primary driver of Hitler's and the Nazi's intentions, is nothing short of sanctioning Holocaust denial by blurring the hatred that was its driving force. Yes, it is vital to recognize that others were systematically targeted for extermination, but the number of Jews murdered and the great lengths taken to identify, capture, and annihilate

them are unprecedented in human history.

This is why we mourn those who lost their lives in one of history's darkest moments. This is why we recommit ourselves to upholding the principle of "never again." This is why we have an International Holocaust Remembrance Day.

A cruel irony is that on this very same day, Trump released his punishing Muslim ban that Bannon reportedly crafted to stop refugees from coming into our country. The executive order bans travel to the United States from seven predominantly Islam countries, though we are told that this is not a Muslim ban.

The bumbling rollout of the order and unmitigated chaos it caused, has drawn scorn from across the political spectrum, and from allies across the world. Fortunately, our legal system has acted as a check on this ban so far. But it is the Islamophobia at the root of it, which is what Mr. Bannon and the alt-right crowd have long promoted. The Jewish community was quick to see the disturbing historic similarities.

In May of 1939, the German liner *St. Louis* sailed to Cuba with 937 passengers, most of them Jews fleeing the Third Reich. The bulk of the Jewish passengers had applied for U.S. visas and planned to stay in Cuba, but anti-Semitic protests prevented them from even disembarking there. After intense negotiations to try to have Cuba accept the refugees failed, the United States turned the ship away, and the passengers were forced to return to Europe. One-third of them were ultimately exterminated by the Nazis.

□ 1015

It was a shameful chapter in our history. Those harsh forces are still at work around the globe, and it is those very same aspirational principles that drive so many immigrants to come to this great Nation.

The idea that someone such as Mr. Bannon has actively worked to oppose these values in the past sickens me. The idea that Mr. Bannon now sits on the principals committee on the National Security Council is also deeply troubling. The prospect that his alt-right views could politicize the decisions that put American troops and lives at risk is inexplicable and inexcusable.

But make no mistake, this outrage lies at the feet of Donald Trump, who allowed this oblique denial to go out in his name.

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to say that I will not be silent. In the face of cruelty and suffering, I will stand with those who refuse to be bystanders. I will join my voice with those who courageously ask questions instead of thoughtlessly taking orders.

Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the Holocaust statement was never just a quibble about words. It is about the memory of 6 million murdered Jews. It is about making sure that no

one, especially in the United States of America, denies that its primary purpose was, at its core, about Jews. And if we are to make certain that this never happens again, we cannot erase them from history or allow history to repeat itself. Never again.

1982 VOTE MACHINE RIGGING

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, fake news by the leftist Washington Post has gotten even more shrill and more irrational since Donald Trump became President.

At a Republican meeting in Philadelphia, a felony was committed by the illegal tape recording and subsequent publication of my private conversation with Vice President MIKE PENCE about voter fraud. The Washington Post reported that I said: "In my first election in 1982, Democrats rigged about 25 percent of the voting machines to vote for everyone on the ballot but me. That's 11 of 45 machines."

Rather than reporting about my being a voter fraud victim or about something else I said that a Federal court decree opened the floodgates for illegal alien voting, The Washington Post did a partisan fake news hit piece and gave me, the voter fraud victim, a four-Pinocchio score on truthfulness.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly wear The Washington Post four Pinocchios like a red badge of courage. I know what the truth was. I was there. Here are the facts:

In 1982, I was a Republican candidate in Alabama House District 18 at a time when Democrats dominated Alabama. All 31 of Alabama's statewide elected officials were Democrats. Democrats held every partisan elected office in Alabama's Tennessee Valley.

On election day, angry voters called me nonstop about rigged voting machines that would not allow them to vote for MO BROOKS. As a former assistant district attorney, I knew how to conduct an investigation. I talked with witnesses. I examined documents. Another attorney did the same. When the polls opened, 11 of 45 voting machines registered votes for all candidates on the ballot except for MO BROOKS. Not once was my opponent or any other candidate blocked on any machine.

My hometown is the birthplace of America's space program and many of America's high-tech weaponry. We know math. Mathematically, if there were 26 candidates on the ballot, which there were, and only one name is blocked out, the odds of a particular candidate being blocked out are 1 in 26. If there are two machines that each has one name blocked out, the odds of MO BROOKS being blocked out both times is 1 in 26 squared, or 1 chance out of 676 chances.

If there are 11 machines that each have one name blocked out, the odds that all 11 blocked names are MO

BROOKS are 1 chance in 26 to the 11th power. Hence, the odds that my name, the only name, was accidentally blocked out on 11 different machines, as The Washington Post would have you believe, are 1 chance out of 26 to the 11th power, or 1 chance out of 3.6 quadrillion chances.

Conversely, the probability that these 11 voting machines were rigged is 3.6 quadrillion to 1. The evidence is overwhelming. There was no accident. The voting machines were rigged.

Who rigged the voting machines?

In 1982, every single elected official with control over voting machines was a Democrat. In 1982, I was campaigning in a hotly contested race to be the only Republican legislator in the northern third of Alabama. I was the breach in the Democratic Party dam.

Earlier in the campaign, the Democratic Alabama secretary of State, who is now serving hard time in Federal prison, notified me that I would be removed from the ballot because my paperwork was allegedly not in their files. Fortunately, I had date-stamped copies of the documents I filed, thereby forcing the Democrat secretary of State to back off.

The Democrats had motive. The Democrats had opportunity. The Democrats had control. It is fake news for The Washington Post to cover up Democratic sins by suggesting otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, The Washington Post's fake news hit piece begs a broader question: Why would The Washington Post even bother to write about an election they know nothing about that happened over 34 years ago? The answer: partisan paranoia. The Democrats and their media allies like The Washington Post are so paranoid and angry about President Trump's election that they are shrilly lying and lashing out against anybody, anytime, regardless of truth.

The Washington Post: fake news, sad.

As a footnote, despite the voter fraud, I won the election with 57 percent of the vote. In a court-ordered election just 1 year later, voters still angry about Democratic voter fraud re-elected me with 82 percent of the vote. That is 25 percentage points higher than when the Democrats rigged the voting machines.

COUNTRY BEFORE PARTY

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my serious concern regarding President Trump's respect for, and adherence to, the United States Constitution. In short, something is not right at the White House.

His behavior suggests that he has little regard for the judicial branch of our government. If the President has purposely acted in contradiction of a court's order, he would be in violation of the Constitution, and this Congress would be required to act.

Today, I am filing a resolution calling for the Department of Justice to appoint an independent counsel to investigate whether the President or his staff directed, or knowingly allowed, Customs and Border Protection to violate court orders designed to freeze the implementation of the January 27 Muslim travel ban executive order.

I strongly disagree with the contents of the executive order in question. It targets people based on their religion, and it instilled fear across the country. It violates our Nation's values and the idea that, in America, people aren't judged by the color of their skin or by the religion they practice but, instead, by their character. This plays right into the hands of terrorists who would use it as a recruiting tool around the world to inflame those who seek to do Americans harm at home and abroad.

Let me be clear, though. My disapproval of the President's unfair executive order did not motivate the introduction of this resolution. This resolution concerns only the President's adherence to a judicial order. The question is whether he knowingly allowed Customs and Border Patrol to violate that order.

I hope the investigation will find that the President and his administration fully complied with court orders concerning his executive order. However, if President Trump overstepped and purposely violated the judiciary, the Congress should censure him. If, after censure, the President again disregards our Nation's systems of checks and balances and separation of powers, the Congress should take steps to remove him from office.

During his campaign and in the time since his election, President Trump has promised to be a law-and-order President. Well, the court system is central to upholding the law and ensuring order in our Nation. It represents the way that we, as Americans, peacefully and civilly resolve disputes. Respect for the judiciary isn't just a constitutional requirement for the President, it is a requirement for all of us.

President Trump is no stranger to our judicial system. He spent his career using the courts to sue his foes and settle his broken promises. Now it is time for him to keep the promise he made to the American people when he took the oath of office last month. He must follow the law and abide by our Constitution.

Defending our democracy requires vigilance and stern action. Our Founders wisely designed our government so that no court, no Congress, and no President could gain a dangerous amount of power. If we in Congress cede our responsibility to keep the executive in check, we risk being complicit in creating a constitutional crisis.

My resolution seeks to defend our Republic and our precious founding documents. Each of us in Congress swore to support the Constitution.

I urge all Members of this body to put country before party and vote in favor of this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from improper references to the President.

COMPETING VISIONS OF THE FUTURE

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has come to a crossroads between two competing visions for the future that don't easily reconcile. At such times as these, emotions run very high.

The good news is that our institutions are the best ever designed to resolve such political disputes. And it comes down to this: In other countries, the government is the sovereign and rights flow from it to the people; here in America, the people are sovereign.

In America, the sovereign does not govern; it hires help to govern during an election. In between elections, the sovereign people debate how the hired help is doing. That is the real debate, the one that goes on every day over backyard fences and family dinner tables wherever Americans gather. After that family discussion, we decide whether to fire the hired help or keep it for another cycle. As long as we are with each other and not shouting at each other, our system works very well.

Once in our history, we stopped talking with each other. That was the election of 1860. That election was marked not by reconciliation, but by rioting in those regions where the opposition dominated. The opposition party refused to accept the legitimacy of the election itself. Political leaders pledged resistance to the new administration by any means necessary. They asserted the doctrine of nullification, the notion that any dissenting State or city that opposed Federal laws could simply refuse to obey them. Finally came the secession movement, the ultimate rejection of our Constitution and our rule of law.

Have we not started down that road once again?

Even before the election, we saw violent mobs carrying foreign flags physically attack Americans for the sole reason that they wanted to attend a political rally for the candidate of their choice. The violence in Berkeley last week warns us that this behavior is rising.

Some prominent elected officials are again asserting the doctrine of nullification by declaring that their jurisdictions are sanctuaries where Federal immigration laws will simply be ignored. In California, the formal cessation movement is supported by nearly a third of the population of my own suffering State.

Now, I held more than a hundred townhall meetings in my district throughout the last 8 years, spanning the entire life of the Tea Party and the Occupy Wall Street movements. Through all of these heated debates, the police have never had to intervene, until this weekend in Roseville, when the Roseville Police Department determined that the size and temper of the crowd required a police escort to protect me as I left the venue.

□ 1030

Now, the vast majority of the people attempting to attend this meeting were peaceful, decent, law-abiding folks who sincerely opposed Donald Trump, and they wanted to make their views known to their elected representative. But, there was also a well-organized element that came to disrupt, and disrupt they did.

Now, in the last four elections, our country has turned dramatically away from the left. The Democrats have lost 67 House seats, 12 Senate seats, 10 Governors, more than 900 State legislative seats, and now the Presidency. That happened, in large part, because those who opposed their policies talked with their neighbors about the future of our country.

Instead of pursuing that successful example, the radical left seeks not to persuade their fellow citizens by reason but rather to impose its views by bullying, insulting, intimidating, and, as in Berkeley, by physically attacking their fellow citizens. This is not a tactic likely to change minds, but, if it persists, it could tear down the very institutions of democracy that have served us so well for so long.

I would ask the many sincere citizens who have been caught up with this disruptive element: Do you object because the President is breaking his promises, or do you object because he is keeping them?

If your objection is because the President is keeping the promises he made to the American people, is that not because the sovereign people, your neighbors and fellow countrymen, directed these changes over the last four elections?

If you love our country, and that love for our country is greater than your hatred of our President, I implore you to engage in a civil discussion with your fellow citizens. That is what true democracy looks like.

OUR CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Founding Fathers believed that our constitutional system of checks and balances and separation of powers were the people's primary protection for their liberty, and they saw the usurpation of authority by a single branch to be dangerous to the constitutional system.

Now, there has been a focus this weekend on Presidential tweets regarding the courts, and I think this deserves attention. My view is that the President's broadsides against the courts will likely hurt the government's case on appeal, and were, therefore, counterproductive. I would advise to focus on substance rather than on general broadsides.

But I think it is also important to point out and to criticize the substance of the decision that was made by the Federal court in Seattle because that decision represented a departure from the judicial role. The judge in that case exercised his political will, not his legal judgment, which is the antithesis of how Alexander Hamilton described the proper role of the courts in the Federalist Papers.

The judge there—if you read the opinion, it is a cursory opinion—didn't even attempt to wrestle with the law at issue in the President's executive actions on immigration. The reason why that is important is because the law is very, very clear.

This Congress has enacted a statute, section 1182(f) of the immigration laws that says that the President has the authority to suspend entry of foreign nationals when the President finds that entry would be detrimental to the interests of the U.S. And so that is what was cited. That provision of the law has not been questioned in over 60 years.

The court in Seattle, though, questioned effectively the wisdom of the executive order, not really the legality. And there was a part of the oral argument before the judge issued his temporary retraining order where he said that there hasn't been any terrorism from any foreign national from any of the seven countries that were enumerated from the visa suspension. It is Iran, Iraq, Syria, Somalia, Libya, Sudan. And he said confidently that that had not happened.

Well, that is not true. If you look at just recently, you had the attacker in St. Cloud, Minnesota, September 2016, who was a Somali refugee. You have the Ohio State attacker. That was just 2½ months ago. He was running people over on campus and wielding a butcher knife going after people. He was a refugee from Somalia.

You had the two Iraqi refugees arrested in Bowling Green, Kentucky. They came as refugees, even though they had been active in fighting and in killing American soldiers and Marines in Iraq.

You also have the case, the Federal case in Houston last year with the conviction of Omar Faraj Saeed Al Hardan. He came as a refugee from Iraq and did get a green card, but he was convicted of material support to ISIS for trying to bomb the shopping malls in Houston, Texas.

So you have this judge who is ignoring the law, ignoring what Congress has enacted, ignoring the President's authority, substituting his own policy

judgment, and he is not even right on the facts; doesn't even really know what he is talking about.

Here's the thing, also. Whether there have been attacks or arrests from these countries really is not even relevant to the law at stake. I mean, Bush could have suspended immigration from Saudi Arabia and Egypt in January 2001. People would have been like: Why are you doing that? What's going on?

Well, eventually, obviously you had foreign nationals from that country commit the 9/11 attacks.

The key is, debate the wisdom of the President's policies. That is totally fine, and people are going to have their views on it. But we should not sit here and act like it is normal for a judge to exercise authority to overrule the Congress and the President, when the law is clear, and when you are dealing with an area, in terms of the entry of foreign nationals, that really centers on the national security interests that both the Congress and the President possess.

So our constitutional system requires that the branches exercise the authority properly delegated to them. When the branch, any branch—Congress, the President, or the courts—departs from their proper roles, that is something that we should acknowledge, and that is something that we should be concerned with.

I have no confidence that the Ninth Circuit is going to reverse it, but I do think that this judge overstepped the judicial role and was, effectively, legislating from the bench. That, ultimately, is not good for the constitutional system and, by extension, the people's liberties.

LET OUR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS SUCCEED

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about some significant changes for our education system that will help reestablish local control for our States, for our educators, and, above all else, for our students.

The Every Student Succeeds Act, or the ESSA, was passed in December of 2015, with overwhelming bipartisan support in the House and the Senate. This bill took unilateral power over the public school system away from the Secretary of Education in Washington and gave it back to the States and the local education agencies. This change allowed States to develop their own accountability systems with which to measure the success of their schools and educators.

However, the final guidance on this law issued by the Obama administration, in November of 2016, contained a number of provisions that significantly expanded the law's requirements and violated the statute's prohibition

against overreach by the Secretary. Essentially, this action ignored congressional intent by attempting to constrain State decisionmaking.

Mr. Speaker, the very intent of ESSA is to encourage flexibility and innovation in education, not stifle it. This landmark legislation is meant to prepare students for the 21st century economy, empower parents to get out of the bleachers and back into the classrooms, and to allow our dedicated educators to teach and inspire future generations.

ESSA moved the Federal Government out of the way and gave our educators flexibility to forget about the "teach to the test" environment that had become commonplace in our public schools. Teachers were, again, allowed to truly teach and not merely focus on meeting the demands of the Federal Government. Education should serve the needs of our youth, our children, not the needs of government.

This happened by taking unprecedented steps to rein in the unilateral power of the United States Secretary of Education and give it back to the States and local education agencies. It prohibited the Secretary from adding new requirements to State education plans, being involved in the peer-review process, and exceeding his or her statutory authority. It also allows school districts to gradually disentangle themselves from Common Core without penalty.

Mr. Speaker, what we know is that one-size-fits-all options do not work. ESSA was passed with the promise that the Education Department's role would be limited, and that States would be back in control of education decisions. It is critically important that Congress keep this promise, and that over-regulation will not continue to negatively impact our Nation's teachers and our students.

That is why I support the Congressional Review Act resolution in the House today that disapproves of the Obama administration's requirements that significantly expanded the Department of Education's purview regarding accountability and State plans under the Every Student Succeeds Act.

This Congress must ensure ESSA is enacted as it was intended and be stripped of any provisions that expand the reach of the Secretary of Education.

Now, I am looking forward to going back to the original intent of this bipartisan bill that was approved in both Chambers, and I want all of our children to love learning from passionate teachers who don't teach to a test, but they teach to the students. Our kids deserve no less.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of the universe, thank You for giving us another day.

As the Democratic Caucus prepares to leave for its retreat, bless each Member with skills and the vision to fashion pathways to bringing about what is needed for the benefit of our Nation.

Bless the Republican Conference, which remains at the Capitol, with the same gifts, consistent with their own defining skills and vision.

In Your wisdom, bless both parties with the grace that is needed to work together to benefit our people. May we all be faithful stewards of the Nation bequeathed to us by our American ancestors.

Please keep all who work for the people's House in good health, that they might faithfully fulfill the great responsibility given them in their service to the work of the Capitol.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER 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

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

CELEBRATING SOUTH FLORIDA MENTORS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the organizations that work every day to make a positive impact in the lives of south Florida's youth.

By changing the world one woman at a time, the group, Women of Tomorrow, has transformed the lives of more than 11,000 at-risk girls by matching them with a highly accomplished professional woman and providing them with scholarship opportunities.

Another great organization, Mr. Speaker, is Take Stock in Children. It has given low-income students, most of whom come from minority families, a chance to improve their lives through college preparation programs, through scholarships, and by partnering with them with caring mentors.

Studies show that children with mentors achieve more educational success, have higher personal aspirations, and are more confident.

I would like to encourage everyone in south Florida to become a mentor and, thereby, make our community a better and safer place for our vulnerable youth.

MIDDLE CLASS JOBS CAUCUS

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, as debates over the meaning of last fall's elections continue, one fact is not in question: The American people want us to work together on commonsense, bipartisan solutions to grow our economy and create good-paying, middle class jobs. Neither party can meet this challenge alone.

I am proud to say that Republican Congressman MIKE GALLAGHER and I have joined together in founding the Middle Class Jobs Caucus to bring greater attention to these issues and to advance proposals to address them. The caucus will meet regularly to address a wide array of key issues facing working families, such as job training and infrastructure and transportation modernization.

Every era of prosperity in our history has been built on a thriving middle class. In the plainest terms, middle class jobs mean a strong America. I encourage all of our colleagues to join us in helping families reach the middle class and stay there.

HIPAA PRIVACY RULES SHOULD BE TWEAKED

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's HIPAA patient privacy laws should be improved to allow for compassionate communication between doctors, primary care-

givers, families, and patients. Recently, the editorial board of the Observer-Reporter joined the conversation in support, citing a specific instance in Greene County, Pennsylvania. They wrote:

Christopher was arrested in early December and attacked police officers at the scene. Witnessing his erratic behavior, the officers decided to take him to a hospital for a mental health evaluation.

Christopher was released from the hospital after there was apparently no communication between the hospital's medical staff and the arresting police officers.

Less than 4 weeks later, Christopher was shot to death by his brother, Ryan, in what Ryan and others described as self-defense.

If only the doctors were allowed to share limited, critically important information with the family, with law enforcement, and with supportive community specialists, this tragedy could have been avoided.

The leading predictor of success in treatment for a person with serious mental illness is family involvement. We must change Federal regulations to help, not block, treatment. Until then, there will be more sad stories like Christopher's every day.

BUILD ON THE FOUNDATION OF THE ACA

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to efforts to undo the Affordable Care Act without offering at least an equal solution for American families.

Take, for example, the story of a woman I will call Anne, a constituent who contacted my office. At 62 years old, Anne's husband lost his job of nearly 30 years. Along with a good portion of their income, her family lost the source of their health insurance. Because Anne works 29 hours per week, she does not receive healthcare benefits through her employer.

On the ACA marketplace, Anne's family was able to find affordable coverage. She says that when the bottom dropped out of her health care, the ACA was there.

She writes: "My husband, myself, and our daughter in college all work and pay taxes. I cannot fathom why our Federal Government wants to penalize us by undoing a program that is working. Work to improve the ACA. Don't throw the baby out with the bath water."

I could not agree more.

Repeal and run is irresponsible and will hurt real people like Anne. We need to build on the foundation of the ACA so more of our families have access to quality, affordable health care.

FORMER-LEADER ROBERT "BOB" MICHEL

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for support and prayers for our giants still among our midst. Leader Bob Michel is struggling and in ill health. Bob was born and raised in Peoria, Illinois. He is 93 years old, a World War II vet, fought across Europe, and was part of the D-day invasion.

For 38 years, he served in this Chamber being minority leader from the 97th Congress through the 103rd Congress. That is a total of 14 years.

Bob was honored by then-House Speaker Foley when he was asked to take the gavel on November 29, 1994. I would encourage my colleagues to look at that C-SPAN tape.

Bob, we love you. We are thinking about you at this critical time.

NO MORAL EQUIVALENCY

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, I and many Americans watched in horror as our President continued to wax poetic on TV about the bromance with President Vladimir Putin.

When the host noted "But he's a killer," our President came back with: "There are a lot of killers. You think our country's so innocent?"

While our country has made many mistakes, we have not yet seen an authoritarian regime brazenly assassinate its political dissenters.

The same cannot be said for Putin and the growing list of murder victims and dissenters in Russia, including liberal politician Boris Nemtsov, former Press Minister Mikhail Lesin, former KGB agent Alexander Litvinenko, and journalist Anna Politkovskaya, to just name a few.

There is no moral equivalency between the United States and Russia. We are not yet an autocracy. We are not like Russia, and the President needs to stop relying on alternative facts.

NORTH KOREA RESOLUTION

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last night, I introduced bipartisan resolution H. Res. 92, condemning North Korea's development of multiple intercontinental ballistic missiles and calling for an application of all available sanctions. Sadly, the dictatorship in North Korea has been testing nuclear weapons, threatening the people of South Korea.

This resolution clearly outlines the progression of North Korea's recent aggression—nuclear tests, ballistic missile tests, and their willingness to share weapons technology with state sponsors of terrorism like Iran and

Syria. It is time to stand up to North Korea's aggression. An ICBM with a nuclear warhead is a direct threat to the United States and our allies, especially South Korea.

Along with Congressman ELIOT ENGEL, we are the only two Members of Congress to have visited North Korea. I believe this resolution is a crucial first step to achieving peace through strength, especially following Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis' positive visit to South Korea last week.

I am grateful this resolution is bipartisan, cosponsored by colleagues, Representatives MIKE ROGERS, SETH MOULTON, TED YOHO, and BRAD SHERMAN, along with the Korea Caucus co-chair GERRY CONNOLLY.

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

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of our international institutions that allow us to get along with one another; the WTO, the United Nations, the IMF, the World Bank, NAFTA, CAFTA, all of our great international institutions that allow us to amicably resolve our differences.

Let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker, with all the misbehavior and problems of the current occupant of the White House, what I am most worried about is this rise of nationalism. We have seen this play out before throughout our history.

While no one is as proud to be as American as many of us who have the privilege to serve in this body, the world is more interconnected than ever before. And it is more important than ever before that Republicans and Democrats in this body show our commitment to resolving our legitimate disputes and differences amicably through the rule of international law and our international institutions, rather than resorting to violence and warfare.

I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to renew our commitment to pursuing peaceful, diplomatic ways of resolving our international disputes through international legal bodies.

DIMINISH THE BLIGHT OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to efforts to diminish the blight of human trafficking on my district, the country, and the world.

Each year, millions of individuals worldwide, most often children and

those living in poverty, fall victim to human trafficking. According to the National Human Trafficking Hotline, approximately 550 cases were reported in Florida last year.

In my district, Pasco County law enforcement officials have been hard at work to combat human trafficking and protect victims locally. We have seen it too many times in our own community.

I also wish to highlight the commitment to end human trafficking worldwide by the Greek Orthodox Church. This week, His All Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew hosted a forum in Istanbul, Turkey, alongside religious leaders, scholars, and policymakers to address the issue of modern-day slavery.

I commend their cooperative leadership and stand with them in promoting peace and human dignity internationally.

□ 1215

LET'S KEEP ALL AMERICANS HEALTHY

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

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon because I am appalled by President Trump and my Republican colleagues' attacks on the health of Americans. My Republican colleagues have spent 6 years disparaging the Affordable Care Act from its very inception, describing it as a "death spiral," "failure," and "collapsing," but zero time offering up any viable alternative.

After 6 years of hollow grandstanding, Republicans now face the clear realization that repealing the Affordable Care Act will dump massive costs on families and businesses, blow a hole in the Federal budget, and strip coverage for more than 30 million Americans.

New Jersey has been a positive example of ACA implementation. Since enactment, Medicaid expansion through ACA has insured more than 700,000 middle-income New Jersey residents who couldn't previously afford it. The uninsured rate in New Jersey dropped from 13.2 percent in 2013 to 8.7 percent in 2015.

Mr. Speaker, these are positive trends, but President Trump and Republicans in Washington callously disregard these facts so they can live up to their reckless promises. I hope that they will see the wisdom in their mistake and make sure that we keep all Americans healthy.

REMEMBERING DANIEL DeLOACH

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr.

Daniel DeLoach of Savannah, Georgia, who passed away on Sunday, January 29, from complications of Proteus disease. He was 30 years old.

Mr. DeLoach was born in Savannah to Mike and Julia DeLoach. His parents and his siblings, Michael and Kathleen, were his greatest source of support as he battled his disease.

Though his debilitating condition required more than 100 surgeries in his lifetime, Mr. DeLoach wasn't known for his disease; he was known for his zest for life. Mr. DeLoach never regretted having the disease. Instead, he brightened every room he entered and never ceased to have a positive outlook on life. This outlook led him to accomplish some amazing feats while battling the illness.

In 2005, he graduated from the Benedictine Military School in Savannah and went on to attend the Savannah College of Art and Design, where he earned a degree in industrial design. With his education and personal experience, it was Mr. DeLoach's goal to improve the care of patients and teach others how to best interact with them.

Daniel continues to be an inspiration to all of us who were lucky enough to meet him, and his story bears repeating so it may inspire many others for years to come.

CONGRESSIONAL REPUBLICANS ARE PLAYING CHICKEN WITH HEALTH INSURANCE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Americans have too much to lose for Congressional Republicans to play chicken with their health insurance.

Take a family in my district, Kevin and Kim Filiatraut. Kevin and Kim are young parents of two beautiful children, ages 7 and 5. As an attorney in Cleveland, the family uses insurance through Kevin's employment. Kim's job of 15 years at KeyBank was outsourced to India in 2014. They own a home, and their children go to public schools in Bay Village.

In 2015, at age 39, Kim was diagnosed with stage IV breast cancer. When it was found, it had already spread to her liver, and she has been on chemotherapy ever since and will be evermore. There is only hope and medicine, indefinitely.

She is covered now, but with this pre-existing condition, a repeal of the ACA is daunting. The ACA establishes that she can never be denied enrollment, but congressional Republicans could take this surety away with their brash, nearsighted objective of full repeal of the ACA.

Why would we get rid of something that does so much good for Ohioans, for Americans, with nothing and no plan to replace it?

Kim's treatment costs over \$500,000 a year. Repeal of the ACA could very well bankrupt this family.

And according to The Washington Post, repealing the Affordable Care Act will kill more than 43,000 people in our country, annually. Repeal of the ACA would be the most anti-life measure ever considered or passed by this Congress.

Please vote against repeal now.

WELCOME HOME, ALYSSA

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with hope, thanks, and renewed faith. I am joyful because of a young lady from home, Alyssa Ferguson. She was born on January 7, 2002.

Two days after her 12th birthday, Alyssa was told that she had a tumor the size of a baseball in her brain. She did not flinch; she fought—six brain surgeries, three rounds of radiation, and nine rounds of chemotherapy.

On January 26, our angel used her wings to fly to God. She always had those wings the entire time she was with us here on Earth. She used her dying wish to have a water well dug in a small town in Africa. Extraordinary.

If you close your eyes, you can feel Alyssa's spirit.

Welcome home, Alyssa.

IN MEMORY OF TOWNSEND WOLFE

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I had the opportunity to visit the exceptional exhibit of Ansel Adams' photography, from his early years, at the Arkansas Arts Center, and it made me reflect on the life of Townsend Wolfe, the ultimate southern gentleman and truly a cultural visionary. Townsend passed away earlier this month at the age of 81.

Townsend served as the director and chief curator of the Arkansas Arts Center in Little Rock for 34 years, until his retirement in 2002. That year, he was honored with the Governor's Arts Award for Lifetime Achievement by the Arkansas Arts Council. During his tenure, the Arts Center experienced unparalleled growth in numbers of annual visitors and in its exceptional collection.

Townsend's love of art extended beyond the walls of the galleries, bringing beauty into the lives of countless Arkansans. Townsend leaves behind a legacy of warmth and passion, and his contributions to "The Natural State" will continue to live on at the Arkansas Arts Center.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) laid before the

House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 7, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 7, 2017, at 8:51 a.m.:

Appointments:

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki).

Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China.

Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

HONORING THE LIFE OF HENRY "HANK" ADAMS

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the life of an exemplary leader in our community, in the Turlock area, and the Assyrian community, Henry "Hank" Adams. The beloved husband, brother, father, and grandfather died at the age of 92 on Friday.

He was born and raised in Turlock, California, to Reverend Isaac and Sarah Adams. His father is known as the patriarch of Turlock's Assyrian community. Isaac encouraged his fellow Assyrians to join him in the Central Valley and farm in the rich soils of the region.

In 1943, at the age of 18, Henry graduated from Turlock High School and enlisted in the Army Air Corps. Henry completed over 20 bombing missions in Japan on the Lucky Lady B-29 bomber. He was discharged at the rank of lieutenant in 1947. Henry moved to San Francisco, where he married his wife, Joanne, eventually settling down in Turlock.

Henry had a genuine love for his country and his community. He is known for his service and contributions to the Assyrian community, where he continued the legacy that his father left behind.

Henry leaves behind the love of his life and his wife of 62 years, Joanne, and their two daughters, Nora Adams and Nellie Adams-Morse.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing the tremendous life of Henry "Hank" Adams for his service to his country, and his unwavering leadership and many accomplishments and contributions to the Turlock Assyrian community.

God bless him always.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 44, DISAPPROVING RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR RELATING TO BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 57, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO ACCOUNTABILITY AND STATE PLANS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 58, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO TEACHER PREPARATION ISSUES

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 91 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 91

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior relating to Bureau of Land Management regulations that establish the procedures used to prepare, revise, or amend land use plans pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any joint resolution specified in section 3 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such joint resolution are waived. Each such joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. The joint resolutions referred to in section 2 of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 57) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(b) The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 91 provides for consideration of three separate joint resolutions intended to address government overreach by using the Congressional Review Act process. The first measure deals with the Bureau of Land Management's Planning 2.0 rule. This rule represents a remarkable overreach that encroaches on State and local authority.

By law, BLM is required to coordinate with local governments, but this rule would disrupt that longstanding principle. Under the Planning 2.0 rule, faceless bureaucrats in Washington would be tasked with micromanaging much of our Nation's land and resources. The rule also disregards the Department of the Interior's multiple-use mission. If left intact, the rule will harm grazing, timber, energy, mineral development, and recreation on our public lands.

This is government overreach at its worst. The Federal Government should not be telling communities and States what works best for them. Decisions should be made on the local level, with site-specific considerations, not landscape-level analyses as called for in this rule.

For 4 years, I had the privilege of serving on the Planning Commission for the city of Mobile. Land use planning is and has historically been, in the United States, a local function.

Imagine a Washington bureaucrat trying to tell planning commissions in municipalities or counties anywhere in the United States how they are going to manage land down to the landscaping level. That is not the role of the Federal Government. That is not what our Founding Fathers had in mind when they created this government. Yet this regulation would take us somewhere we have never been before.

Making matters worse, this regulation was pushed through in the waning days of the Obama administration, making it one of the many midnight regulations jammed through at the last minute.

□ 1230

This Congressional Review Act measure is supported by over 60 organizations, ranging from the American Farm Bureau Federation to the Na-

tional Association of Counties, to the National Mining Association. There is broad support for revisiting this misguided rule.

This rule also provides for consideration of Congressional Review Act measures for two rules from the Department of Education. Now, typically, in America, we think of education as a local and State endeavor. The Federal Government provides 15 percent, on average, of the funding for local school systems. Yet, we know that the Federal Government comprises over 50 percent of the requirements for red tape and paperwork. That imbalance harms our ability to deliver education at the local level where it matters the most.

As a member of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, I have been a consistent advocate for ensuring control over education is largely left in the hands of local school boards, teachers, parents, and administrators who know their students best.

I was very pleased to see Congress pass the Every Student Succeeds Act in 2015, which replaced No Child Left Behind and fundamentally changed our Nation's K-12 education policies. Even better, this was a bipartisan effort that brought Members from both sides of the aisle together; and, yes, it was signed by President Obama.

The Wall Street Journal called the Every Student Succeeds Act "the largest devolution of Federal control to the states in a quarter-century."

A major goal of our reform bill was to empower States to create their own accountability systems. This is something else that has been consistent throughout American history. We have looked to the States to put in these accountability systems. I served on the Alabama State Board of Education. This is much of what we did.

While there are broad-guiding principles outlined in the law, the intent of Congress was for there to be very little Federal involvement in the accountability process. Despite clear efforts in the Every Student Succeeds Act to limit the influence of the Federal Secretary of Education, the rule proposed by the Department of Education dealing with accountability gave far too much control to the Secretary, which ultimately harms our students.

Most concerning, the rule will restrict the flexibility that was at the core of the philosophy behind the Every Student Succeeds Act.

We heard from local administrators, local school board members, State superintendents of education, State school board members from all over the country, from all types of States and all types of communities. They wanted to have more flexibility. They wanted to have their own control over their accountability programs.

When the rule was first proposed, leaders in the House and Senate sent a very clear and thorough explanation of their concerns to the Department of Education. In fact, I even expressed my concerns about the proposed rule's contradiction of the statute directly to the

then-Secretary of Education. Unfortunately, most of the concerns of Congress went unaddressed. The final rule gives far too much authority to the Federal Department of Education and stands in direct contrast to law passed by Congress.

As States work on their accountability plans, it is important that they have certainty that the Federal Government will not continue to exert undue power and influence over the process. Through this Congressional Review Act challenge, we can ensure control is at the State and local level and prevent unnecessary Federal overreach into our classrooms.

Finally, this rule provides for a Congressional Review Act resolution overturning the Obama administration's teacher preparation regulation. This is yet another rule that would exert far too much Federal authority over an area that has been traditionally reserved for the States. Teacher preparation is critically important to the success of our Nation's education system, but it is a process that has been successfully controlled and implemented at the State level with some grant assistance from the Federal Government.

What might work to prepare a teacher in one State is totally different from what might work in another State. This rule makes no acknowledgment of that fact. This regulation sets up a one-size-fits-all Federal system, which is not what Congress intended.

As a former member of the Alabama State Board of Education, I can attest that we have highly qualified people who worked very hard every day to make sure we have skilled teachers in our schools who are adequately prepared. These school board members do not need the Federal Government to intervene and place additional burdens and requirements on them. The challenges are serious enough as it is.

Sadly, this regulation is just another attempt to allow bureaucrats in Washington to micromanage our States and local school districts. Groups like the American Council on Education and The School Superintendents Association expressed their concerns with the Federal overreach created by this rule. This resolution would block this unnecessary Federal involvement and keep control in the hands of the States, where it belongs.

Each of the three bills covered by this rule focus on taking power away from bureaucrats in Washington and, instead, empowering States and local communities. Heavy-handed policies from Washington have failed time and time again. It is critical that we use our power to overturn these overreaching regulations. It is clearly what the American people elected to us do.

Many on the other side of the aisle claim that, while they disagree with portions of these rules, Congress should not use the CRA process because it blocks the agencies from reissuing a rule in "substantially the same form." However, this argument ignores the

fact that the statute clearly states an agency may enact a similar rule if it is subsequently authorized by law. Thus, the CRA gives Congress the ability to rein in an out-of-control agency until we, the legislative branch, can give it further instruction.

Members on both sides of the aisle should welcome the chance to use this tool to make sure our legislative intent is actually followed by those implementing the law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 91 and the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest honors that I have had as a Member of Congress has been the opportunity to serve on the Education and the Workforce Committee and on the conference committee that put the Every Student Succeeds Act together in its final form.

Before coming to Congress, I chaired the Colorado State Board of Education; I founded two charter schools, the New America School and the Academy of Urban Learning; and I worked closely with educators, school board members, and parents across our State to improve the quality of our schools in Colorado.

I know firsthand the impact that Federal education policy has on States, on school districts, on schools, and on the families that they serve. So when I arrived in Congress, I was excited to roll up my sleeves and get to work on education policy.

One of the top issues in education when I arrived has always been the desire to replace No Child Left Behind, an outdated and inflexible law that, in many ways, set schools up for failure, with a new and better way of making sure that every student has the opportunity to succeed.

I heard from so many of my constituents that, under No Child Left Behind, schools were testing too much, districts lacked the flexibility they needed, and the Colorado Department of Education—like so many other State departments of education—was effectively at the whim of the U.S. Department of Education with regard to their State plans, effectively living waiver to waiver. That is no way to go about Federal education policy. It is why the Every Student Succeeds Act was so badly needed.

Now, early on, the work on the Every Student Succeeds Act wasn't as collegial as it should have been. Republicans introduced a hyperpartisan bill. It passed this Chamber with no Democrat votes and many Republicans voting against it as well. But throughout the process, one thing remained the same: Members were committed to moving past No Child Left Behind and replacing it with a bill that put the interests of students first. Finally that happened last Congress, 15 years after

the passage of No Child Left Behind and almost 6 years after the expiration of the authorizing statute; but, finally, Congress did its job.

I am proud to say that everyone on the Education and the Workforce Committee has shown that we believe that every child deserves a great education. We may have different ideas at times about how to achieve that goal, and that is okay, but we all value the result of ensuring opportunity for every child in our country.

It was that very commitment and value, as well as our willingness to work together, that produced the Every Student Succeeds Act. The bill passed overwhelmingly in the majority Republican House and Senate, and was signed by our then-Democratic President. It was and continues to be a bright spot of the last Congress, and what too often seems a Congress that is overwhelmed by partisanship.

Unfortunately, the bipartisanship under ESSA potentially ends with this bill. House Republicans have filed the resolution using the Congressional Review Act to overturn a key regulation consistent with the law that was finalized by the Obama administration in December. Now, before diving into the details of this particular Congressional Review Act that is considered under this rule, I want to say a little bit about the process.

We should look no further than the U.S. Constitution in learning how separation of powers works. There are three branches of government: the legislative, executive, and judicial. Each branch is separate, independent, and coequal, and different in how they function. That is an important background and a critical context in evaluating this legislation.

When Congress passed and the President signed the Every Student Succeeds Act in December of 2015, the process didn't end. Many bills, especially one as extensive as ESSA, require clarification from the Department of Education, the agency charged with executing the law. The text of the ESSA anticipated that. In fact, the law describes in detail how the Department of Education should and shouldn't write regulations. Frankly, that had been some of the problem under No Child Left Behind, is it lacked sufficient congressional direction with regard to the waiver process which was used effectively at the full discretion of then-Secretary of Education Duncan and President Obama.

It took the Department a year and a multistakeholder process, ensuring every voice was heard. Sure enough, a year after the legislation was passed, the Department of Education finalized its rules on accountability.

Last week, House Republicans took the first step towards taking a sledgehammer to that entire implementation. Rules that have extensive buy-in from stakeholders and are the blueprint for States in developing our State education plans would be thrown out

under this rule, effectively throwing public education into chaos across all 50 States and completely disregarding the hard work of educators, parents, school board members, superintendents, and principals over the last year.

The two education-related CRAs are considering on the floor were introduced last Wednesday night. That is four legislative days between introduction and action. Once more, the CRAs weren't treated through the committee process. We did not consider them in the Education and the Workforce Committee. There were no hearings, no markups. In fact, the full Education and the Workforce Committee hasn't even had a markup yet with regard to a K-12 bill.

I am honored to be the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, which has jurisdiction over one of these three CRAs under this bill. We had no hearings or markups on this bill. It is really a disservice to the over 50 new Members of this Congress—no imprint on this bill—as well as the Members at large, that this committee avoids the regular process.

It is also counter to promises that were made by Republican leadership about returning to regular order. The actions today couldn't be further from regular order because Republicans have chosen to utilize the Congressional Review Act to move bills from introduction to the floor without going through committee.

Unfortunately, the Congressional Review Act not only overturns regulations, but it prevents the Department of Education from writing a new regulation that is similar to the regulation that was overturned.

Now, Mr. BYRNE mentioned that there can be subsequent legislation that allows it. Let me point out that Every Student Succeeds Act was over 5 years overdue. It took Congress 5 years after the initial expiration of No Child Left Behind to even replace the authorizing statute. So if that is Congress' intent, we are putting the cart before the horse. We should alter or change the authorizing statute in a way that Democrats and Republicans agree, rather than throw out the work that has already occurred.

This statute would effectively tie the hands of the recently confirmed Secretary of Education DeVos and prevent her from implementing the will of this body through the Every Student Succeeds Act.

Over the past few weeks, my office has received hundreds of pieces of mail regarding education, largely in opposition to Secretary DeVos; but I think the issue is that Secretary DeVos, who was recently confirmed—this CRA would prevent her from doing her job and implementing the Every Student Succeeds Act.

Let me just say that this guidance on accountability isn't just for show. It is at the very heart of the Every Student Succeeds Act, which Democrats and

Republicans supported. It has real impact.

I want to close my opening remarks with a story about that real impact from Christina in Pennsylvania, whose son has a learning disability. Christina's son has always had a tough time in school due to diagnosed dyslexia, dysgraphia, and ADHD. While he is a smart and personable kid, when it came time to read and write, he could be thought of as the "bad" kid too often, and he acted out.

It would have been easy for the school to write him off without the protections that are offered under IDEA, but, luckily, he was required to participate in assessments. That accountability encouraged the school to work harder and to stick with it and to figure out why this otherwise smart student couldn't read simple words in different places on a page or demonstrate his achievement of knowledge.

□ 1245

If his school wasn't required to show student progress, there wouldn't have been the incentive for them to invest their time and money in helping his special needs. Without accountability, Christina's son's school would have had little incentive to set appropriate educational goals for him and offer the support necessary to reach them.

Accountability requirements inform school administrators, teachers, parents, students, and the community at large that all students have a learning goal and make sure that all students have the tools to get there.

Today, Christina's son is a college freshman majoring in biology with a 3.2 GPA. The accountability in this CRA that would be thrown out would undermine the very accountability that allowed not only Christina's son to succeed but so many other children across our country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond just briefly to a couple of points that my colleague from Colorado made, and I want to compliment him and his service on our committee. He is a tremendous member, and we appreciate his leadership.

We had a little bit of a constitutional law lesson there. The truth of the matter is, the Department of Education only exists because of an act of Congress. The only powers it has are the powers that we give them through the authorizing legislation. What we authorize, we can unauthorize.

The Every Student Succeeds Act took back a number of things we had authorized under No Child Left Behind. This is no violation of the separation of powers under the Congressional Review Act when we look at a rule-making authority that we have given to a Federal agency and see that they have done it in a way that is contrary to congressional intent and we take it back. We

have the authority to do that, and we should take it back when we see overreach like this.

He also brought up how this might tie the hands of our new Secretary of Education, and I will take this point in time to congratulate her on her confirmation. What this will require her to do is to work with the Congress to make sure that we are on the same page.

I remember very clearly when the former Secretary of Education came before our committee. I, and many others, pleaded with him not to put out this rule because we told him this is not in keeping with the intent of Congress and with the words of Congress in the statute. He went forward anyway.

I believe Secretary DeVos is going to work with Congress to make sure, as the Department of Education, under her management begins to implement this law, it is done so in keeping with the letter and the spirit of the law.

I hope that that is what we will do between the legislative branch and the executive branch and every department of government, but, in the last 8 years, we didn't see very much of that. We basically had the executive branch of government force feeding things to us.

I think it is high time that we take action, whatever party we are in, to exercise our Article I powers to make sure we maintain control over the things we created through our authorizing statutes.

So I don't foresee the problems with the incoming Secretary of Education that my good friend from Colorado does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a part of the country that is the economic engine of not only Texas but our entire Nation. My Houston area district and the surrounding districts are responsible for some of the strongest economic growth in our entire country. These are good, well-paying jobs. There are few places in the Nation where you can graduate from high school, get some trade school certifications, and then be earning close to six figures just a couple of years out of high school.

You can do that in my district, where the petrochemical plants are thriving because of the low cost of crude oil and natural gas. Manufacturing is coming back and growing strongly in the petrochemical sector. Over \$150 billion is being invested by American chemical countries across the Nation, with the largest concentration in the Houston area.

The previous administration took numerous steps to stop the oil and gas boom, and the Bureau of Land Management rule that was published in the waning days of the Obama administration was an example of one such overreach. This ill-advised rule was aimed at removing States and localities from

the BLM decisionmaking process and centralizing decisionmaking by a few political appointees here in Washington, D.C.

This move simply undermines local communities and States. It undermines our ability to develop oil and gas resources on public lands. It threatens American jobs.

I call on my colleagues to put American manufacturing first. A vote for this bill today is a vote for American manufacturing jobs, many of them high-paying, blue-collar jobs and many of them union jobs across America's petroleum and chemical plants.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support and vote for this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am seeing a lot of feigned indignation about the accountability provisions of this bill. It wasn't that long ago when we passed the Every Student Succeeds Act when Democrats and Republicans came down here and said we are giving the Secretary specific authority around accountability for preventing Secretaries from doing rogue things that both sides have perceived previous Secretaries had done, and the authorizing statute was passed by Democrats and Republicans.

Now, all of a sudden, we have Republicans coming down here gutting the very accountability provisions that they themselves lauded under the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act, which passed in this body overwhelmingly, as well as in the U.S. Senate.

It is a little hard to understand how Republicans are upset with the very authority around specific parameters around that authority that they specifically gave to the Secretary of Education. Again, if there are particular quibbles, there is a different Secretary of Education now. Those rules can be changed through a stakeholder process—and they may very well be—but now Republicans are seeking to tie the hands of the new Secretary of Education and throwing out all of the hard work that I got to see people in Colorado working on, and I know occurred in many other States, to come up with thoughtful, sensible accountability plans that met the legislative intent of Democrats and Republicans in this body.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first, let me say that the previous question and the rule should be defeated not just because it is designed to undo the protections that help the American people but because voting for this will prevent Congress, this Chamber, this body from clearly rejecting some of the White House's worst behavior.

Just over a week ago, the White House issued a statement on Inter-

national Holocaust Remembrance Day. That statement failed to mention that 6 million Jewish people were killed in the Holocaust. It never mentioned them.

It is deeply troubling because the United States has, until now, been at the forefront of the fight against efforts that would deny the extent of Jewish suffering and death during the Holocaust. And yes, there are still many deniers of the Holocaust who traffic in conspiracy and claim the whole thing never happened.

It should be a shocking omission coming from the White House, but, frankly, not all that surprising for an administration based on a campaign that trafficked in anti-Semitism.

But you know what? I thought to myself: maybe they will fix the statement; maybe this is all a misunderstanding, an accident. But no, they didn't fix it. They doubled down and they defended it. Not only that, we found out that the White House purposely took out the language stating that Jews died in the Holocaust. So it was not an error. It was purposeful from beginning to end.

Now, I know this: the White House thinks it is living in a post-factual world. They think that they can get away with saying anything they like and anything they want and that people will just believe it. But the truth is, what they say has very, very real consequences.

Even after our parents and grandparents, the Greatest Generation, fought and worked so hard to defeat Nazism, now we see a public dinner party held right here in this city where people were doing the Nazi salute.

Even after there has been so much work to stop targeting religions, now we are seeing a resurgence of swastikas across the country and around the world.

Even after law enforcement has worked hard to protect our people, now there is a wave of bomb threats against synagogues.

This is what is happening. This is fact. Frankly, those now feeling emboldened were inspired by the President, first in his campaign and now in his Presidency.

We all know that one of the President's members of his National Security Council led a website that fosters extremist views. So don't count me amongst the surprised when the White House issues a statement like this, but don't expect me to accept it either. None of us, Democrat nor Republican, should accept it.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against this previous question, against this rule, to allow consideration of a resolution that states this Congress' clear position against Holocaust deniers. We need to restate the truth as clearly as we can.

The White House was wrong on this issue, and here are some more facts. Yes, the Holocaust happened. No, the Jewish people weren't simply another

group of people in a long list of targets. The Holocaust was designed to eliminate the Jewish people from the face of the Earth. Other groups of people were targeted and killed, but anti-Semitism was at the core of the Nazi ideology of a Final Solution.

As the late Nobel Peace Prize recipient Elie Wiesel said, while receiving the Congressional Gold Medal from President Ronald Reagan: "It is true that not all victims were Jews, but all the Jews were victims."

I implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this measure so that we can, in a bipartisan way, express the truth. If people aren't going to tell the truth about this then we are all lost.

Truthfully, I found the White House statement to be shameful. It needs to stop, and it needs to stop now. This is your chance to lend your voice to the record. Will you stand with me? Will you stand against Jewish Holocaust deniers? Don't be enablers. This is your opportunity. There may not be another to repudiate what the White House has done.

Vote "no" on this previous question and vote "no" on this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the passionate remarks of the gentleman from New York. The Holocaust is something that all of us should learn more about and take seriously.

There are people today who would seek to destroy the Nation of Israel. The leadership of Iran has said that over and over again, yet the previous administration reached an egregious deal with them that puts the Nation of Israel at risk.

So I take no back seat to anybody in standing up for the Jewish people, as I and many other people in this body have done, but we are here today to talk about two education bills and a third bill dealing with the Bureau of Land Management. I would like to redirect our debate to those subjects.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the Holocaust was an unspeakable atrocity resulting in the murder of more than 6 million Jews. As a Jewish American, it is very difficult to talk about. But, of course, in my own family, I can only imagine the grief that my grandparents and great grandparents had not knowing, not hearing from their relatives in the old country. And, of course, finding out the very worst—that they had disappeared.

□ 1300

I know my Uncle Henry, who lives in New York with his wife, Arlene, my dad's sister, who was able to escape Vienna on a Kindertransport, one of the very last ones, as a young man, effectively growing up as an orphan in Switzerland during the war and escaping the mass slaughter that killed most of

his family targeted, of course, merely because they were Jews.

The Holocaust was a deliberate and planned act of slaughter and genocide against the Jewish people; and the fact that it was targeted against the Jewish people, resulting in over 6 million deaths, cannot be delinked from our remembrance of one of the greatest horrors of modern history.

It is especially troubling in the current environment, where we have seen an increase in anti-Semitism and racism, generally, since the election of President Trump. Just last week, the Jewish Community Center in my district in Boulder, Colorado, had to close because of a bomb threat, the families and children sent home. We have seen swastikas on New York City subways and in our schools.

Frankly, I think many Jewish Americans are fearful about what the intentions are of the occupant of the White House and his top advisers and what we can do as a country to combat this; and it is exactly the wrong message to send on Holocaust Remembrance Day, to leave out the obvious truth that continues to be denied by anti-Semitic leaders around the world, including former Presidents of Iran and Supreme Leaders of Iran and others, that the Holocaust was a deliberate effort of terror and genocide directed against the Jewish people by the Nazi regime.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Mr. CROWLEY's resolution which would reiterate the fact that the Nazi regime targeted the Jewish people and calls on the executive branch to affirm this fact.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, over the last few years, one complaint I have heard over and over is how inconsistent education policy has been. States have been using waivers at the discretion of the Department of Education. Finally, educators, school board members, families, hope that ESSA, the Every Student Succeeds Act, could provide more stability. Unfortunately for States, undoing the accountability CRA would only reenergize that uncertainty.

For months, States have been working on their State plans, and I have had the opportunity to join our Colorado group that has been working on that plan as required under the Every Student Succeeds Act. We have had guidance from the Department of Education since last November, and we have been writing our State plans with that in mind. Now, if this regulation is overturned, it would pull the rug out from States that have been working diligently to enact their plans.

Likewise, H.J. Res. 58, another education-related bill that would occur under this rule, would effectively unravel the Department of Education's teacher preparation regulations. In the Higher Education Act, States are required to assess the effectiveness of teacher prep programs, and this regulation simply provides guidance for how States can do that, making sure our teacher training programs work, making sure that we are improving the quality of our public educators.

This provision also requires that TEACH grant recipients attend high-performing teacher prep programs. It is not a matter of picking winners and losers; it is making sure that our taxpayer dollars are used effectively to train high-quality educators.

If money is going to be invested in future teachers at high-needs schools, we want to make sure that teachers are attending the highest quality programs available. At the end of the day, a great education starts with a great teacher in the classroom, and this requirement ensures that even the neediest students have access to a great teacher. Taken together, these two bills represent a strategic attempt by Republicans to undermine public education.

The other CRA, which is completely unrelated to the two education-related CRAs, is actually related to a land management issue. I want to describe why that is a bad idea as well.

I come from a Western State. My district that I represent is over 60 percent public lands, so this BLM plan will actually affect my district, and that is why I am so impassioned to speak here today and listen to others in my State about this rule.

A revision of this BLM plan is long overdue. Few plans or rules can remain relevant for decades, and BLM's planning was last drafted in 1983. Needing a new planning system may not sound like the most exciting thing in the world, but it is actually critical because it can impact everything from cultural to environmental resources, to jobs in the economy in our district which relate to our use of public lands. That is why I have been contacted by groups of sportsmen, county commissioners, outdoor recreation groups, and conservationists asking how Congress can be wasting their time repealing something that makes BLM's process more transparent and conclusive.

Local control and constituent input are top priorities for those of us who live in and around public land, particularly in the West, so it makes sense that many counties and groups in Colorado who have worked with BLM offices on land use are pleading with Congress not to use a CRA to repeal this commonsense rule and join their voices with ours in opposition to this rule and this bill. The kinds of groups opposed to this bill include the International Mountain Bicycling Association because they know that, even though the planning process isn't perfect and, of

course, can be refined, it would be a huge mistake to throw out the whole thing and bar the BLM from making necessary modernizations moving forward, especially when the Republicans are in the driver's seat.

Hunting and fishing groups and outdoor industry businesses, like the Outdoor Industry Association, Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, and the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, know that this planning process will give them the voice they need in the planning process without diminishing anyone else's role. I believe that those who have actually experienced and been part of the process are the voices that need to be heeded when we are determining if the planning has been a success.

Here are a few of the quotes from some counties in Western States that have been part of the process and support the new planning system. From Lewis and Clark County in Idaho:

A great example of the potential of Planning 2.0 can be found in eastern and central Idaho, where the BLM is preparing to engage in a land use planning process for public lands from the big desert to the benches of the Salmon River. At the behest of local BLM leadership, which has already been operating under the spirit of Planning 2.0, a number of sporting groups, conservation organizations, and Salmon Valley stewardship have reached out to a wide-ranging constituency of ranchers, loggers, motorized users, sportsmen, and other groups. The benefit of this early conversation can be very valuable to sportsmen. Take the Donkey Hills at the headwaters of the Pahsimeroi River as an example. There has been near unanimous agreement that the critical elk calving area in the Donkey Hills needs thoughtful consideration as a critical wildlife area.

From Missoula County, Montana:

Western Montana, where the Missoula BLM field offices engaged in a land-use planning revision process for public lands from the John Long Range to Joshua Park all the way to the Garnet Range, through this process, BLM has piloted the steps in Planning 2.0 to further engage the public in land management decisions.

I include in the RECORD letters from both of these counties, as well as a letter from a group of outdoor industries asking for this body to oppose the CRA.

LEWIS & CLARK COUNTY,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Helena, Montana.

Re the Bureau of Land Management's Proposed Resource Management Planning Rules, 81 Fed. Reg. 8674 (February 25, 2016).

NEIL KORNZE,
Director, Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR KORNZE: The Lewis and Clark County Board of County Commissioners offer this letter of support for provisions of the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM's) Proposed Resource Management Planning Rules, 81 Fed. Reg. 8674 (Feb. 25, 2016) (the Proposed Rules). We appreciate the effort to improve opportunities for public involvement earlier in the planning processes, including the chance to review preliminary resource management alternatives and preliminary rationales for those alternatives.

We value our relationship with our federal partners, and our constituents are impacted

greatly by actions taken by your agency. Increasing access to the planning process and targeting your efforts towards greater public involvement enhances the relationship between the people and their government, and we support your initiative.

Additionally, we note that the Proposed Rules also expand opportunities for states and local governments to have meaningful involvement in the development of BLM's land use decisions. The Proposed Rules continue to provide for coordination with state and local representatives in order to ensure, to the extent available under federal law, that RMPs are consistent with state and local land use plans, as provided in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL MURRAY,
Chairman
SUSAN GOOD GEISE,
Vice Chair
ANDY HUNTHAUSEN,
Member

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Missoula, MT, May 23, 2016.

Re Proposed Resource Management Planning Rules, 81 Fed. Reg. 8674.

Director NEIL KORNZE,
Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR KORNZE: We are writing you to commend you and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for your efforts to improve BLM's planning process (Planning 2.0) and better address the diverse interests found in Missoula County and other communities across the western United States.

Missoula County is approximately 2,600 square miles in size, and federal management in the county accounts for 52 percent of the land ownership. The BLM manages roughly 23,000 acres for the public in Missoula County and the sustainable management of these public lands is vitally important to the residents we represent. Our citizens and local economies depend on state and federal lands for water quality and quantity, as well as for multiple sustainable uses ranging from outdoor recreation to livestock grazing to mineral exploration and development. Consequently, we wish to thank the BLM for proposing to address their land management options from a landscape perspective. This approach recognizes that the management of federal lands has a direct impact on other properties well beyond those close to or adjacent to BLM managed land.

We support the provisions of the BLM's Proposed Resource Management Planning Rules, 81 Fed. Reg. 8674 (Feb. 25, 2016). These rules provide additional opportunities for public involvement earlier in the planning process, including the chance to review preliminary resource management alternatives and preliminary rationales for those alternatives. This early public involvement will help resolve conflicts and produce a Resource Management Plan that better reflect the needs of our citizens as well as others who use the public lands and have a stake in their future. Equally important is the improved openness and transparency the rules bring to the process, allowing any local government to actively participate and share information on issues critical to local residents and their elected representatives.

The proposed rules continue to provide for coordination with state and local representatives in order to ensure, to the extent allowable under federal law, that Resource Management Plans are consistent with state and local land use plans, as provided in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

Thank you for considering our comments. If you or your staff have any questions, please feel free to contact us or our Chief Planning Officer, Patrick O'Herren.

Sincerely,

NICOLE ROWLEY,
Chair.
JEAN CURTISS,
Commissioner.
STACY RYE,
Commissioner.

FEBRUARY 3, 2017.

Re H.J. Res. 44 to disapprove BLM's Planning 2.0 rulemaking.

Rep. LIZ CHENEY,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. CHENEY: As representatives of the outdoor recreation community and industry, we write to express our support for the Bureau of Land Management's Planning 2.0 initiative and our opposition to its disapproval through the Congressional Review Act. Collectively, our members recreate on BLM lands across the country and have a deep and personal interest in the management of these areas, and these public lands are also essential to supporting our businesses. While Planning 2.0 may require improvements, those necessary targeted changes would be foreclosed by a CRA disapproval, drastically setting back the ability of BLM to deliver much needed modernizations to the agency's planning process.

In our experience with land management planning across agencies, a modern approach to planning built on robust public engagement from the earliest stages of the planning process is a tremendous benefit to land use management. It is an essential step toward alleviating conflicts, ensuring appropriately balanced and ordered uses, and stewarding our country's public lands. Although there are aspects of BLM's Planning 2.0 rulemaking that could be improved, this effort has produced a strong step forward for the agency's planning process, and we believe strongly that throwing this rulemaking out in its entirety would be a costly and unproductive decision.

During the Planning 2.0 development process, BLM engaged in impressive public outreach and worked in an open and collaborative fashion with a full spectrum of public lands stakeholders. We believe the outcome is a process that provides greatly improved opportunities for public input in land use planning, in particular in helping the agency better understand the values Americans ascribe to their public lands, including where people go, why people go there, and the experiences that these landscapes enable that are an essential part of their inherent value. It also does a much better job of recognizing the importance of recreation, including for local economies, and greatly improves the agency's ability to handle data.

Our feedback on this rulemaking is in part based on our experience with the Forest Service's 2012 revisions to its planning rule, which made similar changes to the Forest Service's planning process. As that rule is being implemented, we are seeing a significantly more transparent process, with better up-front data collection and more opportunities for collaboration. In North Carolina, for example, where we have been engaged in Forest Planning on the Nantahala-Pisgah Forests, loggers and hunters, kayakers and off-road enthusiasts have been working side-by-side to develop consensus recommendations for the Forest Service. Far from circumventing local input, these modern planning processes reward long-term, local engagement, and empower local communities to develop visions for their public lands in concert with a full array of stakeholders.

Planning 2.0 has been a valuable step in helping BLM modernize its planning process, and we believe strongly that—while targeted improvements to the rulemaking may be possible—this rulemaking should not be thrown out through the Congressional Review Act. Congress is well positioned to pursue necessary changes or improvements with the new administration, whereas CRA disapproval would not only block these changes, but stymie future agency efforts at modernization.

Thank you for considering our perspective on maintaining this important step in modernizing BLM planning.

Best regards,

ADAM CRAMER,
Executive Director,
Outdoor Alliance.
JOHN STERLING,
Executive Director,
The Conservation
Alliance.
AMY ROBERTS,
Executive Director,
Outdoor Industry
Association.
TIM BLUMENTHAL,
President,
PeopleForBikes.

Mr. POLIS. Finally, in my home State of Colorado, a great example of stakeholders who know the new process is working is Park County, which I have the honor of representing part of. As part of revising the Eastern Colorado Resource Management Plan, the Royal Gorge Field Office in Colorado has already embraced and implemented some of the ideas for Planning 2.0, including recent envisioning sessions that involve multiple stakeholders.

I include in the RECORD a letter from Park County, Colorado.

COUNTY OF PARK,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
May 12, 2016.

Re the Bureau of Land Management's Proposed Resource Management Planning Rules, 81 Fed. Reg. 8674 (February 25, 2016).

NEIL KORNZE,
Director, Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR KORNZE: The undersigned representatives of local government are writing to share their support for provisions of the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM's) Proposed Resource Management Planning Rules, 81 Fed. Reg. 8674 (Feb. 25, 2016) (the Proposed Rules). In particular, we support the provisions of the Proposed Rules that provide additional opportunities for public involvement earlier in the planning process, including the chance to review preliminary resource management alternatives and preliminary rationales for those alternatives.

Each of undersigned representatives come from local jurisdictions whose land bases include substantial amounts of public lands managed by BLM. The management of these public lands is vitally important to the citizens we represent. Our citizens and local economies depend on these lands for sustainable multiple uses, from outdoor recreation to livestock grazing to mineral exploration and development.

The current BLM planning methodology lacks adequate opportunities for public involvement, particularly early in the process. It also lacks transparency. It often results in a range of alternatives that fails to address the concerns of all stakeholders. The proposed changes would provide the public with

an opportunity to raise concerns and review potential management alternatives before these alternatives become solidified in a draft Resource Management Plan (RMP). This early public involvement will hopefully help resolve conflicts and produce RMPs that better reflect the needs of our citizens as well as others who use the public lands and have a stake in their future.

In addition, we note that the Proposed Rules also expand opportunities for states and local governments to have meaningful involvement in the development of BLM's land use decisions. The Proposed Rules continue to provide for coordination with state and local representatives in order to ensure, to the extent available under federal law, that RMPs are consistent with state and local land use plans, as provided in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

Sincerely,

MIKE BRAZELL,
Chairman, County of Park.

Mr. POLIS. It reads, in part: "The current BLM planning methodology lacks adequate opportunities for public involvement, particularly early in the process."

This rule that the CRA would invalidate addresses some of the shortcomings in the current rule. This last point is especially important, that changes would provide the public with an opportunity to raise concerns and review potential management alternatives before those alternatives become solidified. By having an opportunity for early involvement, BLM can actually avoid expensive litigation after a plan is complete.

This legislation is not only good for transparency, public involvement, and environmental and wildlife protections, but it saves taxpayer dollars. I don't know how anyone can oppose that. The process has widespread support from those of us who live in and around public land, from people who are on the ground, including landowners, farmers, ranchers, sportsmen, and conservationists.

In a hearing in the Committee on Natural Resources, one of our witnesses was a rancher from my home State of Colorado, who eloquently spoke about how the old system was not working and how this desperately needed new system had worked well in its limited implementation.

BLM Planning 2.0 is working, and a CRA that will never allow the BLM to modernize its process, the process that has been locked in place since 1983, is simply thoughtless legislating for cheap political points.

Mr. Speaker, the resolutions before us today represent everything that is wrong with Washington. When our constituents sent us here to Washington, D.C., they weren't asking us to engage in partisan bickering and using brutal techniques to undo thoughtful, nuanced regulation. If Members of this body have problems with rules that have been promulgated, change the authorizing statutes; don't simply prevent the agencies from enacting the very things that this body has told them to do. It doesn't make sense.

We have not engaged in regular order. We have avoided a thoughtful, deliberative process, and, unfortunately, the resolutions before us are yet another example of that. These resolutions undermine the basic responsibility of the Department of Education and the Bureau of Land Management. They are a shortsighted strategy for governing that will have long-term negative consequences for our public lands and our use thereof, as well as for children in our schools and educators.

We should fix accountability and make it work in education rather than throw it out. We should make sure that our teacher training programs and those whom we support with your taxpayer money are the best possible teacher training programs; and, of course, we should have a multistakeholder process around use of our public lands, including recreationists, residents, county commissioners, and others.

For that reason, I strongly oppose the rules before us. I urge my colleagues to vote "no." I also urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring up Mr. CROWLEY's bill, which I think is a bill that would receive, hopefully, unanimous support in this body with regard to the remembrances of the Jewish victims of the Holocaust.

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

Mr. BYRNE. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talks about regular order. This particular regulation from the Bureau of Land Management was enacted very quickly and hurriedly without input from State and county governments. So, essentially, this was a hurried-through rule that didn't have the regular order input that it should have had, yet another reason why it should be reversed through this Congressional Review Act.

But it is also the case that this doesn't mean the BLM doesn't have any authority here. They can go back to their old regulation, which was already in place, and they can come up with a new rule so long as it is not a substantially similar rule, or they can come to us and seek specific authorization. The truth of the matter is this particular regulation has had so many problems, it cannot be tweaked or amended. They need to start all over again and take input from State and local government.

Now, I heard the gentleman talk about people who hunt and fish. I am a lifelong hunter and fisherman. In fact, I believe the gentleman has invited me to come to Colorado to go fishing with him, and I have invited him to come to the Gulf to come fishing with me. I spend a lot of my time with people who hunt and fish all over the country, and I have never heard anybody in the hunting and fishing community say: I really want the Federal Government to tell me when and how and where I can

hunt and fish. Quite the opposite. My friends who hunt and fish want the Federal Government to stay out of it. They would rather let local and State people make those sorts of decisions, particularly as they pertain to land use management.

On the education issues, as I said before, I was an 8-year member of the Alabama State Board of Education. My colleague from Colorado said something that is so true: getting a high-quality, well-trained, caring teacher in the classroom is the most important thing we can do for our schoolchildren. I don't trust the Federal Government to do that better than I trust State and local officials to do it.

We had this law, No Child Left Behind, that gave the Federal Government the power to determine when a teacher was highly qualified or not. I don't think anybody in Washington knows better how to assess whether a teacher is highly qualified or not than the principal and superintendent that that teacher works for, than the local school board that that teacher works for. There is nobody up here who can know that better than they can.

There is nobody up here who can do a better job of looking at the teacher preparation programs and saying they are good or bad than State school boards, most of whom, like me, were elected by the people, accountable to the people, instead of somebody up here who sits in some office and makes that decision for them.

Do we really think that is what the American people want? The American people want control of their lives back. They are tired of Washington bureaucrats telling them what to do, and they are really tired of the Federal Government telling the people they entrust with the education of their children what to do and what not to do. They want the people who make those decisions to be the people who live in their communities, that they see in church, that they see at the grocery store, that they interact with at the school every day. That is what they want. And they want us, the Federal Government, to get out of the way.

□ 1315

I talked to dozens and dozens of people who are school board members and teachers and people involved in the school administration who said this regulation by the Department of Education Accountability is way over the line, please don't let them go through with that. So we are being responsive to those people in doing this, and I am proud that we are.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 91 and the underlying joint resolutions.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 91 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to the consideration, without intervention of

any point of order, in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 78) reiterating the indisputable fact that the Nazi regime targeted the Jewish people in its perpetration of the Holocaust and calling on every entity in the executive branch to affirm that fact. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 78.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous ques-

tion on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REED). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 187, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—234

Abraham	DesJarlais	Jordan
Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Joyce (OH)
Allen	Donovan	Katko
Amash	Duffy	Kelly (MS)
Amodei	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)
Arrington	Duncan (TN)	King (IA)
Babin	Dunn	King (NY)
Bacon	Emmer	Kinzinger
Banks (IN)	Farenthold	Knight
Barletta	Faso	Kustoff (TN)
Barr	Ferguson	Labrador
Barton	Fitzpatrick	LaHood
Bergman	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Biggs	Flores	Lamborn
Bilirakis	Portenberry	Lance
Bishop (MI)	Foxx	Latta
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (MN)
Black	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Blackburn	Gaetz	Long
Blum	Gallagher	Loudermilk
Bost	Garrett	Love
Brady (TX)	Gibbs	Lucas
Brat	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Bridenstine	Goodlatte	MacArthur
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Marchant
Brooks (IN)	Gowdy	Marino
Buchanan	Granger	Marshall
Buck	Graves (GA)	Mastie
Bucshon	Graves (LA)	Masse
Budd	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Burgess	Griffith	McCaul
Byrne	Grothman	McClintock
Calvert	Guthrie	McHenry
Carter (GA)	Harper	McKinley
Carter (TX)	Harris	McMorris
Chabot	Hartzler	Rodgers
Cheney	Hensarling	McSally
Coffman	Herrera Beutler	Meadows
Cole	Hice, Jody B.	Meehan
Collins (GA)	Higgins (LA)	Messer
Collins (NY)	Hill	Mitchell
Comer	Holding	Moolenaar
Comstock	Hollingsworth	Mooney (WV)
Conaway	Hudson	Mullin
Cook	Huizenga	Murphy (PA)
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Newhouse
Cramer	Hunter	Noem
Crawford	Hurd	Nunes
Culberson	Issa	Olson
Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo
Davidson	Jenkins (WV)	Palmer
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (LA)	Paulsen
Denham	Johnson (OH)	Pearce
Dent	Johnson, Sam	Perry
DeSantis	Jones	Pittenger

Poliquin	Sanford	Turner
Posey	Scalise	Upton
Ratcliffe	Schweikert	Valadao
Reed	Scott, Austin	Wagner
Reichert	Sensenbrenner	Walberg
Renacci	Sessions	Walden
Rice (SC)	Shimkus	Walker
Roby	Shuster	Walorski
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Walters, Mimi
Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Weber (TX)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Wenstrup
Rokita	Smith (TX)	Westerman
Rooney, Francis	Smucker	Williams
Rooney, Thomas J.	Stefanik	Wilson (SC)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stewart	Wittman
Roskam	Stivers	Womack
Ross	Taylor	Woodall
Rothfus	Tenney	Yoder
Rouzer	Thompson (PA)	Yoho
Royce (CA)	Thornberry	Young (AK)
Russell	Tiberi	Young (IA)
Rutherford	Tipton	Zeldin
	Trott	

NAYS—187

Adams	Gabbard	Neal
Aguilar	Gallego	Nolan
Barragan	Garamendi	Norcross
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Bera	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Panetta
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pascrell
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Heck	Peters
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Pingree
Bustos	Hoyer	Pocan
Butterfield	Huffman	Polis
Capuano	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Carbajal	Jeffries	Quigley
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Cartwright	Kaptur	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Keating	Rosen
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Ruiz
Ciilline	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Clark (MA)	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sánchez
Clay	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kind	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Connolly	Langevin	Schrader
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Correa	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Costa	Lawrence	Serrano
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Swell (AL)
Crist	Lee	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Levin	Sherman
Cuellar	Lewis (GA)	Sinema
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Soto
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Speier
DeFazio	Lofgren	Suozi
DeGette	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	Lowey	Takano
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	M.	Thompson (MS)
Demings	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Tonko
Deutch	Maloney,	Torres
Dingell	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Doyle, Michael F.	Matsui	Veasey
Ellison	McColum	Vela
Engel	McEachin	Velázquez
Eshoo	McGovern	Vislosky
Espallat	McNerney	Walz
Esty	Meeks	Wasserman
Evans	Meng	Schultz
Foster	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Welch
	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
	Napolitano	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Beatty	Mulvaney	Sires
Chaffetz	Poe (TX)	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Price, Tom (GA)	Zinke
Jackson Lee	Rush	

□ 1336

Messrs. CUELLAR and PETERSON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 186, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

AYES—233

Abraham	Flores	Massie
Aderholt	Fortenberry	Mast
Allen	Fox	McCarthy
Amash	Franks (AZ)	McCaul
Amodei	Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Arrington	Gaetz	McHenry
Babin	Gallagher	McKinley
Bacon	Garrett	McMorris
Banks (IN)	Gibbs	Rodgers
Barletta	Gohmert	McSally
Barr	Goodlatte	Meadows
Barton	Gosar	Meehan
Bergman	Gowdy	Messer
Biggs	Granger	Mitchell
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Moolenaar
Bishop (MI)	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Black	Griffith	Murphy (PA)
Blackburn	Grothman	Newhouse
Blum	Guthrie	Noem
Bost	Harper	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Harris	Olson
Brat	Hartzler	Palazzo
Bridenstine	Hensarling	Palmer
Brooks (AL)	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Brooks (IN)	Hice, Jody B.	Pearce
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Buck	Hill	Pittenger
Bucshon	Holding	Poliquin
Budd	Hollingsworth	Posey
Burgess	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Byrne	Huizenga	Reed
Calvert	Hultgren	Reichert
Carter (GA)	Hunter	Renacci
Carter (TX)	Hurd	Rice (SC)
Chabot	Issa	Roby
Cheney	Jenkins (KS)	Roe (TN)
Coffman	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Cole	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Comer	Jones	Rooney, Francis
Comstock	Jordan	Rooney, Thomas
Conaway	Joyce (OH)	J.
Cook	Katko	Ros-Lehtinen
Costello (PA)	Kelly (MS)	Roskam
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Crawford	King (IA)	Rothfus
Culberson	King (NY)	Rouzer
Curbelo (FL)	Kinzinger	Royce (CA)
Davidson	Knight	Russell
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff (TN)	Rutherford
Denham	Labrador	Sanford
Dent	LaHood	Scalise
DeSantis	LaMalfa	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Sensenbrenner
Donovan	Latta	Sessions
Duffy	Lewis (MN)	Shimkus
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Shuster
Duncan (TN)	Long	Simpson
Dunn	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Emmer	Love	Smith (NE)
Farenthold	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Faso	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Ferguson	MacArthur	Smucker
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Stefanik
Fleischmann	Marshall	Stewart

Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao

Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY AND COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 7, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Given my appointment to the House Committee on Ways and Means, I hereby resign from the House Judiciary Committee. I also submit my resignation from the Committee on Small Business as a permanent member.

Sincerely,

JUDY CHU, Ph.D.,
Member of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 95

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

- (1) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—Mr. O'Halleran and Mr. Suozzi.
- (2) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Ms. Jackson Lee and Ms. Schakowsky.
- (3) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—Mr. Schneider.
- (4) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mr. Clay.
- (5) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Welch, Mr. Cartwright, and Mr. DeSaulnier.
- (6) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—Mr. McNerney, Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Foster, Mr. Takano, Ms. Hanabusa, and Mr. Crist.
- (7) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Ms. Clarke of New York, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Ms. Adams, and Mr. Espallat.
- (8) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Mr. Sablan, Ms. Esty, and Mr. Peters.
- (9) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—Ms. Judy Chu of California.

Mr. CROWLEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOES—186

Adams	Gabbard	Nolan
Aguilar	Gallego	Norcross
Barragan	Garamendi	O'Halleran
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Rourke
Bera	Gottheimer	Pallone
Beyer	Green, Al	Panetta
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Payne
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Heck	Peters
F.	Higgins (NY)	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Polis
Bustos	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Jeffries	Quigley
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Carbajal	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Keating	Rosen
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Kihuen	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kildee	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schakowsky
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Clyburn	Langevin	Schrader
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Conyers	Lawrence	Serrano
Correa	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lee	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Levin	Sherman
Crist	Lewis (GA)	Sinema
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Cuellar	Lipinski	Soto
Cummings	Loebsack	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Suozzi
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowe	Takano
DeGette	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	M.	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Titus
DeBene	Lynch	Tonko
Demings	Maloney,	Torres
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Tsongas
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Dingell	Matsui	Veasey
Doggett	McCollum	Vela
Doyle, Michael	McEachin	Velázquez
F.	McGovern	Visclosky
Ellison	McNerney	Walz
Engel	Meeks	Wasserman
Eshoo	Meng	Schultz
Espallat	Moore	Waters, Maxine
Esty	Moulton	Watson Coleman
Evans	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Foster	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Fudge	Neal	

NOT VOTING—13

Beatty	Marchant	Sires
Chaffetz	Mulvaney	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Poe (TX)	Zinke
Hastings	Price, Tom (GA)	
Jackson Lee	Rush	

□ 1343

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISAPPROVING RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR RELATING TO BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 91, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior relating to Bureau of Land Management regulations that establish the procedures used to prepare, revise, or amend land use plans pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 91, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 44

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior relating to "Resource Management Planning" (published at 81 Fed. Reg. 89580 (December 12, 2016)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.J. Res. 44.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, BLM Planning 2.0 is yet one more example of Obama-era Federal Government overreach. It takes authority away from people in local communities, in my home State of Wyoming, and all across the West. It takes authority away from our elected representatives at a local level, and it puts Washington bureaucrats in charge of decisions that influence and impact our lives.

It significantly dilutes cooperating agency status, and it discounts input from those who are closest to our land and our resources. BLM 2.0 is an example of the midnight rulemaking that we saw that was so rampant in the Obama administration. In fact, it is an abuse of that rulemaking process.

By statute, Mr. Speaker, the BLM is supposed to manage our public lands for multiple use and for sustained yield, but instead we have seen consistently throughout the last 8 years the Obama administration doing everything possible to deny all human use of our public lands.

This rulemaking isn't based on the language of the statute that underlies it. It is based, rather, on policy preferences that have been expressed in memos and in various studies. The rulemaking takes another step in imposing a brand new mitigation formula that essentially is a land grab by a Federal agency that would put even more land under the control of Washington bureaucrats.

Despite the fact that these agencies are required to consider costs as they impose regulations, BLM 2.0 was imposed not only using cost estimates that are clearly wrong, but, in fact, it removed all reference to looking at the devastating impact that this rule has on our local economies across the West.

This rule takes away authority and power from those who know best how to manage our lands and how to manage our resources. In fact, it opens up our planning process to such an extent that we could have foreign, nongovernmental organizations having just as much say in how we manage our land and resources as the very stakeholders—the ranchers, the farmers across Wyoming and the West, and the people that they have elected to speak for them.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this rule takes authority away from those who know best what we need to do to manage and sustain our resources, and it puts it in the hands of the Federal Government and bureaucrats here in Washington, D.C.

Repealing 2.0 using the Congressional Review Act will help to restore the voices and input. It will help to restore democracy and help to restore authority to our local communities.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is time to face the facts. Congressional Republicans do not value our Nation's public lands the way everyday Americans do. I know this because they opened the 115th Congress by adopting a rules package that makes it easier to sell our national parks and national forests to the highest bidder without pesky budget rules getting in the way. That was just a start.

Last week, they voted to gut clean water and clean air protections in coal country, suspended a rule requiring oil companies to disclose payments made to foreign governments, and pulled a plug on a waste prevention regulation that would have saved money and improved air quality.

Today, their assault on the environment and our public land continues with this misguided effort to scrap the Bureau of Land Management's effort to update its planning rule. This resolution targets what is commonly known as Planning 2.0, an initiative to make public land management more transparent and efficient by enhancing opportunities for public input and utilizing actual science.

The American public does not support erasing this new planning rule, and they certainly don't support the broad antipublic land agenda being pushed by the Republicans.

Our constituents are sick of seeing corporate interests, especially big polluters, come first. They do not want their national parks and cherished natural places turned over to industrial polluters. We have seen this in the massive response to the Dakota Access pipeline, heartbreak over what happened in Flint, Michigan, and the millions of people who marched worldwide on the first full day of this new administration.

Just last week, we saw how much Americans truly value their public land. After a prominent Republican introduced a bill to sell off more than 3 million acres of taxpayer-owned land, thousands of people picked up the phone and called their Representatives to express their outrage. Because of that passion and deep concern, the sponsor of that bill has vowed to withdraw it from consideration for the first time in five Congresses.

This is an important story because it speaks to our constituents' true priorities. They sent us here to be responsible stewards of their special places. They sent us here to protect their national parks and public lands. They sent us here to make government work for them.

This resolution fails on all those tests.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on this different kind of rule. It is basically a rule defining a rule that defines future activity. So it is somewhat convoluted.

But this is a regulation—one more of those broad, midnight regulations—that affects 250 million acres of land, almost all of which is found in the West. Even in my own district, it will affect 3 million acres of land; that means something that is bigger than the State of Delaware and Rhode Island combined. It affects us with disastrous consequences. As has been said, this dilutes local and State voices and centralizes power here in Washington, D.C.

By law already, the agencies have got to meet with local and State leaders and coordinate, which they are not doing well. This undermines that specifically, and it stacks the deck from the very beginning against counties and State voices and against multiple use.

This puts special interest groups above elected local officials, which is not the way it was ever intended to be. There are 60 different organizations that are begging us to repeal this bad rule.

In my district, the Duchesne County Commissioners wrote us to say:

“Our constituents are good stewards of the land, dedicated to meeting environmental requirements, while developing and supplying affordable energy to consumers. We believe Planning 2.0 presents multiple challenges that will prejudice multiple use interests with a bias. . . .”

That bias is clearly there. That bias is shown in the mitigation factor within this. Within the bowels of the Department of the Interior, they have shown us how they are going to implement this rule, which means if there is any kind of economic or recreational opportunity and you want to develop, say, like 50 acres to do that, they will insist that you go out and buy either State or private land as a mitigation for those 50 acres. And if you can't find additional private or State lands, you hold up the entire process.

Either way, you expand the amount of acreage the Federal Government will do, and that is part of this Planning 2.0 process. That is why it is so ludicrous.

Duchesne County participated in the rulemaking process for Planning 2.0, but like all the other counties, States, and local governments, their concerns were ignored and their opinions were excluded in the final rule. We had two separate hearings on this issue, but all the testimony that was heard was also ignored and no input was given to them at that time.

Look, counties like Duchesne are in dire situations, especially in the West. They need to be consulted. That is their role and responsibility. That is what a democracy in the republican form of government does.

This rule bypasses them. It cuts out their voice, and it puts in programs like that mitigation, which is definitely scary and has absolutely negative connotations for the future.

This is a perfect rule that needs to be rolled back because it goes too far, it was done at the last minute, and it undermines the kind of input we need to make proper decisions.

I compliment the gentlewoman from Wyoming for presenting this rule. This is one that has got to go. I urge Members' support of her resolution.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Republican majority pushed through legislation attacking clean air, clean water, and blocking public transparency into payments made to foreign governments by oil and mining companies.

Today we are considering legislation that will roll back opportunities for the American people to have a say in how our Nation's public lands are managed. The idea that there should be national public lands that belong to and are managed on behalf of the American people is a value that dates back to the founding of our country and is embedded in our Constitution.

Generation after generation of Americans has endorsed the idea that our public lands should be managed to balance many competing uses: recreation, responsible economic development, sustainable resource extraction, renewable energy, military purposes, and conservation of historic American landscapes, just to name a few.

We all want to see this important aspect of our national heritage managed in an effective and efficient manner, balancing conservation for future generations with sustainable productivity for local communities.

The Bureau of Land Management's Planning 2.0, as it is known, will help us better achieve this balance on the approximately 245 million acres of land managed by the BLM. As American citizens, we all have a right to provide input on how we would like to see these public lands managed; but the current process for doing so is slow, lacks transparency, and fails to incorporate over 30 years of updated science and understanding of our changing climate. In fact, this process hasn't been substantially updated since the Reagan administration. States, local governments, and other stakeholders all agreed that the process was in need of updates.

BLM agreed with this consensus and began a 2-year review, receiving over 3,000 public comments on what changes needed to be made. Two years, 3,000 public comments, this was no midnight regulation. Their final product, which the resolution before us today would permanently overturn, increases transparency, enhances the role of science and decisionmaking, and strengthens the role of the public's voice earlier in this planning process.

□ 1400

Planning 2.0 also upholds the Federal Land Policy and Management Act's commitment to States, local government, and tribes in land management decisions.

The Bureau of Land Management made several changes in between the draft rule and the final rule to clarify coordination requirements and promote consistency with local land use plans, all in response to concerns raised through the public input process.

According to a BLM fact sheet on the final rule, “The new rule does not change the special relationship and opportunities provided by statute for cooperating agencies,” and, “The final rule establishes several new opportunities for coordination between the BLM and our government partners.”

We should be working together on proposals that strengthen management of our public lands, balance conservation with economic development, and provide sustainable benefits to the people who rely on them for their economic livelihoods. The resolution before us today flies in the face of these goals.

I urge my colleagues to reject this Congressional Review Act resolution and vote “no.”

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, of all of the stifling, bureaucratic, pettifogging regulations that Congress is now repealing from the previous administration, none is more deserving of repeal than the BLM's Planning 2.0 rule.

This rule governs the process for creating resource management plans. If they are done wrong, they can devastate the economies of the communities that are impacted by those lands. A new RMP can crush an industry, and it can destroy a community, which is why States and counties across the West have been anxiously watching this process unfold.

Despite serious concerns being raised by State and local governments—by farming, livestock, and energy production groups, and even by Congress during the rulemaking process—the Bureau of Land Management charged full steam ahead and finalized this rule. The BLM assured stakeholders that the final rule governing this process would not undercut State and local voices. But, when the BLM realized that the election of President Trump endangered the environmental left's stranglehold on this agency, the Planning 2.0 rule was hastily finalized in contradiction of almost all of the promises that the BLM made.

The Planning 2.0 rule is a gross expansion of BLM's power, and the power of well-funded political groups that use the veneer of environmentalism at the expense of local communities. Under BLM's current RMP procedures, our Western counties already complain of having their voices ignored and their interests disregarded.

Last year, the Federal Lands Subcommittee held a field hearing in St. George, Utah. We heard how the city of St. George was experiencing economic growth, pushing the limits of its infrastructure, and how the city had tried over and over to engage the BLM in the development of a new RMP to address the needs of the local community. The city was desperate for the new RMP to include a transportation corridor for a new road to meet the needs of their growing economy. In their testimony before the subcommittee, the city relayed that they were unable to secure regular meetings with their local BLM office, despite the BLM office holding frequent meetings with local environmental groups.

In the end, the RMP was released and there was nothing to account for the transportation needs of the people of St. George. In a State that is two-thirds owned by the Federal Government, I find it hard to believe that the BLM could not have worked with the city of St. George to accommodate a simple road.

With these kind of results under BLM's current planning regime, it is no wonder that counties across the West are weary of a new planning rule.

BLM should be focused on improving their collaboration and coordination with counties and local governments. Instead, this rule enshrines that disregard into formal Federal regulation.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I think the real question for the majority is: What do you have against Secretary-elect RYAN ZINKE? He is being given a brand-new rule and the keys to the castle. He has a clean slate to develop the play-book for a hugely impactful planning process and free rein to make it what he wants.

Yet, one of the first moves the majority is making, before Mr. ZINKE has even been confirmed, is to undo Planning 2.0 and leave the agency with a planning process that was written before my staff was born. In other words, the majority is tying Mr. ZINKE's hands.

Quite simply, the majority is laboring under the false impression that Planning 2.0 makes the BLM's planning process worse when, in fact, it makes it better. Under the current regulatory framework for resource management plans, it takes BLM an average of 8 years to update and revise a plan, and this matters because, by the time the plan is completed, it is almost already out of date. Significant public involvement doesn't happen until the end of the process. There is often litigation which stalls the process even more. This is a huge waste of government resources and taxpayer money.

Mr. Speaker, as Ranking Member GRIJALVA said earlier, the use of the Congressional Review Act to revoke BLM Planning 2.0, or any other Federal regulation, is a radical step. That is the reason why the Congressional Review Act has only been used once before this year.

Once Congress approves the Congressional Review Act resolution, the agency can never issue a similar rule. So this is an extreme overreach in general, but especially for something like BLM's Planning 2.0, which is designed to enhance efficiency and make BLM more responsive to public input.

Isn't our goal to improve how government works and make it more efficient? This resolution will permanently lock us into an old rule that didn't work for anybody.

I know House Republicans and President Trump are eager to roll back regulations, but we should bump the brakes on this particular resolution. A lot has changed since 1983.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Virginia may not be completely aware of the implementation and the effect of this rule in Western States like Wyoming where, for example, the process that has been described as an open process is, in fact, one where, in my State, our Department of Environmental Quality on another

BLM rule was in a position where they agreed to be a cooperating agency and then did not hear from the BLM for 4 years.

When you are talking about our very livelihood, you are in a situation where we simply can't run that risk. We cannot adopt a rule or let a rule stand that expands that kind of authority in Washington, no matter who is in charge in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Land Management manages 245 million acres, or nearly 10 percent of the total area of the United States, and a whopping 700 million acres of mineral estate. Nearly all of this acreage is in our Western States, which makes it imperative that the agency extensively cooperate with the State and local governments during the planning process.

It is true that the BLM's new planning rule, Planning 2.0, included revisions to several aspects of the planning process, some of which seemed to make some good sense.

Unfortunately, the new rule also introduced a significant measure of confusion regarding how planning areas would be determined, and, most distressingly, diminished the historic and valued role that State and local governments play throughout the process.

In many of the counties in my district, it is not uncommon for the public lands to make up well over half of the total area. For these communities, having an equal seat at the planning table isn't merely a luxury. It is an essential ingredient to ensuring that our way of life is proudly maintained over many generations and is not extinguished.

Because of this, the BLM is required by law to consult and to coordinate with State and local governments and maintain consistency across their management plans and policies. Yet, the agency's new planning rule envisioned weakening that partnership in several regards. For one, the agency intends to dismiss consistency requirements with anything other than the officially approved and adopted plans. This not only places an undue burden on rural communities who likely do not have the resources available to draft and maintain comprehensive plans, but significantly lessens the importance of an array of other policies and agreements that are germane to the planning process.

The importance of a State Governor's review of a Federal management plan is also reduced, as it appears to limit input only to the identification of inconsistencies with State and local plans, but precludes formal input and observations regarding other aspects of the plan.

Americans the Nation over treasure our public lands and thoroughly enjoy our ability to be able to access them. But it cannot be denied that, in many of our communities, decisions made by Federal Land Management agencies

like the BLM have amplified the impact. No planning process revision should weaken the voices of our communities as Planning 2.0 would do.

For those reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I applaud the efforts of my colleague out of Wyoming for her efforts on this and urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), also a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution which would do away with the new procedures established under BLM Planning 2.0.

Planning 2.0 encourages, at its foundation, early and frequent public input. By rolling back this planning effort, public input—in particular, tribal input—will be removed.

Federally recognized tribes have the right to engage in government-to-government consultation, and, under Planning 2.0, tribal rights to participate in the planning process are clearly enumerated and protected.

By introducing the resolution we are considering today, the majority is making clear it doesn't value tribal input in the development of BLM's resource management plans. In this updated planning process, the BLM worked hard to ensure government-to-government consultation was accomplished. Tribes were encouraged to submit comments through the formal comment period and through government-to-government consultation. But BLM recognizes the hard work of tribes and has been inclusive of tribal concerns.

In fact, BLM has recognized the quality and value that tribes' traditional ecological knowledge brings to planning efforts. It is important to incorporate this information to avoid resource conflicts and to protect hunting and fishing grounds.

In many areas, the BLM and tribes actually have to manage resources together. How can they do this when tribes are not invited to be a part of the consultation process? By including government-to-government consultation early in the planning process, all taxpayers benefit in the long run because we can develop a stronger plan that doesn't end up in court being litigated.

We want BLM to be an agency that actively embraces the people who live on and use the land they manage. By formalizing the tribal consultation role and recognizing the value tribes bring to the planning process as Planning 2.0 does, the BLM is taking important steps to fully engage with all their constituents.

Land management is about looking at the bigger picture, and tribes understand that more than anyone. They deserve to be recognized in the planning process, and Planning 2.0 does that.

Repealing this rule through the CRA is shortsighted and wrongheaded. BLM

Planning 2.0 allows for the very kind of oversight and public input my Republican colleagues claim to want, and helps avoid the costly court battles they complain about.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure and keep Planning 2.0 in place.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, thank you to my colleague from Wyoming for the time and ability to weigh in on this.

Today, I rise in support of the measure for congressional disapproval under the Congressional Review Act for disapproving of the BLM's 2.0 rule.

It is another midnight regulation passed in the final days of the previous administration which undercuts the resource management planning process on public lands by stripping local community input and centralizing, again, in Washington, D.C., the decision-making.

California holds some of the largest amounts of public land in the U.S. The Federal Government has approximately 46 percent of the total land in California, amounting to about 46 million acres. BLM oversees about 15 million acres of those public lands, or about 15 percent of the State's total land mass.

The abundance of natural resources and diversity of landscapes within California creates unique challenges for BLM to even fulfill its multiple-use mandate. It is essential that development of these resource management plans include close coordination with local, State, and tribal governments—the people who actually grew up and know those lands the best for all of the potential these lands could bring, whether it is for development of potential energy or timber management. Whatever those ideas are that they would have, let the locals have the input on it. These decisions need to be made with that local input so that everyone's voice is heard.

□ 1415

In strong rural areas like my own, the First District of California, close coordination between the Federal Government and local groups is vital to have good decisions be made regarding public land management. Unfortunately, what we have is nonmanagement, and we suffer for that each summer and fall with a forestry that is not managed and the inability to have an economic opportunity for those people in those areas.

The 2.0 rule does just the opposite with that collaboration. It strengthens BLM's power once again in Washington, marginalizing Western counties and districts, eliminating their ability to coordinate or challenge BLM's proposed plans in an open setting.

Under the pretext of climate change and landscape scale management, the agency's rule undermines federalism

and allows for the implementation of a previous era environmental agenda. No wonder Modoc County, in my own district, as well as other counties from Western States have sued BLM for its failure to properly engage and coordinate with the public and fulfill what the law requires for the BLM in managing these lands.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LAMALFA. It is time to put an end to the previous administration's legacy to shut out local input by forcing through a rule abrogating for public lands decisions based on unelected bureaucrats in D.C.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my colleague for yielding me time, and I ask for support of this measure.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN), who is a new member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, the BLM's Planning 2.0 initiative has made important, overdue updates to our process for drafting resource management plans.

These plans govern our use of more than 175 million acres of public lands. The way in which we use those lands deeply affects the environmental quality, public health, and all Americans' quality of life. It is vitally important that we get our planning right.

This rule promotes transparency and consensus, creating more and earlier opportunities for public involvement in the planning process. It encourages greater use of high-quality scientific information, and it provides for a big-picture, landscape-level response to challenges like wildfire management and invasive species. The effect is to strengthen, streamline, and democratize a process that had previously bred litigation and delay.

Mr. Speaker, I have to wonder: Which of these changes does my friend across the aisle oppose?

Mr. Speaker, in the last week, the House voted to disapprove three other rules that protect public health and environmental quality. I am disturbed by that pattern, and I am disturbed by the haste with which we have moved, especially since all of these rules took years to create and craft.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the majority to think of their children, their grandchildren, and all the generations to come. They deserve to inherit a rich, healthy, and sustainable world. If we continue down this reckless path, I fear they will not.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), who is the majority leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for her

hard work on this bill and bringing it here today. Most people don't realize just how much land the Federal Government controls, and it is just a fact that someone thousands of miles away in an office in D.C. won't understand those land issues as much as the people who live on the land do.

Now, the sponsor of this bill, Ms. CHENEY, knows that in her great State of Wyoming, they constantly struggle with the Federal Government over land policies, just as California and many Western States do. Federal regulators restrict how we can build, what our farmers can grow, where our ranchers can graze, and how our people can enjoy the beauty of our land.

The Bureau of Land Management's new rule, the innocently named Planning 2.0 rule, imposes Washington's vision on land management over vast areas of the West. This was devised by people who don't live on our land and who don't know our land, and they just try to dictate how to use our land. They are undermining the very idea of multiple use of Federal lands by making the lands entirely off limits for any type of economic purposes.

Under this rule, the Bureau will cut out local and county officials even more. They will consolidate control over 175 million acres of land in 11 States out West, and that is not a small amount of land. Just to put that in perspective, that is over 261 times the size of Rhode Island.

Using the Congressional Review Act today, we will be able to overturn this last-minute power grab from the Obama administration and bring some power back to the people. The American people should have the power back again to write their own future.

I want to thank Congresswoman CHENEY for keeping her word and for standing with Wyoming and all those out west who care for their land and want those locals to be able to control and to understand where it is best to graze, to care, and to build, not somebody in Washington to dictate what to do with it.

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

Mr. Speaker, using the Congressional Review Act to nullify a Federal regulation is indeed a radical move. It has only been done once before this year, but now it has become a regular part of the Republican playbook.

BLM's Planning 2.0 is not some midnight regulation that was rushed through at the last minute. BLM went through a transparent rulemaking process and responded to thousands of comments. We had two hearings last year about Planning 2.0 in the Natural Resources Committee. BLM was only invited by the majority to one of the hearings, but the agency listened and made significant changes before publishing their final rule. This rule took 2.5 years to develop. It is not anywhere near a midnight rule.

It has been over 30 years since BLM updated the regulatory framework governing its planning process. That

means we are relying on Reagan-era rules that were put in place before the widespread availability of cellphones and digital mapping techniques to oversee everything from energy permitting to cultural resource management on over 250 million acres.

Everyone engaged in the management of our public lands wants to see this process improved. Planning 2.0 is that opportunity. However, if this resolution becomes law, BLM will never be allowed to evaluate and modernize this process, and we return to management planning from the 1980s. That is not a good outcome for anybody. The resolution is irresponsible and needs to be rejected.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, on December 12, 2016, the Obama administration published another overreaching midnight regulation in the form of the BLM's new resource management rule, commonly referred to as BLM 2.0. That same day, six Western States filed a lawsuit alleging the new rules will severely impair their ability to work with the BLM on future planning and management issues.

More than 3,350 comments were submitted on BLM's Planning 2.0 rule. Rather than reviewing and incorporating those suggestions, the Obama administration hastily rolled out another midnight regulation that failed to address the technical flaws raised during the public comment period.

Let me be clear: Planning 2.0 takes planning decisions away from local communities and centralizes those decisions with bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. BLM's Planning 2.0 rule is a significant departure from the planning process that has existed more than three decades and allowed significant local government involvement.

Planning 2.0 directs the BLM to perform large, landscape-scale planning efforts that stretch across county lines and State lines. This new regulation allows radical, special interest groups from other States to have the same influence as county and local officials in the planning process.

In many counties in the West, less than 20 percent of the land is privately owned. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, the Bureau of Land Management manages more than 247 million acres of public land and administers about 700 million acres of Federal subsurface mineral estates throughout the Nation.

Rural counties and Western States depend on their ability to use BLM and public lands in order to support their livelihoods. Critical activities like grazing, forest thinning, mining, recreation, responsible energy development—including wind and solar—all take place on these lands and are the lifeblood of many communities. Unfortunately, Planning 2.0 will prevent

many of these uses on BLM lands and cause significant harm to local communities.

The American Farm Bureau Federation supports Representative CHENEY's bill and opposes Planning 2.0, stating: "We . . . are concerned that the Planning 2.0 rule will diminish the statutory requirements multiple use and dismantle the cooperative ideals of Federalism. . . . BLM did not fully evaluate the impacts on consumers, public lands-dependent ranching families, energy, mining, recreation, and rural communities across the American West."

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, who is key voting in support of the bill, stated: "This Obama administration 'midnight regulation' undercuts States from fulfilling their role as managers of resources and land use decisions. The shift in authority away from local planning and land management will inherently jeopardize jobs throughout the West in industries ranging from timber, energy, mineral development, grazing, and recreation."

Western Energy Alliance has also raised serious concerns about BLM 2.0 and has urged adoption of Representative CHENEY's bill, stating: "Besides delaying oil and natural gas development indefinitely, Planning 2.0 would prevent ranching, mining, timber harvesting, and other productive uses of the West's working landscapes that sustain rural communities and livelihoods."

Americans for Prosperity, who is key voting in support of the bill, stated: "The process outlined by the Planning 2.0 rule is highly problematic—it limits public involvement in decisionmaking, centralizes planning in Washington rather than in State and field offices, redefines BLM's interpretation of the 'multiple use' requirement, prioritizes conservation over sustained yield, i.e. mineral leasing, and could further lengthen an already long permitting process."

The National Association of Conservation Districts supports the bill, stating: "The CRA allows for the BLM to go back to the drawing board and write a planning rule that truly increases local government involvement as opposed to centralizing the planning process."

Again, the BLM Planning 2.0 rule takes planning decisions away from local governments and, instead, allows those important decisions to be made by bureaucrats in Washington who aren't familiar with our land, water, or communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of Representative CHENEY's commonsense bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, when you don't look at the whole field, you make mistakes. Without using their vision, quarterbacks throw passes into double coverage and Presidents trigger angry protests of their ill-conceived policies.

Seeing the whole field is what BLM 2.0 is all about.

Instead of managing lands by looking at isolated units and only soliciting the input of local governments, this new framework takes a landscape view of BLM's multiple use mission. This update is absolutely necessary if we expect BLM to address the problems we all acknowledge the agency has. Climate change, wildfire, drought, and invasive species are just some of the problems that need landscape-level solutions. On the flip side, coordinating planning for outdoor recreation and renewable energy development across multiple BLM units will help increase the growth of these industries.

Rejecting landscape-level planning is like rejecting air traffic control; you can do it, but the results won't be pretty. By repealing this rule and locking a broken system in place in perpetuity, Republicans hope to fulfill their own prophecy that BLM does a poor job managing public lands. If enough people believe them, they think, then maybe they will achieve their goal of giving away America's public lands. The problem, though, is that not enough people believe them. Those who do are shrinking every day, and the ones who don't are making their voices heard.

People who care about sound management of BLM lands know that the Planning 2.0 rule is an important step forward. They know it isn't an abuse of executive authority or a government land grab, and they are tired of hearing from discredited voices who say it is. These views are backward looking and ignore the fact that these lands belong to a kid from Chicago just as much as they do to an oilman from Wyoming.

Landscape-scale planning allows BLM, with the input of all stakeholders, to manage across the lands. Under Planning 2.0, BLM State offices and the scientists and the land management professionals they employ are finally allowed to build a consistent land management policy that doesn't stop at the State line.

Planning 2.0 helps our land managers see the whole field and looks to the future. The majority wants to send us back to the past. We shouldn't allow that to happen.

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

□ 1430

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, after serving on a school board, in my State legislature, and now in Congress, I have witnessed firsthand that government works better when it is closest to the people. That is why I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 44, which disapproves the Bureau of Land Management's 2.0 Planning rule.

I commend the gentlewoman from Wyoming for introducing this legislation on behalf of her constituents as

well as Americans all across the country that desire more effective government.

The Planning 2.0 rule will fundamentally change the way land management decisions are made, and I believe it will fundamentally change them for the worse. Planning 2.0 puts faith in a far-away, Washington-based one-size-fits-all approach to land management decisions.

BLM has a light footprint in my home State of Arkansas, but last year I had the opportunity to attend a field hearing in St. George, Utah. I saw firsthand the mismanagement by the BLM and how it impacts real people.

Individuals from Washington County, Utah, told our field hearing of the heavy-handed approach BLM takes toward local landowners in management decisions. Local officials talked about how BLM has also ignored the will of Congress by ensuring updated resource management plans decrease grazing permits or effectively stop the construction of roads that are authorized in Federal legislation. Land management changes should be made in a collaborative way, with ample State and local input.

Despite what some people may think, Congress and Congress' will still matters. Planning 2.0 marginalizes State and local officials in favor of unelected bureaucrats and special interests. By passing H.J. Res. 44, we will remind Federal agencies that they work for the people.

Mr. Speaker, we are not a people of the government, by the government, and for the government. We have a government that is supposed to be of the people, by the people, and for the people. The people's voice should be heard in major land management decisions. H.J. Res. 44 will make the BLM listen to their voice.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 13½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, using the CRA to repeal this rule would freeze Federal land managers and the places they manage in 1983. That is the year the previous rule was written, and that is the rule we would be stuck with if this resolution passes.

Voting for this resolution means voting for outdated science; it means voting for a return to managing individual parcels with blinders on to the larger landscape; and it means continuing to ignore our changing climate.

Overtaking BLM 2.0 means you are okay with ignoring the overwhelming scientific and public support for the planning updates implemented in the rule.

Don't get me wrong, Mr. Speaker. There were plenty of great things from the early 1980s: movies like "Return of

the Jedi" and those early cell phones that were the size of bricks. And don't forget the fashions of the 1980s. I am sure people thought they looked great in parachute pants, but eventually we all updated our wardrobes.

We might have had early cell phones back in the 1980s, but we didn't have modern computing, current technologies for mapping, or even GPS. There is no doubt that it is time to update our land use planning to take advantage of these technologies and respond to new challenges and to current times.

So why are congressional Republicans so interested in blasting us back to the past? Why are they so eager to throw away 2½ years of public input into a modern, transparent, science-driven planning process?

They allege some local counties aren't happy, but we have got letters from counties saying that they support the rule, and thousands of pages of comments from the agency demonstrating that they responded to any concerns. This can't be the real motivation, Mr. Speaker.

No, the true purpose of this resolution is to tie the hands of Federal land managers so they can't manage special places in ways that might hinder pollution or cut down on private profiteering. Apparently, congressional Republicans have decided to give Representative ZINKE a parting gift as he leaves to be Secretary of the Interior. That gift is a pair of handcuffs.

If you have updated your wardrobe or your cell phone since 1983, or if you enjoy the luxury of Google Maps or GPS, I urge you to oppose this resolution because it fails to update our ability to protect our precious public lands.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the BLM 2.0 rule represents the turning back of a clock of ignoring science, ignoring the need for public participation.

Although Republicans claim they want to take power away from government and give it to the people, why do they oppose every attempt to actually do that?

They don't want the people to use citizen suits to hold polluters accountable. They don't want the people to use the NEPA process to ensure government actions aren't harming their communities. Today, they don't want the people to have increased participation in managing our public lands.

The reason, of course, is that Republicans don't want all people to have a seat at the table. They only want certain people to be there.

In this case, the old BLM planning process gave local governments in the West—many of which are cozy with mining, drilling, and grazing interests—a privileged position in influ-

encing land management planning. Given that these public lands belong to all Americans and not just those who happen to live close to them, that approach was wrong.

BLM's Planning 2.0 rule changes that, leveling the playing field and allowing more stakeholders and interested parties to get involved earlier.

Under BLM's new rule, tribes, local governments, and stakeholders across the spectrum who care about these places where they work, recreate, hunt, fish, and live are all now encouraged to provide input at the outset instead of waiting until the bitter end. This will save time and money, reduce litigation, and generally make government work better.

So why would Republicans oppose it?

Hunters, anglers, and others who value the outdoors are asking the same question and are lining up in opposition to this misguided resolution and other bills that would reduce their access to public land.

The people have grown wise to the Republican crusade to give away ownership of and authority over their lands to States, localities, and private interests. They have grown very weary of that. They understand that this resolution is part of that crusade.

So Republicans have a choice. They can continue doing favors for the dirty development interests of the past or they can embrace policies like BLM 2.0 and use it to give a boost to the ongoing jobs boom in sectors like solar, wind, and outdoor recreation. For the sake of Western economies and landscapes, I hope they choose the latter.

Planning 2.0 finally recognizes the value of the public's voice in the planning process. Let's not silence them.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, at its heart, this rule is about one thing. It is about taking power away from local officials, including local BLM officials, and moving that power to Washington, D.C., to faceless bureaucrats who sit in cubicles here in this city and make decisions that have enormous impacts upon families and upon individuals. In many cases, these bureaucrats have never been to the States, and may never be.

There is a county in my district that is 97 percent controlled by the Federal Government. I have two counties that are 90 percent controlled by the Federal Government. So many of the decisions that are made that impact these counties and these families are made in Washington rather than at the local level. That is what we are here today to talk about: this egregious consolidation and power by D.C. bureaucrats.

The Bureau of Land Management's final rule is exactly that—a snapshot of everything that is wrong with the previous administration. The rule is so flawed that a couple of administrative

fixes simply won't fix it. It has to be repealed.

The previous rule was on the book for decades. This rule was introduced and finalized in less than a year. Thousands of comments were intended to fix flawed reasoning in the rule. State and county commissioners' comments were largely ignored. Let's remember, those State and county commissioners represent the people. They understand the needs of the people.

Once again, 2.0 moves all of that decisionmaking out of the local office and back here to Washington, D.C. These D.C. bureaucrats don't have the on-the-ground knowledge of the situation; they don't know the land, they don't know the needs of the county, and they don't know the people.

That is not the only instance of diluting local voices. Planning 2.0 also undercuts the involvement of counties and other local government agencies by inviting distant voices to the planning table who would steer resource management plans away from multiple use early on in the planning process. This is a 180-degree turn from previous planning regulations.

Not only did 2.0 dilute local control, it also dilutes real local impacts. Let me explain what that means. When you look at local impacts instead of looking at the actual communities around where these decisions are being made, they can look out very broadly.

In my case, you look at a national park in Utah. They can look at the impacts of that and say, well, this has had a positive benefit, but that is because they may be looking at a community that is 100 miles away. They may be looking at St. George.

Why not look at Las Vegas? Why not look at Los Angeles and say, Oh, those communities are doing fine; the local economic impacts have been positive?

It is not a fair reflection of what is happening to the local communities. Once again, the local people, the local families.

While many lauded the BLM for giving this planning process an update—and I am glad that it did; it was necessary—they fell short of delivering a final rule that helps people. That is why I join in this effort to repeal it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in opposition to this resolution. These letters come from a broad array of stakeholders, including sportsmen, county commissioners, county supervisors, and conservationists, highlighting the breadth and depth of support for Planning 2.0.

FEBRUARY 6, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As organizations committed to preserving our nation's historic and cultural resources, we urge you to OPOSE the Congressional Review Act resolution (H.J. Res. 44) to nullify the Bureau of Land Management's final planning rule, commonly referred to as BLM Planning 2.0.

The Congressional Review Act is the wrong tool to address resource management planning. While no regulation is perfect, using

the Congressional Review Act to overturn the Planning 2.0 rule would have far-reaching implications for cultural resources and management of our public lands. This resolution of disapproval would prohibit the BLM from developing any "substantially similar" regulation in the future. The result would be to replace the new regulation with BLM's prior planning rule, which is more than 30 years old and does not incorporate current technology and streamlining practices to maximize efficient and effective decision-making. Locking in inefficient and outdated regulations does not serve any users of our public lands.

The BLM's Planning 2.0 rule is designed to bring much needed efficiency, predictability, and transparency to BLM's management of multiple uses on public lands. The rule is carefully crafted to collect state and local government, tribal, and public input early in the planning process. In addition to making BLM's planning more efficient, improving available information allows project developers to consider potential impacts to environmental, cultural, and historic resources at the outset rather than being surprised by stakeholder concerns and information identified late in the process. The rule also improves the planning process by reducing the need for costly and time-consuming supplements that can delay decision-making and inhibit private sector investment.

The BLM's Planning 2.0 rule updates procedures for developing individual resource management plans that guide actions and decisions on the nearly 250 million surface acres and more than 700 million acres of subsurface mineral resources that the agency manages. These lands contain the largest, most diverse, and scientifically most important body of cultural resources of any federal land management agency, including well over a million historic, archaeological, and other cultural sites. Our organizations remain committed to promoting a responsible land management planning process that enhances public involvement, improves transparency, and promotes sound, efficient decision-making based on full information, including better data on cultural resources on our public lands.

If the resolution passes, it will make management of our public lands less efficient and less effective. Again, we urge you to OPOSE the Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn the BLM Planning 2.0 rule. Sincerely,

National Trust for Historic Preservation; American Anthropological Association; American Cultural Resources Association; Archaeology Southwest; Arizona Preservation Foundation; Cienega Watershed Partnership; City of Kingman, AZ; Coalition for American Heritage; Colorado Plateau Archaeological Alliance; Conservation Lands Foundation; Friends of Cedar Mesa.

Friends of Organ Mountains Desert Peaks; Friends of the Agua Fria National Monument; Friends of the Cliffs; Modern Phoenix; Montana Preservation Alliance; National Association of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers; Nevada Preservation Foundation; Site Steward Foundation; Society for American Archaeology; Washington Trust for Historic Preservation.

February 6, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, we urge you to Vote NO on H.J. Res. 44, the Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolution to rescind the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) Planning 2.0 regulation. This resolution is an extreme and unnecessary response to a sensible and overdue rule.

H.R. Res. 44 would invalidate a new, collaborative, science-based approach to land

use planning that boosts public engagement, improves administrative efficiency, and increases responsiveness in planning on our largest public land system. It allows managers to move beyond an outdated 30-year-old process to better address pressing challenges posed by critical issues, such as wildfire, invasive species and increased demand for domestic energy. More specifically, this new guidance:

Increases efficiency and public participation in planning. The BLM rule will save taxpayer dollars, shorten planning times, and avoid disputes by investing time upfront to collaborate with locals and stakeholders on prospective management strategies. Public voices will help develop plans with improved opportunities for participation, new electronic options for submitting input, and updated processes for filing plan protests—improving the likelihood that the plans meet Americans' broad array of conservation and resource needs.

Preserves priority status for local government in planning. The new rule carefully preserves a priority role for local government and other cooperators in BLM planning processes as directed by Congress, ensuring that final plans consider local and regional perspectives and priorities.

Increases transparency in planning. The rule will prevent closed door decision making between the BLM and special interests by updating guidance that provides the American people the ability to participate in the planning process at all stages.

Improves science-based decision making in planning. High quality data will be a foundation for BLM planning and management. Planning 2.0 will incorporate current science, geospatial data and technology to evaluate landscapes at the regional level. These changes will enable faster response to today's environmental, economic and social realities with new evaluation markers and agency flexibility to plan across traditional administrative boundaries, keeping our lands great places to hike, hunt, and fish.

Supports sporting pursuits on BLM lands. Hunters and anglers support Planning 2.0 because the rule takes steps to ensure that important habitats, such as migration corridors and other intact habitats, are identified early in the planning process so these important areas can be managed and conserved as the agency makes decisions about other public land uses.

Overturning this common sense rule will relegate hundreds of millions of acres of public lands to planning under an out-of-date rule that has not been substantially changed since 1983. The public will lose opportunities to participate in how these public lands—owned by all Americans—should be managed. Without the new rule, public land management will continue to be contentious, inefficient and costly.

Finally, if the rule is struck down by the CRA, the BLM could be prohibited from issuing a similar rule in the future, preventing the agency from modernizing its land use planning regulation to adequately address contemporary issues like energy development, grazing, wildlife, mining, conservation, recreation, cultural resources protection or any of the many multiple uses that occur on our public lands.

Planning 2.0 is a sensible and much needed rule that updates an antiquated process that limited management decisions to outdated concepts of resource planning, and instead creates a framework to support more inclusive, comprehensive planning and management on our public lands. We urge you to stand up to protect the new planning rule and to Vote NO on H.J. Res. 44.

Sincerely,
Alaska Wilderness League; American Bird Conservancy; Center for Biological Diversity; Defenders of Wildlife; Friends of the

Sonoran Desert; Grand Canyon Trust; GreenLatinos; League of Conservation Voters; Los Padres ForestWatch. National Parks Conservation Association; National Trust for Historic Preservation; Natural Resources Defense Council; Partnership for the National Trails System; Sierra Club; The Nature Conservancy; The Wilderness Society; Wilderness Workshop.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT,
Eureka, California, June 22, 2016.

NEIL KORNZE,
Director, Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, DC.

Subject: BLM's Proposed Resource Management Planning Rules ("Planning 2.0").

DEAR DIRECTOR KORNZE: Humboldt County includes over 86,000 acres of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) parcels, including such special places as the King Range National Conservation Area and Headwaters Forest Reserve. The stewardship of these lands is very important to my constituents, other local residents, and countless visitors to this region. It is a matter of great concern to many of us when the BLM begins to develop individual management plans for these parcels.

The BLM's Proposed Resource Management Planning Rule described at 81 Federal Register 8674 (February 25, 2016), commonly known as Planning 2.0, requires the agency to involve the public, other federal agencies, state and local governments and tribes as key partners early in the process of developing local plans. Encouraging public involvement early and often in the development of these plans is a very positive step indeed. This is especially important given that the BLM's Arcata Field Office will be using this new and more inclusive approach to public involvement as it revises its existing 1995 Resource Management Plan. I am therefore pleased to offer my support for Planning 2.0.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

RYAN SUNDBERG,
5th District Supervisor.

LEWIS & CLARK COUNTY,
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Helena, Montana.

Re the Bureau of Land Management's Proposed Resource Management Planning Rules, 81 Fed. Reg. 8674 (February 25, 2016).

NEIL KORNZE,
Director, Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR KORNZE: The Lewis and Clark County Board of County Commissioners offer this letter of support for provisions of the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM's) Proposed Resource Management Planning Rules, 81 Fed. Reg. 8674 (Feb. 25, 2016) (the Proposed Rules). We appreciate the effort to improve opportunities for public involvement earlier in the planning processes, including the chance to review preliminary resource management alternatives and preliminary rationales for those alternatives.

We value our relationship with our federal partners, and our constituents are impacted greatly by actions taken by your agency. Increasing access to the planning process and targeting your efforts towards greater public involvement enhances the relationship between the people and their government, and we support your initiative.

Additionally, we note that the Proposed Rules also expand opportunities for states and local governments to have meaningful involvement in the development of BLM's land use decisions. The Proposed Rules continue to provide for coordination with state

and local representatives in order to ensure, to the extent available under federal law, that RMPs are consistent with state and local land use plans, as provided in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL MURRAY,
Chairman.
SUSAN GOAD GEISE,
Vice Chair.
ANDY HUNTHAUSEN,
Member.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Missoula, MT, May 23, 2016.

Re Proposed Resource Management Planning Rules, 81 Fed. Reg. 8674.

Director NEIL KORNZE,
Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR KORNZE: We are writing you to commend you and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for your efforts to improve BLM's planning process (Planning 2.0) and better address the diverse interests found in Missoula County and other communities across the western United States.

Missoula County is approximately 2,600 square miles in size, and federal management in the county accounts for 52 percent of the land ownership. The BLM manages roughly 23,000 acres for the public in Missoula County and the sustainable management of these public lands is vitally important to the residents we represent. Our citizens and local economies depend on state and federal lands for water quality and quantity, as well as for multiple sustainable uses ranging from outdoor recreation to livestock grazing to mineral exploration and development. Consequently, we wish to thank the BLM for proposing to address their land management options from a landscape perspective. This approach recognizes that the management of federal lands has a direct impact on other properties well beyond those close to or adjacent to BLM managed land.

We support the provisions of the BLM's Proposed Resource Management Planning Rules, 81 Fed. Reg. 8674 (Feb. 25, 2016). These rules provide additional opportunities for public involvement earlier in the planning process, including the chance to review preliminary resource management alternatives and preliminary rationales for those alternatives. This early public involvement will help resolve conflicts and produce a Resource Management Plan that better reflect the needs of our citizens as well as others who use the public lands and have a stake in their future. Equally important is the improved openness and transparency the rules bring to the process, allowing any local government to actively participate and share information on issues critical to local residents and their elected representatives.

The proposed rules continue to provide for coordination with state and local representatives in order to ensure, to the extent allowable under federal law, that Resource Management Plans are consistent with state and local land use plans, as provided in the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

Thank you for considering our comments. If you or your staff have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS,
NICOLE ROWLEY,
Chair.
JEAN CURTISS,
Commissioner.
STACY RYE,
Commissioner.

THE PEW

CHARITABLE TRUSTS,
Washington, DC, February 2, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Next week the House of Representatives will consider H.J. Res 44, a resolution to overturn the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) 2016 land-use planning rule. The Pew Charitable Trusts opposes this effort to reduce agency transparency and limit the public's ability to have a say in how their public lands are managed, and we urge you to vote against it.

BLM's rule, often called "Planning 2.0," establishes procedures for preparing, revising, or amending land use plans, and provides new opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the early stages of developing plans. This means that states and counties, scientists, ranchers, hunters and anglers, miners, hikers, boaters, the energy industry and other users of the public lands will have more information on what a plan will cover and will be able to express their hopes and concerns about the plan.

Increased public participation will ensure that the BLM has the best available information at the start of the planning process, before issuing draft management plans. The broad consideration of issues at this earlier stage is expected to reduce controversy later in the planning process, and reduce litigation after the plan is issued.

Planning 2.0 also includes steps to ensure that important fish and wildlife habitats, such as migration corridors and intact habitats, are identified early in the planning process so these important areas can be managed and conserved as the agency makes decisions about development, recreation and other public land uses.

The rule also includes good government provisions such as improved potential for better interagency communication, and steps that increase efficiency and ease burdens on public.

Many concerns that were raised about an earlier draft of the rule were addressed and corrected in the final rule. For example, the public comment period once a draft plan is released is now 100 days—more than the previous 1983 regulations or the original 2015 proposal allowed. The final rule also takes meaningful steps to accommodate requests from local governments and the public to improve the process, preserving the special role of state, local and tribal cooperating agencies, as specifically required by the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act.

Passage of H.J. Res 44 would force BLM to return to its previous, long-outdated planning rule, which was published in 1983. Of additional concern is that the Congressional Review Act prohibits the agency from writing a new rule that is "substantially the same" without additional legislative action. As a result, many good aspects of Planning 2.0 would be precluded from being enacted indefinitely, thereby stripping incoming Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke of his authority to reformulate the rule.

We strongly urge Members to work with the new administration to make refinements to a planning process that many stakeholders championed. If H.J. Res 44 is enacted, the BLM would be forced to continue using outdated guidelines for land-use planning, which keep the public and development interests alike in the dark until very late in the planning process.

If you would like further information regarding Pew's position on this resolution, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

KEN RAIT,
Director U.S. Public Lands.

CHAIRMAN ROB BISHOP,
Natural Resources Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Ranking Member RAÚL GRIJALVA,
Natural Resources Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP AND RANKING MEMBER GRIJALVA: The undersigned hunting, fishing, conservation, natural resource professional and outdoor-industry organizations represent millions of American sportsmen and women, and we are writing to express our support for the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) recently revised land-use planning rule, also known as Planning 2.0. The revised planning rule increases federal agency transparency and incorporates best practices in land-use planning, while maintaining the important cooperating agency role of state and local governments.

Stakeholders from across the multiple-use spectrum agreed that the previous BLM planning process could be improved. Under the outdated process, opportunities for public involvement were too few, and the public didn't learn about agency plans until they were already proposed.

With the new rule, the BLM provides three additional opportunities for cooperating agency and public involvement. These extra steps enable the BLM to gather public opinion and the best available information at the start of the planning process, then vet preliminary alternatives before issuing the draft resource management plan.

Further, the revised planning rule will identify important areas for fish, wildlife and outdoor recreation well in advance of plan development so that avoidance and minimization of impacts to these vital areas can be achieved as the agency plans for a range of uses of the land through individual plans. Given advancements in wildlife science and data collection since the previous planning rule was created more than 30 years ago, these updates were sorely needed, and the sporting and wildlife communities support this revision.

Finally, local, state, and tribal governments, including county commissioners, will retain their preexisting cooperating agency status and an elevated level of involvement in BLM land-use planning as specifically required by the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act. In fact, significant changes were made to the final planning rule in response to requests from cooperating agencies.

The new rule is the product of two and a half years of collaboration and is a productive step towards improving BLM planning. If additional improvements are necessary, the undersigned organizations are committed to working with the new Secretary of Interior, interested lawmakers and stakeholders to make such adjustments. However, Congressional actions to delay or dismiss the new BLM planning rule are unnecessary and counterproductive.

Sincerely,

American Fly Fishing Trade Association; Archery Trade Association; Backcountry Hunters & Anglers; Hispanic Access Foundation; Izaak Walton League of America; Muley Fanatic Foundation; National Wildlife Federation; Northwest Steelheaders; Oregon Hunters Association.

Outdoor Industry Association; Pheasants Forever; Public Lands Foundation; Quail Forever; Snook and Gamefish Foundation; The Nature Conservancy; Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership; The Wildlife Society; Trout Unlimited; Wildlife Management Institute.

WILD CONNECTIONS,

Colorado Springs, CO, February 6, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Tomorrow, the House of Representatives will vote on

H.J. Res 44, to overturn Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) new land use planning rule, "Planning 2.0", established in 2016. Wild Connections opposes this resolution and we urge you to vote against an effort that will reduce agency transparency, limit the amount of input that the public has on their public lands, and lose strong management designations for wildlife and ecological biodiversity. Wild Connections is an organization that has been promoting landscape connectivity on a watershed and ecoregion-wide basis for over 20 years and which has been actively involved in the management plan revision for the BLM's Royal Gorge Field Office, which is currently under way. As a locally based conservation organization, we believe that it is important for citizens to have opportunities to work with the BLM to decide future management for these millions of acres of public land. Planning 2.0 is a step in the right direction.

BLM's Planning 2.0 makes BLM land use management planning more collaborative and transparent. It offers more and new opportunities for stakeholders to get involved, including local governments, Indian tribes, and the general public. Planning 2.0 engages the public earlier in the land management planning process leading to more input into the process, enabling the BLM with the best available information at the onset of the planning process. More and earlier public involvement will not only broaden the scope of the plan, but will likely reduce litigation after the plan is enacted.

This new planning rule is also important for fish and wildlife habitat. Migration corridors and intact habitats are identified early in the planning process so that these important areas can be managed and conserved as the agency makes decisions about development, recreation and other public land uses. Hunters and anglers support Planning 2.0 as the rule offers wildlife corridors as a management designation, for a key type of wildlife habitat or an area of ecological importance.

As you know, the BLM's ongoing Eastern Colorado Resource Management Plan Revision has incorporated parts of the Planning 2.0 planning rule. Wild Connections and our members have benefited from the "envisioning meetings" in 6 towns and cities within the planning area, offering the public opportunities to voice their concerns and comments in preparation for the full planning effort. The BLM has received positive comments from a diverse voice of users, including outfitters, horse-packers, grazing lessees, environmental organizations, wildlife groups, hunters, anglers, snowmobilers, off-highway vehicle users, and mining claimants.

If H.J. Res 44 is passed, the BLM would return to its long-outdated planning rule, which was established in 1983. Of additional concern is that the Congressional Review Act prohibits the agency from writing a new rule that is "substantially the same" without additional legislative action. Thus many important aspects of Planning 2.0 would be precluded from being enacted indefinitely in the reformulation of the rule.

We strongly urge Members to work with the new administration to make refinements to this planning process that many stakeholders have championed. Please vote against H.J. Res 44 so—that we do not lose these important BLM planning aspects that were just carefully constructed under Planning 2.0.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. LOCKHART,

President.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Congressional Republicans have a scorched Earth policy

when it comes to anything originated under President Obama. It is the same approach with the Affordable Care Act. They want to completely destroy it, regardless of any merits.

The majority is not spending all this time and effort simply to repeal this planning rule. This is one of the steps in their massive campaign to convince Americans that Barack Obama wasn't a good President. They simply can't stand to allow the accomplishments of the previous administration to stand, so they reflexively strike out to destroy anything President Obama supported.

This is not legislating. It is certainly not public service, and it isn't even smart. To paraphrase a former Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn: anybody can kick down a barn; it takes a carpenter to build one.

This isn't how our government is supposed to work. It is especially counterproductive when it comes to something like Planning 2.0, which is specifically designed to make a Federal agency more efficient and more transparent.

The BLM rule is about bringing our land use plans into the 21st century. It is about local input. It is about using the best available science. The majority wants to return to 1983 so that polluters and developers are the only ones with a seat at the table.

We should support BLM 2.0, reject this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have nearly 100 State and local groups supporting repeal of BLM 2.0. These are groups like the National Association of Counties, National Association of Conservation Districts, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Public Lands Council, Western Energy Alliance, National Mining Association, Petroleum Association of Wyoming, as well as a number of Governors and local officials, including my home State Governor, Matt Mead.

Mr. Speaker, I include a letter from Governor Mead in support of this joint resolution and a joint letter from numerous other governmental and association groups in support of this joint resolution.

THE STATE OF WYOMING,

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,

Wyoming, January 20, 2017.

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

Hon. STEVE SCALISE,
House Majority Whip, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN, MAJORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, AND MAJORITY WHIP SCALISE: The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) recently published a final rule amending regulations that establish procedures for Resource Management Planning (RMP) (43 CFR Part 1600). The final rule decreases the BLM's accountability for cooperating with state and local

governments. Specifically, it minimizes state and local government plans, programs and policies and the important role these entities should play in final RMP decisions.

This rule is a prime candidate for Congressional analysis under the Congressional Review Act (CRA). I ask that you bring this rule to the full House for consideration under the CRA for a floor debate. The BLM can and must involve state and local governments in RMP decisions and it must respect the role of state and local governments.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW H. MEAD,
Governor.

JANUARY 26, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

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

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

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

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: As representatives of state and local governments and public lands stakeholders from across the United States, we encourage Congress to use its legislative authority to review the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) Planning 2.0 rule. As partners with the federal government, we continue to encourage the BLM to engage in meaningful collaboration with local stakeholders during the development of policies and guidelines. And despite representations by the BLM to do just that, we remain unconvinced that Planning 2.0 in its final form does much to satisfy the objective of meaningful collaboration and consultation with non-federal governmental entities.

Robust coordination and cooperation between states and local governments and the BLM allows federal decision-makers to be responsive to the concerns of state and local government officials during policy development and sets the stage for more effective and efficient implementation of federal policies by involving multi-jurisdictional resources and expertise. Simply put, gathering meaningful, on the ground, input from the states and localities that will be most impacted by BLM's planning regulations is critical to ensuring a practical federal policy that works at the local level.

For years to come, the proposed Planning 2.0 rule will have a substantial impact on how the BLM engages with state and local government and manages its 245 million acres of public lands and 700 million acres of subsurface minerals. We encourage Congress to act to ensure BLM's Planning 2.0 rule does not go into effect and instruct the agency to work with intergovernmental partners to ensure the policy has benefited from meaningful, on the ground, collaboration with state and local governments.

Sincerely,

Alaska Municipal League; American Sheep Industry Association; Arizona Association of Counties; Arizona County Supervisors Association; Association of Oregon Counties; Eureka County, Nevada; National Association of Conservation Districts; National Association of Counties; National Association of State Departments of Agriculture; National Cattlemen's Beef Association; Nevada Association of Conservation Districts.

Nevada Association of Counties; Oregon Association of Conservation Districts;

Public Lands Council; Rural County Representatives of California; Utah Association of Conservation Districts; Utah Association of Counties; Western Interstate Region of NACo; Wyoming Association of Conservation Districts; Wyoming County Commissioners Association; Wyoming Stock Growers Association; Wyoming Wool Growers Association.

□ 1445

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, we know that government that is closest to the people is best. What we have seen over the last 8 years, unfortunately, in Washington, D.C., has been a massive expansion of the authority and the overreach of the Federal Government under the Obama administration. We have seen a number of instances where agencies have acted outside of the law, in some instances outside of the Constitution.

BLM 2.0 is an example of where this agency is acting completely outside of the law. There is absolutely no legal authority, no statutory language on which they can base this rulemaking, on which they can base the fundamental changes that they are making and the fundamental power grab that they are making.

It is hugely important for us, as we go forward here, to make sure that we have done everything we can to roll back regulations that are really killing our jobs, that are preventing people in our local communities from being able to make a living, from being able to consistently graze, for example, on these public lands. It is absolutely outside of the law to have a situation, as 2.0 would create, where people who have never been to these lands, people who, frankly, may not even be in the United States, have just as much a say in how we manage our lands as a rancher who has got to graze on those lands or as the county commissioners who are charged with making decisions about those lands.

A number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have mentioned today the thousands of comments that the BLM sought as they were going through this rulemaking process. The problem is that there is very little evidence that any of those comments were taken into account in the final rulemaking. As I mentioned earlier, the track record with respect to the BLM listening to and being willing to take into account local concerns is a very bad one in which you have got State agencies that are led to believe they will have an impact and then find themselves having radio silence, essentially, from the BLM.

Mr. Speaker, Planning 2.0 is a dangerous and damaging rule. Overturning it today, through the Congressional Review Act, through this joint resolution, will enable us to begin to restore authority where it belongs: with our local communities, with our local elected officials. Those who are closest to the land, those who have to work on the land, those who make a living on

the land are the absolute best stewards of our land and of our resources.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this measure to repeal BLM Planning 2.0.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 91, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO TEACHER PREPARATION ISSUES

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 91, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 91, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 58

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues (published at 81 Fed. Reg. 75494 (October 31, 2016)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 58.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 58. The purpose of the resolution under consideration is simple: reining in the Federal role in education and protecting State and local control promised to students, parents, and education leaders.

Under the Higher Education Act, teacher preparation programs are required to provide certain information to State leaders to help determine the effectiveness of those programs. The State then submits an annual report card to the Department of Education that highlights the quality of their teacher preparation programs. Additionally, the Higher Education Act provides TEACH Grants to high-achieving students who commit to teaching math, science, reading, or a foreign language at high-needs schools. To ensure taxpayer dollars are being used responsibly, the law requires that grant recipients attend an institution that provides high-quality teacher preparation and professional development services.

In 2012, the Obama administration began a rulemaking process to develop Federal criteria for State teacher preparation report cards. For the first time, and without congressional authorization, the rule that came out of that process tied eligibility for TEACH Grants to the State's teacher preparation report card. That flawed and controversial rule is the reason we are here today.

We all agree that accountability is important, particularly when it comes to ensuring our students receive the high-quality education they deserve. However, it is also important that State and local leaders have the flexibility they need to make decisions that affect the schools and programs in their local communities.

Teacher preparation should be addressed through reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, not unilaterally by executive fiat. That is exactly what the Obama administration did by forcing its one-size-fits-all approach to education on teacher preparation programs. The rule requires States to track new teachers across three performance levels: student learning outcomes, employment outcomes, and employer surveys. In doing so, it essentially creates a Federal mandate for teacher evaluations that Congress explicitly rejected with the Every Student Succeeds Act. The regulation assumes the Federal Government knows better than local education leaders when it comes to what makes an effective teacher. And to make matters worse, it will also result in fewer teachers opting to teach students in low-income neighborhoods and schools.

Teachers play an important role in helping students learn and succeed both in and out of the classroom. Unfortunately, as it did so often, the Obama administration overreached and

took a flawed approach to preparing teachers to meet the needs of their students. The teacher preparation rule blatantly ignores the principles guiding recent bipartisan education reforms and will make it more difficult for State and local leaders to help ensure teachers are ready to succeed.

The resolution under consideration, H.J. Res. 58, will block the implementation of this misguided policy and protect State and local control over decisions affecting their teachers and students. The Federal Government has played too large a role in education for far too long. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this resolution and help rein in the Federal Government's role in education.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 58, which would dismantle key protections of teacher preparation programs. Unfortunately, this joint resolution is part of a much larger effort by my colleagues to remove crucial safeguards from the education sector and move us backwards.

In my time on the San Diego School Board, the California legislature, and the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, I found one thing to be a constant: studies find time and time again that a quality teacher makes the most important impact on a child's success in school.

So I am finding it difficult to understand why anyone would support this joint resolution that decreases the quality of the very programs responsible for training our teachers.

H.J. Res. 58 undoes years of hard work on both sides of the aisle to develop vital safeguards that ensure transparency and quality in teacher preparation programs. This provision plays a significant role in ensuring that teaching programs across the country work with educators to develop curriculum that trains teachers most effectively. Beyond this specific protection, it is important to keep in mind the damage that Congressional Review Acts can do to key safeguards on the books.

H.J. Res. 58 takes away the possibility of the Department of Education coming back to rethink these protections and takes a sword to the language where a scalpel should be used.

I know that many of my colleagues have concerns about the burdens that these protections have on our schools. Rightly so. But it is important to remember that, behind many of these safeguards, there is a student whose future is at stake.

I have heard countless stories from students in my district who have been defrauded by schools that they trusted with their time and their money. I think it is important to remind my colleagues across the aisle that those are the people who we have been elected to

serve, students who seek higher education as a means to a brighter future and often find themselves no better off at the end of years of hard work.

So if my Republican colleagues want to discuss changes to the teacher preparation program provisions when we hopefully reauthorize the Higher Education Act this Congress, I am certainly open to having that discussion. If they want to get creative about increasing the quality and the efficiency of our schools, I will be the first person to sit down and have those discussions.

But if they want to deregulate just for the sake of deregulation, well, I have to stand up for our students. If they want to, as Jerry Falwell recently implied, undo vital components of title 9 safeguards against sexual assault on our campuses, I am hopeful that my colleagues from both sides of the aisle will refuse.

Mr. Speaker, we were elected to this House to protect all of our constituents, including the most vulnerable members of our society. Nowhere is that more critical than where it pertains to the young people who are the most important investments that we can make as a country.

For every student who is defrauded by a school, not given an opportunity because of their socioeconomic background, or drowning in debt, we are holding back one more person who could be contributing to our economy and to our society. We are giving one more person the wrong start in their adult lives, and the impact of that debt often affects their parents, their spouses, and children for years.

I hope that my colleagues realize that it is in our best interest to protect students and not corporations. That it is in our best interest to safeguard equity and accessibility in our schools, and not for-profit schools who donate millions to encourage deregulation.

I am hopeful that instead of taking an ax to the many protections that we developed for our students, my colleagues will join me in discussing the most responsible way, the best way that we can increase quality and efficiency in our schools.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE.)

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 58, which nullifies the teacher preparation issues rule finalized by the Department of Education in October of 2016.

Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate situation that we find ourselves in when I consistently hear from educators that they are spending more and more time trying to comply with misguided rules from the Federal Government instead of teaching our children and grandchildren.

The Department of Education and the Obama administration have acted as if they know what type of teacher is best for east Tennessee instead of the

people living and working there every day. I want nothing more than to have the best teachers in our classrooms teaching children all across this country, but burdensome one-size-fits-all regulations from the Federal Government that emphasize bureaucracy and compliance instead of a student education is not the way to get there.

□ 1500

The teacher preparation regulations put forth by the Obama administration are yet another example of misguided Federal overreach that would burden schools, institutions of higher education, and States. These regulations are unfunded and would impose extensive data collection requirements on States, colleges, and universities. And one university, Mr. Speaker, in my State spends \$150 million a year complying with government regulations.

Under these regulations, institutions of higher education that do not meet the rules requirements could lose access to Federal financial aid, which is yet another example of the prior administration using the regulatory process to bypass the legislative process. Both the School Superintendents Association and the National Governors Association have highlighted how these regulations are a significant intrusion on the role States play in ensuring accountability for teacher preparation. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has indicated that these regulations are likely to exacerbate teacher shortages in areas where they are critically needed, like special education.

When Congress passed on a bipartisan basis Every Student Succeeds Act, we expected the Obama administration would work to continue the momentum for giving States and local school districts the flexibility they needed to help kids learn. The administration went in the opposite direction, which is why I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 57 and 58 that undermine equity in public education.

Until I moved to Chicago when I was 19, I attended segregated schools because our States failed to follow Federal laws and the Federal Government demonstrated weak enforcement. The Civil Rights Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act advanced equal educational opportunity for African-American students and other students who faced discrimination and barriers in education, making this country stronger and better.

During Black History Month, the GOP will advance a bill to undermine the educational civil rights of African-American students. The scope of this

joint resolution of disapproval clearly reflects the discrimination and the intent. It doesn't target a narrow regulation. It encompasses each of the critical civil rights elements of ESSA—data collection and reporting to ensure transparency about whether schools are educating vulnerable students comparably to other students, and accountability to ensure that schools take action to improve and receive support in meeting the needs of all students. To do so leaves States confused and Federal protections for disadvantaged students hollow.

H.J. Res. 57 is an extreme, calculated effort to promote discrimination, removing any transparency and accountability related to educational civil rights.

African-American students do not yet have equal educational opportunity. Black students are suspended and expelled three times the rate that their White peers are, only about two-thirds of Black students graduate high school on time compared to 86 percent of White students, and one in three Black men who start as a full-time student at a university graduate with a bachelor's degree within 6 years.

Students with disabilities, English language learners, low-income students, Latino students, and Native-American students also do not yet enjoy equal educational opportunity. This resolution will erase this data and allow schools that continue these disparities to continue performing poorly in perpetuity.

Out of respect for our country's history of educational discrimination against vulnerable students, out of respect for Black History Month, and out of respect for the American value of equal opportunity, I ask my colleagues to reject this discriminatory resolution.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 58. I am pleased to join Congressman GUTHRIE as a cosponsor.

As a parent, I know the critical difference teachers can make in a student's life. That is why many young people choose the path of education as their career and their mission.

This rule creates an arbitrary tie between teacher preparation programs and student test scores. What is worse, this rule unfairly discriminates against teachers who commit to teaching STEM subjects or different languages—critical subjects already facing a teacher shortage and occupations desperately seeking skilled employees.

In Michigan—my home State—teacher training program enrollment declined 38 percent between 2008 and 2013. The number of people who actually pursue teaching after going through a prep curriculum declined by 26 percent. We face a teacher shortage in Michigan and nationwide.

I frequently hear from the people I serve, teachers and parents in my district, that they are disheartened and frustrated by the Federal Government's overreach and arrogance that turns educating young people into a test score.

Mr. Speaker, let's return authority where it belongs with teachers and, more importantly, parents.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 58, which would gut States' teacher preparedness programs.

This rollback is just one of many attempts by Republicans to dismantle the Department of Education by stripping its oversight and enforcement authority. The Trump administration has already made it clear its lack of regard for public education by picking an unqualified nominee to head the Department, and congressional Republicans are falling right in line by attempting to remove important rules to improve teacher preparedness.

This rule came into place as part of the bipartisan reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. The reauthorization brought consensus measures to improve teacher training. But given the opportunity, Republicans are willing to forego public education all together by using the CRA to prevent the Department from overseeing State-led initiatives. And there is the crux of it. These initiatives are State-led and allow great levels of flexibility, provisions that Republicans championed during reauthorization. Now, they want to take advantage of an obscure congressional provision, used only once in our history prior to this Congress. This will tie the hands of future administrations from improving the transparency and quality of teacher preparedness programs.

If Republicans are happy with the rule and want to change it to improve the quality of education, this administration should use existing administrative tools to amend and revise the regulation. But that is not what this is about. This is about dismantling our public education system. Congressional Republicans want blanket deregulation of Federal education programs in order to allow States to ignore laws intended to protect disadvantaged students.

I invite my Republican colleagues to bring forth a plan that improves rules protecting our students, not to dismantle them. But this is simply not the way. I implore my colleagues to abandon this backdoor workaround and to work in a bipartisan fashion, like we did when Congress reauthorized the HEA, to develop ways in which we can improve public education for all of our children.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 58, which would undermine the requirement that States assess the quality of their teacher preparation programs and weaken efforts to provide educators with high-quality teacher preparation programs.

There is no doubt that our country needs highly skilled and diverse educators, and that means attracting good people by providing them with high-quality preparation and ongoing support, especially early in their careers. Many teacher preparation programs are meeting this charge—recruiting diverse candidates, offering rigorous practicums, and providing supports that follow them into their classrooms.

But some programs are still preparing large cohorts of educators for fields that are not in demand. And, according to one survey, more than 60 percent of teachers still enter the classroom feeling unprepared for one of the toughest, most important jobs in America.

Many of us readily agree that the regulations governing transparency and program quality for teacher preparation are not perfect. But, let's remember that this resolution would effectively demolish key provisions at the Higher Education Act, which was last reauthorized in 2008, and in which Members from both sides of the aisle agreed that States needed to provide better data on the quality of their teacher preparation programs.

If the rules for improving teacher preparation programs are unnecessary, as my friends across the aisle may contend, I would ask them to explain why critical sections of the Higher Education Act remain largely unimplemented, nearly a decade after Members of Congress wrote the requirements into law. Without regulations, provisions of the 2008 reauthorization will continue to go unfilled. Taxpayer-funded grants will continue to support ineffective programs for teachers in high-needs schools.

The truth is, Democrats and Republicans could probably reach consensus about how we might like to see these regulations amended and improved. I am sure we all support robust data on how new teachers are performing and being supported in the classroom. And I am sure we all support States and institutions using data to continually strengthen their preparation programs.

But, unfortunately, my Republican colleagues appear unwilling to have that conversation about how to give teacher preparation programs the tools they need to improve. Instead, they have offered this resolution that would essentially guarantee that important provisions in law are never fully implemented by this administration, or a future administration, because this resolution is under the Congressional Review Act, which, until recently, has been used successfully only once. It is

a blunt instrument that actually bans Federal agencies from providing similar protections in the future.

So instead of fixing the teacher preparation regulations and upholding congressional intent in the Higher Education Act, supporters of this resolution are turning their backs on the law. The resolution is an overreaction. It appears to be part of a dangerous agenda to do permanent damage to the Department of Education's important oversight and enforcement responsibilities.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this and work together on amending the regulations.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I need to explain what we are doing here. We are not changing the report card that schools have that teacher preparation programs have to provide.

This rule says that if a school doesn't score well on its report card then students in that program can't get TEACH grants, which tries to focus on getting teachers from teacher programs into challenging schools. So what happens is, if you are an outstanding student and you are trapped in a school, let's say, because where you can afford to go is not performing well, then based on your school not performing well, not on the merit of that future teacher, they are not allowed to get a TEACH grant. That is what we are trying to prevent here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I just want to comment because I was a little confused by what the gentleman said. I believe that we want to be sure that teachers who get TEACH grants are doing that at schools that have shown the capacity and the ability to really help children achieve. And so that is why we want to direct them into those schools particularly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this measure. And I do so as someone who, in 2008, actually was a member of the conference committee when we passed the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Unfortunately, that is the last time Congress has moved forward, and we are about 3 or 4 years overdue in terms of modernizing and updating that law.

But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, having been to the meetings—and we actually met as conferees and we had votes and we had discussion, unlike a lot of the short-circuited processes that unfortunately dominates most of our business these days—it was a healthy process.

□ 1515

This issue of teacher preparation in setting up standards was totally non-controversial. There were a couple of items on which the two sides actually debated, but this one was a no-brainer. It just makes perfect sense that we

want to make sure that there is at least a minimum standard out there to make sure that kids are getting the opportunities they need, particularly with the changing demands and needs of the workforce.

What also just sort of astonishes me is the manner in which this regulation was issued, which was only last October. The ink is, really, barely dry on it. We have a new incoming administration with a new Secretary, whom I will talk about in a second, and they have more than ample opportunity to go back into the regulations process and amend it, make changes, if they so choose. Instead, rather than using a scalpel, we are using a chain saw to basically carve out, in essence, a section of the law because the ability of the Department's to go back and do a similar regulation is not allowed under the Congressional Review Act.

This is a measure which, as I said, was just totally noncontroversial, on which we had a very strong vote, by the way, in terms of the final result of the conference that took place back in 2008, and the process that is being used is just tremendous overkill.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I yield the gentleman such time as he may consume.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, frankly, I think, as we stand here today in the Chamber—and just an hour or so ago, we had a Secretary who was confirmed in an unprecedented procedure during which the Vice President had to come in and break the tie—it, unfortunately, has the look of, really, being part of a pattern that we are seeing emerge here with the confirmation hearing process during which the incoming Secretary showed almost no regard for the notion of accountability in terms of charter schools and voucher programs, which, for the taxpayer and for the kids and the parents who really depend on our education system, is just a totally unacceptable approach.

As I said, this CRA bill on the teacher preparation program is just part of the same cloth. It is saying that we are just going to carve out a section which was a totally bipartisan, commonsense provision back in 2008 and that we are going to handcuff the ability of the Department to even come in with a substitute. The chances of Congress, at this point, coming in with new legislation—I mean, I am the eternal optimist. Hopefully, that will happen, but it sure hasn't happened over the last 3 or 4 years since the HEA, Higher Education Act, expired.

This is really, I think, a very unfortunate effort that is being put forth here on the floor. As I said, given what is going on with the Department and the vote that took place here earlier today, for those who really care about making sure that our free public education system, which has been, basically, part of America since Abraham Lincoln first proposed it back in the

middle of the Civil War, we need to be totally on guard—on standby—to make sure that the taxpayer is protected in terms of making sure these grant programs go to school districts and systems that are actually following through with programs of value and to make sure that we protect the pillars of public education. Anyone watching that confirmation process over in the Senate, I think, was extremely worried and alarmed, which is why, I think, we had this avalanche of emails and calls that came in all across the country during that process.

I strongly urge a “no” vote for all of the reasons I have stated.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 57, which we will be voting on today and discussing and debating in a few moments, would overturn an administration rule on school accountability standards that were finalized back in November.

Congress passed a law last year with the intent of giving power back to States and to local communities, but unelected bureaucrats at the Department of Education finalized this rule last year which, ultimately, could force Common Core standards on States that don't comply.

We see this time and time again. Congress will create a law, and then an agency that is filled with unelected officials disregards the will of the people by writing regulations as it sees fit. Every American, in putting aside one's personal ideology, can agree that an important issue like how we educate our kids is not something that we should decide here in Washington. In the months and the years to come, we should welcome a continued debate about whether the fate of a child's education should be decided in Washington or if a child's education should be more personalized at the State and the community levels. In my view, dictating specific accountability requirements from Washington and punishing those who don't meet those standards is a losing prescription.

It is my hope that every kid in my district, in North Carolina, and around the country has a quality education. I think that is the hope of my colleagues, too. The more we think that Washington has all of the answers, the further we get away from our founding vision of a limited Federal role in our lives, especially in something as personal as education.

It will be debated in a few moments, but I do urge a “yes” vote on H.J. Res. 57.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are actually talking about two of these joint resolutions, both H.J. Res. 57 and H.J. Res. 58, and are looking at accountability measures. Sometimes I think people forget, actually, that the first time that Common Core was men-

tioned in Federal law was in ESSA, the most recently reauthorized legislation for elementary and secondary education. That was done because we agreed to do that, because we felt that it was important to call it out while, at the same time, being careful to look at our local and our State authorities and have them come together and make the decisions that they think are best for their students. That has been the tradition, and that is why it is important that we have those folks in place in our local school districts.

As a former school board member, I know that those are where the real decisions are made for kids, but we need to see in which area and why we have a Federal role. I think, even at the hearing that we had in the Education and the Workforce Committee today, the Republicans' witnesses acknowledged that there is an importance of a Federal role. It is in accountability and responsibility and in acknowledging that sometimes it is important to give direction to States and to give direction to local school districts as well.

That is really what we are trying to do here. We are trying to do it in a smart way, and we are trying to do it in a way so that we can realize, in the future, there may be changes that need to be made and that those changes may require Congresses of the future to look at particular protections and see if they are redundant, if they are necessary, or if, maybe, they take us in the wrong direction. What we are talking about today gives us no hope that we will be able to do that. We are basically writing in stone that we will never have to go back—that we can't go back—and look at some of those protections. That is the wrong thing to do.

We all know that, with one protection or another, of course, there can be problems. We don't want to ignore that, but we want to be sure that, particularly when we are looking at teacher prep programs, for example, we are looking at the data that is coming together that suggests whether some programs are more beneficial for the achievement of young people in our schools than others.

Boy, I sure hope as a school board member that we have the information that is available to people, because we can get that at a national level that we can't necessarily all get at the State level. It is important to know what processes are in place. Some of these protections that the Federal Government has created are giving direction to that. They are saying here are ways to look at your program and decide whether, in fact, they are doing exactly what you think they should be doing.

The most important part is that we are getting feedback from our teachers. This is a process that is so critical, that of having people who are on the ground who know what they are talking about. We are responsive to that, and those were some of the processes that we used in the Department of Edu-

cation as well. I am not going to tell you that each one is perfect. I just want us to have a way to look at them and to understand how they impact our teachers. I want all teachers who want to succeed with kids, who are not in teaching for financial reimbursement, to be there because they really believe in kids and because they believe in their ability to succeed, and they want to be sure that they have the tools, that they have the resources, to do that. Many of the protections that we are talking about provide that kind of help and assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 58, the joint resolution of disapproval of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation programs.

This resolution would not only block the rule in question, but according to the rules of the CRA, it would tie the hands of this and of any future administration from re-regulating the provisions until a successful reauthorization of the Higher Education Act might take place.

Mr. Speaker, this rule in question provides clarity to States on how to increase teacher preparation program quality, transparency, and the equitable distribution of well-prepared teachers. It was promulgated to enable compliance with the statutory provision included in the 2008 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

According to a study by the Education Schools Project, more than 60 percent of new teachers feel unprepared to enter the classroom. We also know that disadvantaged students are taught disproportionately by new, inexperienced, and underprepared teachers. Congress sought to address this in the HEA reauthorization through the inclusion of requirements that are clarified by this regulation. Congress clearly intended for these equity-focused provisions to be meaningfully implemented; however, absent Federal regulation, the bipartisan intent of Congress has gone unfulfilled.

Despite statements made by many on the other side of the aisle, the Department of Education did engage in extensive consultation with stakeholders and the public in drafting and then in finalizing this rule. The draft rule put forward in 2014 lacked the appropriate flexibility and was met with overwhelming resistance. Through an extended comment period, the Department worked for more than 2 years to revise the rule and produce a final rule with considerably more flexibility for States and institutions.

Regardless of how flexible the rule is or not, I believe that, upon careful review of the regulation and the statutory provisions, the final rule is clearly within the scope of the agency's regulatory authority. Whether one thinks

the rule is perfect or flawed, the substance of the final rule is reasonable and is clarifying an interpretation of how to comply with statutory requirements.

It is now 2017. Federal requirements to improve teacher preparation program quality and transparency have gone largely unfulfilled since the 2008 reauthorization. In such an instance, it is well within the purview of the implementing agency to regulate and more clearly interpret statutory requirements to prompt meaningful compliance and inform Congress and the agency in subsequent reauthorizations.

The executive overreach or illegality of a rule and the disagreement with the substance of the rule are not two sides of the same coin. Republicans now control the executive branch. President Trump has administrative tools at his disposal to revise or to completely rewrite this regulation. It is clear, based on the history of the implementation of these provisions, that regulatory clarity is necessary. The responsible approach would be to utilize those tools to improve the regulation.

In the history of the Congressional Review Act, Congress has only used it once to disapprove a regulation. Instead of engaging in the hard work of governing by revising the teacher preparation rule, my colleagues have resorted to this act of repealing yet another rule that is meant to support our Nation's families and children. It is unnecessary, and we must recommit to doing the right thing for those whom we serve.

I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution.

□ 1530

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I think this has been a good discussion, and I think that the hearing that we had today was even an opening as well at looking at this issue.

I think no matter what side of the aisle one was on, you couldn't necessarily distinguish the witnesses because it was important that we say that there is a smart way to do this and, frankly, there is kind of a stupid way to do it. Because we want to be sure that the consequences of our actions are not ones that would be impacting our children down the road.

So we have to go about this in a measured way, in a smart way. I actually believe that we all have the capacity to do that. There is no question in my mind that we can't do that in a way that really asks the right questions: Why are those protections there? Why did they establish those regulations and protections?

So that we can track and understand what is behind them.

I really do remember that, as a school board member, now and then, there was some frustration over some-

thing within the special education arena. But when you went back and you looked at why that came about, it was because there was a child who represented a problem in the system because we didn't do the right thing. We realized that it wasn't just that child, but it was many children who could be affected in the same way.

That is what we have to look at: Why are they there? How can we change them? How can we be smart about it and make sure that we don't do something that, in the end, will harm our education system and even impact those children who really are the most vulnerable that we would not want to impact under any circumstances?

So, Mr. Speaker, let's work together on this. Unfortunately, what this does today is it takes away that ability to use, I think, the goodwill of our committee to do the right thing. I hope that my colleagues will agree with that.

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

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

Republicans and Democrats on both sides of the aisle have worked hard in recent years, particularly in the ESSA that we passed to make sure that we have local control of education, the idea that reforms that State and education local leaders know best. I think the same is true for teachers.

It is vitally important that we have teachers that are prepared to succeed. We want the best and brightest in the classroom that help ensure our students receive the quality education they deserve.

This resolution will put an end to this rule that will have negative consequences, I believe, for teachers and students; but it will allow us to address teacher preparation responsibly. Article I of the Constitution gives the legislative powers to Congress. So we don't just need to say: There's a new administration in town, let them fix it.

What we need to say is that it is Congress' job, through working together, to pass the law and reauthorize higher education that will ensure that we have quality teachers in the classroom teaching our children.

So I urge my colleagues to put a stop to this rule and vote "yes" on H.J. Res. 58.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 91, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Ms. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO ACCOUNTABILITY AND STATE PLANS

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 91, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 57) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 91, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 57

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (published at 81 Fed. Reg. 86076 (November 29, 2016)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.J. Res. 57.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 57.

Mr. Speaker, I was here also on this floor listening to the debate that just finished on H.J. Res. 58, and I have a feeling a lot of the same things are going to carry over because we are dealing with the same Department. In fact, we are dealing with the prior administration generally.

I was struck by the words that we need to "give direction to the States." I think, by definition, those words demonstrate how one side here thinks that they know best; that their judgment is somehow better than the judgment of governors, of State legislators,

of parents, teachers, and superintendents themselves when it comes to this issue and, in fact, in a larger perspective, when it comes to most issues around here. We must give direction to the States—no.

The fact of the matter is, when the President signed into law, when we passed ESSA—the Every Student Succeeds Act—in a lot of ways we were saying to the States: You give the direction. You set the way that you think is best to educate your best assets. Your best assets, of course, being our next generation.

While we at the Federal level would like to be partners, the fact of the matter is it is their property. The tax dollars we are talking about are the property of the individuals living in the 50 States and other jurisdictions.

So now here we are using the Congressional Review Act to get rid of some regulations that are doing that very thing. We wrote a very specific law saying the States are in charge. Here we have a Federal agency inserting itself, not just interpreting law, but actually making law and taking us in the exact opposite direction that all of us intended.

When I say all of us, I say that in a very bipartisan way, Mr. Speaker, because—I am now in my fifth year of being chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education here in the House. My first 4 years were consumed working with past Chairman John Kline, current Chairwoman VIRGINIA FOXX, other members of the committee, and all our Democratic counterparts in getting this very bipartisan law passed and signed into law.

Let me go back, Mr. Speaker, and set the table here. You will have to remember that under the No Child Left Behind law, which was the law of the land for some 13 years—perhaps a well-intentioned law, but completely unreasonable in terms of its forced, ridged, one-size-fits-all accountability system that heavily dictated how we would gauge and address school performance—that system represented a top-down approach in K–12 education. After 13 years, the data is in and the results are in. It simply didn't work.

So that is why just a little more than a year ago, Congress passed—again, former President Obama signed into law in a very bipartisan way—the Every Student Succeeds Act. With this law, Republicans and Democrats worked together to reform our education system to ensure that all children are able to receive the education they deserve. It represents a fundamentally different approach to education and, in the words of one superintendent, empowers local leaders to “dream and lead and transform public education in this country.”

Unfortunately, almost immediately after the bill became law, the Obama administration began its attempt to roll back these bipartisan reforms. With the Every Student Succeeds Act,

Congress promised to reduce the Federal role and restore State and local control over K–12 education. The law empowers States to develop their own policies to hold schools accountable to parents and taxpayers.

For accountability to work, Mr. Speaker, it must be driven by the State and local leaders who are best equipped to directly address the issues in their school. Those leaders know better than any Federal bureaucrat in the Department of Education what their kids need, even down to what their kids' names are. I challenge any Federal bureaucrat to know better.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration's flawed accountability regulation would reestablish the Washington-knows-best approach to accountability. It is the very same thing I mentioned earlier that we just heard regarding H.J. Res. 58. It is an approach that is deeply flawed.

How do I know? What is the best metric to prove the point that that Washington-knows-best approach is deeply flawed?

Look at it. Look at the test scores since the Federal Government has been involved in education. You see that they haven't gone up. Yet we have spent billions and billions of dollars since the 1970s here at the Federal level on local education to see no improvement in the test scores.

Not only does the regulation dictate prescriptive accountability requirements, but it violates many of the prohibitions that we put in on the Secretary of Education. As we all saw, the top-down approach simply didn't work. So that is why we repealed No Child Left Behind and passed a bill to transform K–12 education.

Our students deserve better than the failed policies of the past, and that is what the Every Student Succeeds Act does, if implemented as Congress intended.

Now, our intent was not ambiguous, and the law is far from silent. We were very specific in the law we wrote. Our specificity dictated that the States and localities were back in charge. They were driving the bus again. No pun intended.

The Department has taken some kind of ambiguity, I guess, some kind of silence, and has inserted themselves into the lawmaking role. That wasn't our intent.

Our intent was for a new role for the Department, a much smaller role for the Department, a less supervisory role for the Department, and a less punitive role for the Department, one that would simply ensure that our specifically written law, as passed off this floor, passed off the Senate floor, and eventually signed into law, was followed as we wrote it. So an example of that was we require the States to have plans for how they were going to test, that they would test, but nothing more prescriptive than that. That is just one example, the testing. There were some other parameters.

Then they were to submit those plans to the Federal Government, and the Department of Education was simply to check the box and make sure that the plans were done and otherwise comply with the law. The Department wasn't to be more prescriptive than that. It wasn't to give any more regulation than that. It wasn't to, frankly, give too much more direction than that because we recognize that this responsibility is primarily that of governors, State legislators, school superintendents, parents, and teachers.

Now, States are already working to implement the law in their school districts. I want to be very clear that this resolution in no way does anything to stymie those efforts. States should move straight ahead.

Instead, the resolution gives States the certainty they need to continue moving forward, confident that their plans will be reviewed by the Department of Education against the requirements of the statute and nothing more, with deference given to the judgment of these local legislators, local superintendents, et cetera, as the law requires.

We are also committed to working with the new administration to ensure States receive the support they need consistent with the limits placed in the statute.

So, my colleagues, by passing this resolution and blocking implementation of the Obama administration's flawed accountability rule, we can ensure that the promises we made under the Every Student Succeeds Act to restore State and local control in K–12 education are kept.

I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 57 and protect those important bipartisan reforms.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution before us, which would overturn the accountability regulations in the Every Student Succeeds Act, our Nation's most important K–12 education law.

These accountability guidelines promulgated by the Department are not only allowed under the Every Student Succeeds Act, but they are essentially required. This legislative body last session put language into the Every Student Succeeds Act calling upon the Department and the Secretary to clarify this. It is a very different perspective on what that legislative intent was.

There are items in the Every Student Succeeds Act that we agreed—Democrats and Republicans—the Secretary and the Department would be prohibited from promulgating rules regarding. For instance, one of those is the promulgation of rules in support of the Common Core curriculum.

□ 1545

Democrats and Republicans agree that the Federal Government should

not be setting curriculum. That is a matter for the States. We prohibit it, specifically, in language in ESSA. We prohibit the Federal Government from promulgating rules that require, in any way, shape, or form, the adoption of the common core standards at the State level.

What is not prohibited is rules regarding State accountability systems. Quite to the contrary, it is important work. In fact, it is the core work under the Every Student Succeeds Act, that very core commitment to civil rights that so many Democrats and Republicans feel passionate about that is contained through these rules.

When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act first passed in 1965, it was a critical piece of civil rights legislation, and it still is to this day. It was written with the intent that every student, no matter their race, background, ZIP Code, deserved a great education. And today, the Every Student Succeeds Act maintains that spirit.

If it had some of the prohibition that my colleague on the other side of the aisle believes it has, but won't be able to cite specific statute that it has, Democrats wouldn't have supported that bill, and it wouldn't have passed with nearly every Democrat—if not every Democratic vote—in the House and the Senate.

For months, States have been working diligently to write their own State plans to comply with the Every Student Succeeds Act. My home State of Colorado has undertaken an extensive process. I got to attend one of the stakeholder meetings as part of that process, gathering feedback from educators, and parents, and students to write a State plan that works for Colorado and meets the requirements of the new law and the rules that this CRA would undo.

This resolution would undo all of that State-level work, all of the work that people in Colorado have done, that people in other States have done; create massive chaos and uncertainty in public education; and destroy the civil rights safeguards that Republicans and Democrats worked so diligently to put in place in the Every Student Succeeds Act.

Not only would this CRA overturn the regulations, but it would prevent the Department of Education from looking at accountability again. It would tie the hands of the newly confirmed Secretary of Education, preventing her from improving or building upon the accountability measures that Congress, through the language of ESSA, asked the Department to take on.

This regulation was written after the Department of Education received thousands of comments from stakeholders, including parents, teachers, school boards, and advocates. Without a rule, the approval of the State accountability plans would be entirely at the discretion of the new Secretary, Secretary DeVos—the exact type of

scenario the Republicans wanted to avoid by rewriting ESSA, essentially arguing—and many Democrats agreed with the argument—that effectively it was arbitrary use of power that then-Secretary Duncan wielded, and then-Secretary King, to grant the necessary waivers under the No Child Left Behind Act by removing these rules that had been promulgated.

Effectively, we would be back to where we started without criteria for approval or denial of State plans; without adequate safeguards for civil rights; and without the assurance that we can improve and build upon progress.

How can we trust any Secretary—Duncan, King, DeVos, future Secretaries—to know what a good accountability plan and bad accountability plan look like? Why should our legislative body delegate that level of authority without rules and regulations that we derive and allow them to make an arbitrary and capricious decision-making process that could involve approving bad accountability plans, or failing to approve strong accountability plans? That should be a huge concern for parents, teachers, students, and the public system.

You know what? Republicans were right, as were Democrats, when we argued that we needed criteria for the approval of accountability plans. And the answer is not to give blanket authority to any Secretary with regard to approval or denial of their plans, and that is what these rules do. And if they need to be improved and built upon, let's work with the new Secretary to do that.

But by not only undoing those rules, but by actually prohibiting the Secretary from promulgating additional rules, it will give the Department of Education effective arbitrary veto over every State in our country and an unprecedented level of federalized control of our schools, which might be the real Republican agenda with this bill here today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I would only comment that the comments made to the rule in this regard—the ones I have seen—were almost all bad. They were negative against this rule, except for maybe a few groups.

I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) who is chairwoman of the full committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague Mr. ROKITA for yielding time and for handling this on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 57. For years, the Federal Government operated under the flawed idea that Washington knows best when it comes to education. Policies put in place in recent decades vastly expanded the Federal footprint in the K-12 schools and prevented State and local education leaders from delivering the high-quality education all children deserve.

Something needed to change. Yet, under the Obama administration, the problem only got worse. For years, the last administration used regulations, waivers, and pet projects to unilaterally exert its control over education. Its heavy-handed, one-size-fits-all policies only increased the Federal role in America's classrooms, moving K-12 education in the wrong direction. That is why Republicans and Democrats came together to pass the Every Student Succeeds Act.

Enacted just over a year ago, the law was built on three important principles: empowering parents, reducing the Federal role, and restoring local control. It sent a clear message that the American people were done with the top-down approach to education.

Unfortunately, the previous administration didn't get the message. The Department of Education continued using rules and regulations to push its failed education agenda—the same agenda Congress rejected with overwhelming bipartisan support. We are here today to put a stop to two of those rules.

The resolution under consideration, H.J. Res. 57, will roll back a regulation implementing accountability provisions in the Every Student Succeeds Act. The law empowers States to develop ways to hold schools accountable to the students and parents they serve, and ensure taxpayer dollars are being spent responsibly. The Department's accountability rule, however, does the exact opposite. Not only does it impose prescriptive accountability requirements on State education leaders, but it also violates specific prohibitions the law places on the Secretary of Education's authority.

We also considered, a few moments ago, H.J. Res. 58, which will block implementation of a regulation that significantly expands the Federal Government's involvement in teacher preparation.

Yet, another example of Obama overreach, the teacher preparation rule essentially creates a Federal system for evaluating teacher performance. It would be virtually impossible to implement and could lead to fewer teachers serving low-income students.

Together, these two resolutions of disapproval will move us towards limiting the Federal role in education and protect the local control promised with recent education reforms.

I want to thank Representatives ROKITA and GUTHRIE for their work to fight against the flawed policies of the past and for leading the way in delivering a more positive, more limited, and more responsible Federal role in education.

I urge my colleagues to support both resolutions.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I

rise in strong opposition of H.J. Res. 57. This resolution takes aim at the heart of the Every Student Succeeds Act, or ESSA. That bill passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. This resolution would strike down regulations that provide necessary clarity to States about what it means to ensure that all students are taught to high standards, and what it means to provide accurate data on student academic performance and resource equity.

States now lack direction needed to proceed with implementation of the bill. Just last week, the Department removed all ESSA technical assistance to the States from the public domain, despite numerous and repeated requests for technical assistance from State and local leaders.

Mr. Speaker, when Congress came together to pass ESSA, we made a promise, the promise of stability and consistency and a full replacement of No Child Left Behind. And while we promised new flexibilities, those flexibilities came with guardrails to guide the decisionmaking, to ensure protections for vulnerable students, and to support educators and school leaders. This resolution breaks that bipartisan promise.

Contrary to the wishes of some, ESSA was not a blank check to States from the Federal Government. ESSA is a fundamental approach with much power restored to the State and local level, but it comes with Federal protections for vulnerable students. So we must not waver in our commitment to give States the support and guidance they need to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, some claim the regulations are unnecessary because States can just read the law and implement it. But we all know, based on precedence and common sense, that the new landscape of ESSA would necessitate regulatory clarity from the executive branch, just as all Federal agencies routinely update existing regulations as new legislation is passed.

Providing stakeholders with direction and clarity about how to carry out the Federal laws as big as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is not new. No Child Left Behind led the Bush administration to undergo similar rulemaking, and it was more than 2 years before the regulations were fully realized. It also enabled States, in their efforts, to move forward with timely submission of their ESSA plans.

If this resolution of disapproval is enacted, States will have no ability to prepare State plans that require Federal approval until after the Department reestablishes requirements and criteria, causing an unwelcome and unnecessary delay for States eager to move forward, leaving ESSA unregulated before States to just wait until the new regulations are passed, and also undo months of work that is currently underway.

In effect, the lack of clarity on how to effectively utilize the new flexibilities, while meeting statutory requirements, may lead many States to revert

to—they have to revert to something—maybe the No Child Left Behind narrow policies and systems, the very policies that the ESSA eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, where the law's requirements are ambiguous, agency interpretation is necessary to set a Federal floor. Without that floor, compliance with the Federal law becomes subjective, with different standards being applied from State to State. This kind of subjectivity was the same problem we had with No Child Left Behind when States relied on guidance without regulation.

Under that scheme, the Department could not be held accountable for treating one State different from another, and that is what we are correcting through the enactment and regulation of ESSA's core requirements. Those requirements must be applied fairly across all States. That is the whole point of a Federal law.

The Department conducted hundreds of meetings, held public forums and listening sessions, and read and responded to thousands of comments to produce a consensus-driven rule. The Department made significant revisions before finalization, and they were met with praise from teachers, State education chiefs, local administrators, parents, and civil rights communities.

Regardless of whether you think the rule is perfect or flawed, the substance of the rule is a reasonable interpretation that provides clarity for States to enable their compliance with statutory requirements. Now, President Trump has administrative tools at his disposal to revise or completely rewrite this regulation. However, it is clear, based on history of implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that regulatory clarity is necessary.

Using the CRA to block the rule is unnecessary and shortsighted. It hurts students and schools. It undermines a bipartisan intent of Congress and leaves States in a lurch by causing confusion and delays for the submission of their State plans. It also undermines equity protections for vulnerable students that the law was intended to serve.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. This resolution threatens the success of the law we fought so hard to pass, so I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I finally realized what is happening here. What the other side considers ambiguous is really flexibility. I think that is the difference here. But, let's be clear. What we intended through ESSA was flexibility for the States. Nowhere in the law are we ambiguous about what we intended.

I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), who, in the month that he has been here, has already injected a lot of

energy to the committee and is doing a great job for his constituents.

□ 1600

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 57. Voting in support of this resolution ensures that the Federal Government will stay out of our children's classrooms and give the power back to the local authorities to make good, solid education decisions.

Throughout my congressional campaign, the people of the Third District of Georgia of all backgrounds and income continued to express their frustration that the Federal Government continued to get involved in policies that should be the domain of local and State governments.

I have spoken with education leaders in the Third District of Georgia, in places like Troup County and Fayette County, and they were very pleased with the bipartisan effort of the Every Student Succeeds Act passed last Congress. They told me that they felt hopeful with the new flexibility written into the law granting the power to the States and the local leaders to decide what accountability measures work best for their students. However, as time went on, they expressed great concern as the Department of Education began writing this new accountability regulation.

The accountability measures that will work for my home State of Georgia and my home district won't always work best for students elsewhere. Trying to educate students in the Third District of Georgia the exact same way you do students in Detroit, Michigan, or Spokane, Washington, or Prescott, Arizona, just simply will not work.

Every child deserves access to quality education, but imposing a nationwide standard will only hamper this goal with burdensome regulations, and we have seen that failed policy under the No Child Left Behind Act. This resolution pulls back the Federal overreach, ensuring that the decisions will remain at the local level, and that is why I support H.J. Res. 57 today.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57.

This resolution is an extreme measure that will disrupt and delay the implementation of the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act, an important law that replaces the failed policies of No Child Left Behind by carefully balancing the need for more local control in education with strong Federal civil rights protections for students.

Today, sadly, the promise of the Every Student Succeeds Act is in jeopardy. This resolution appears to be part of a larger effort to dismantle the oversight and enforcement responsibilities of the Department of Education which would harm all students.

If my Republican friends are serious about successfully implementing the

law we all worked so hard to pass, they would not be demolishing a key set of regulations, and certainly not while States are currently finalizing their plans to implement the new accountability systems and public reporting requirements outlined in the regulations.

These regulations give States considerable flexibility and guidance. For example, they provide additional time to identify schools for comprehensive and targeted support. They ensure that parents are notified if their school is identified for additional support and explain how parents can get involved in their school's improvement efforts, and they give States flexibility to use multiple indicators in evaluating schools. These regulations are reasonable clarifications that reinforce the intent of the law.

Of course, my colleagues might disagree with some elements of the regulations, but this is the wrong way to change them. If my colleagues were serious about changing the regulations, then they would involve stakeholders and have a collaborative and transparent process to amend the rules through the public notice and comment process.

Unfortunately, without critical rules for implementing the Every Student Succeeds Act and the ability to write similar rules in the future, I expect we will see two things happen, both of which are detrimental:

Some States will take an anything-goes approach, which could hurt our 15 million public school students and, historically, is particularly damaging to African-American students, Hispanic students, Native American students, students with disabilities, and English-language learners. Remember the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act was about equity.

Other States, without clear rules for compliance, will simply continue existing policies—many of which are a legacy of the No Child Left Behind era—and miss out on the important flexibility and positive changes in the new law.

Using the Congressional Review Act to dismantle important regulations for the Every Student Succeeds Act will create a great deal of uncertainty and threaten the implementation of the law. Certainty is what our school districts need, and it risks critical equity protections for disadvantaged students.

The resolution before us is an extreme measure. It is entirely avoidable. The administration can revise these regulations, but instead, the supporters of this resolution are choosing to gut this important law by making implementation essentially unfeasible and uncertain.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to stand with our students across this country and vote “no” on this resolution, and then let's work together to amend the regulations.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentlewoman: ESSA was a

landmark bipartisan achievement. Unfortunately, the Obama administration's partisan implementation of it is what brings us here today. Instead of choosing to take every opportunity to work with us, the Obama administration is choosing to do through the regulatory process what it couldn't achieve legislatively.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), who is doing a great job for his State.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Congress, Members on both sides of the aisle came together to restore education decisionmaking authority to where it should be—at the State and local level—devolving it from overreach by the Federal Government through the Every Student Succeeds Act. It was a bipartisan accomplishment that I speak very proudly of in my congressional district, as I know many Members do in their congressional districts.

However, certain regulations were issued by the Department of Education last year that threaten regulatory overreach, including problematic provisions requiring States to issue uniform standards to determine a teacher's level of effectiveness or ineffectiveness. Put quite simply, the rule, as it was issued late in November, is not consistent with the law that we passed that we were all so proud of. In fact, it is necessary to use the CRA to override this rule in order to maintain the integrity of the ESSA, which we are all very proud of passing, to restore local control, and that goes from student testing to curriculum, to teacher evaluation. What we have here, as written, are regulations which threaten an overemphasis on students' standardized testing scores when evaluating the quality of a teacher.

H.J. Res. 57 would override regulations because they are not consistent with the law that we just passed. H.J. Res. 57 would preserve the bipartisan accomplishments achieved in the ESSA by allowing States to continue tailoring the ESSA to meet local needs without overreach and without mandates from the Federal Government. Put simply, what we are seeking to do here is to prevent the Federal Government from once again nudging its nose into local and State control over teacher evaluations, which was one of the main objectives of the ESSA in the first instance.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman ROKITA for his leadership.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT), who is a new member of the Education and the Workforce Committee and is doing an excellent job so far.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 57. Not only is the rollback of these substantive measures incredibly detrimental, but the process by which my Republican colleagues are fa-

cilitating their actions is, quite simply, wrong. This regulation is a product of months of work to come to a consensus on what is best for all of our students.

Mr. Speaker, the Every Student Succeeds Act received strong bipartisan support, and it received bicameral support when it passed when 359 Members of the House and 85 Senators voted in favor of this legislation. In fact, Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER, who serves as chairman of the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, said back then that this bill was truly a Christmas miracle for American children. However, just weeks into this administration, Republicans, for purely political reasons and for political purposes, are actively working to strip States and districts of the stability and clarity they need to implement this law.

Approximately 50 million children attend public schools in the United States. About 1.1 million of those students are in New York City Public Schools. I think everyone agrees that we should be doing all we can do to help and prepare our students, but this resolution does the exact opposite. This regulation provides important guidance to ensure the students are college and career ready. It helps schools identify subgroups of students in need of additional academic support and help.

Dismantling this regulation will disrupt ways in which information used to measure school performance and resource equity is reported, ultimately resulting in our parents, teachers, and policymakers not being equipped with the necessary data to make important decisions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Further, rolling back this regulation directly targets inner-city public schools and shows, at best, indifference to our Nation's most vulnerable students. It will leave students—specifically, low-income minority students and English-language learners—without the protections and support intended by Congress.

I, of all people, understand this important measure to look out for students with special English-language needs, coming from a low-income immigrant family, and I implore my Republican colleagues to reconsider this troublesome action.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER), who is a new member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 57 today for two reasons. I believe that the majority's repeated use of the Congressional Review Act this week

and last week is unnecessary, constricting, and, in this case, adds cost. The Congressional Review Act has only been used successfully in 2000 one time, and already this month the House is considering its eighth joint resolution of disapproval.

I believe in our role of oversight of the executive branch, but using the blunt tool of the CRA to block regulatory action in an effort to support and improve public education is an abuse of the CRA. The newly confirmed Secretary of Education can already amend targeted rules like the one this resolution is addressing without fully repealing the guidance and preventing similar rules in the future.

The Every Student Succeeds Act was a major bipartisan accomplishment, and I am particularly concerned about the uncertainty for the States and local stakeholders caused by repealing these accountability standards in the underlying rule.

In Delaware, just as in States across the country, local stakeholder groups and State departments of education have been working together to provide thorough feedback and guidance on these accountability rules that the majority wants to repeal.

I have heard from my State board of education that repealing these regulations would cause States to delay the development of their plans, potentially costing them both time and money to gather feedback on a significantly different set of guidelines for the plan, and, most importantly, further delaying the implementation of changes to the education system that our students need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, my question to my colleagues would be: Why get rid of the whole rule when it comes from a bill that ultimately happened in such a bipartisan way? Why prevent accountability and guidance for States?

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. I will oppose H.J. Res. 57, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to oppose H.J. Res. 57.

□ 1615

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The effect of this action will not halt State implementation efforts. Let me say that again. The effect of this action will not halt State implementation efforts.

Our intent is to require clarity and consistency so implementation can, in fact, continue. States are continuing to develop State plans that comply with the law, as you have already seen being done across the country. The States and school districts are in the driver's seat here, Mr. Speaker, and they should continue moving forward.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Cali-

fornia, (Ms. JUDY CHU), the chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 57. This reckless measure rolls back the progress made by the Every Student Succeeds Act, or ESSA, by making it easier for schools to ignore vulnerable or underachieving students.

Before ESSA, American schools operated under the one-size-fits-all model of No Child Left Behind. What we got was a lopsided understanding of our education system—one that focused on meeting unforgiving benchmarks and turned a blind eye to students who needed more support.

Then, after years of careful, bipartisan work, we finally succeeded in passing ESSA last Congress. Thanks to the work of the Congressional Tri-Caucus, this bill made needed changes to ensure that vulnerable students, including English language learners and students of color, didn't slip through the cracks. In fact, the accountability provisions within ESSA were specifically designed to protect the rights of every student and ensure that struggling schools have the resources and support they need to succeed.

Now, by rescinding the rule which implements the core of this law, Republicans are undoing all of that work in the name of relentless deregulation. Worse, they are, once again, using the little-known Congressional Review Act, which means no future administration can issue a rule like this ever again.

Most Americans are unfamiliar with the Congressional Review Act because, before this Congress, it has only been used once before. Now Republicans are using it almost daily to weaken our government and support fewer people.

With today's vote, Republicans are taking an ax to equity provisions of ESSA and prioritizing politics over students. Rather than pass this extreme measure, we should focus on a way to enforce ESSA and ensure that every student, no matter their race, income level, or language ability, has access to a quality education.

I urge my colleagues to prioritize our Nation's students and vote "no" on H.J. Res. 57.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say to the gentlewoman that I agree that we have to be careful to make sure underserved children are not vulnerable, which is what we did in the underlying law in a bipartisan manner when we passed it and when the President signed the law.

I reject the premise that State and local leaders, however, cannot be trusted to deliver an excellent education to all of their students. More importantly, that premise was rejected by Congresses in ESSA itself.

Beyond that, the criticism just levied is simply not true. The Department of Education has the right and, indeed, the obligation to enforce the law. That has never been in dispute.

There are clear requirements in this statute for States to develop ways to hold their schools accountable and to report information about school performance to parents and their communities. That duty continues.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about the legal implications and the chaos that this resolution would create if it were passed. I want to share with you a brief story from a parent who has two sons with special needs and who depends on strong accountability for her son's success.

What parents across this country who have kids in public schools want to see is a system that works for them. They are not so caught up in which rule is being passed by who and who is doing what. They want to make sure the learning needs of their child are met.

Frankly, a strong accountability system and a reliable accountability system with parameters that are clear rather than a chaotic and unpredictable one goes a long way to reassuring parents across this country that the needs of their child are being met.

Here is a brief story from a parent with two sons with special needs:

My son Jacob is a freshman in high school. Today, he's a straight A student well on his way to a great future. But it wasn't always that way. He spent his early elementary school years lacking the supports he needed to be successful in the classroom.

At the beginning of fourth grade, he was in a self-contained classroom, which supported his behavioral needs, but not his academic needs. We were given the choice to "opt out" of grade-level testing, but refused. It was the results of those tests that gave us the data we needed to see where he needed support and to see where he could excel academically. We all saw he was working at or above grade-level in many areas. It kept us accountable to planning his successful future.

By the end of fourth grade, he was partially included in a general education classroom. By middle school, he was fully included in the general education classroom with minimal supports in place. Without accountability standards in place for students like Jacob, none of us—his parents, his teachers, and even Jacob himself—would have been able to track his upward trajectory.

I hear stories like this from so many of my constituents, Mr. Speaker: kids with learning disabilities, kids who attend schools that have pervasive achievement gaps between higher- and lower-income students and students of color and White students.

Frankly, the accountability system that we have had and the improvements that we built into it through the Every Student Succeeds Act and this rulemaking process are the prime civil rights safeguards that families across the country have so that they can, with confidence, know that the public schools are required to meet the learning needs of their child and that somebody is watching that, who will watch the watchers, and that their only recourse isn't just expensive litigation,

which the repeal of this rule would lead to more of, but, frankly, is where the money is coming from and making sure that there is a degree of controls in place that the learning of the child is being met.

Stories like Jacob's are the reason why so many organizations have voiced their opposition to H.J. Res. 57.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of organizations that have announced opposition.

The following organizations have all voiced their opposition to House Joint Resolution 57:

Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus (CAPAC); Congressional Black Caucus (CBC); Congressional Hispanic Caucus (CHC); Alliance for Excellent Education; Association of University Centers on Disabilities; Center for American Progress; Children's Defense Fund; Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities; Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates; Democrats for Education Reform; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund.

Easterseals; The Education Trust; Judge David L. Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law; League of United Latin American Citizens; Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF); NAACP; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities; National Center for Learning Disabilities; National Council of La Raza; National Disability Rights Network; National Down Syndrome Congress; National Indian Education Association.

National Urban League; National Women's Law Center; New Leaders; PolicyLink; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC); Stand for Children; Teach For America; Teach Plus; The New Teacher Project (TNTP); The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; United Negro College Fund (UNCF).

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
February 6, 2017.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS: The Chamber opposes H.J. Res. 57, which would block regulations implementing accountability provisions in the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

The Chamber believes these regulations, although not perfect, have provided states, districts, and schools the guidance necessary to ensure an orderly transition from the prior No Child Left Behind Act to the new, and far more flexible, accountability provisions under ESSA.

The Chamber is concerned that repealing the regulations could delay implementation of this critical new law. Over the past year, states have been developing implementation plans with input from thousands of stakeholders. Many states are in the final stages of developing these plans and preparing them for submission to the Department of Education. Repealing will create unnecessary confusion and uncertainty.

The Chamber urges you to vote against H.J. Res. 57.

Sincerely,

JACK HOWARD.

CONGRESSIONAL TRI-CAUCUS CHAIRS OPPOSE
EFFORTS TO UNDERMINE PUBLIC EDUCATION
[For Immediate Release—Feb. 7, 2017]

WASHINGTON, DC.—Today, the Chairs of the Congressional Tri-Caucus—composed of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus—released the

following joint statement in opposition to H.J. Res. 57, which would undermine the Department of Education's authority to implement and enforce key provisions of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA):

"H.J. Res. 57, the joint resolution to undermine implementation of the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), is another step in the Republican attack on public education and enforcement authority of the Department of Education. First, President Trump nominates a champion of privatization who is unfamiliar and unwilling to enforce key civil rights protections for students. Now, Congressional Republicans are ripping apart regulation to guide implementation of the most important equity provisions of our nation's new K-12 law.

"As leaders of the Congressional Asian Pacific American, Black, and Hispanic Caucuses we fought to couple ESSA's unprecedented state and local flexibility over school accountability and improvement with strong federal protections for our most vulnerable students. Without the stability and clarity provided through regulation, plan development stops, systems halt, and students and teachers lose. While this regulation reflects the consensus of the education and civil rights community, it is within the purview of the new Republican administration to re-examine and amend it as they see fit. However, rather than take this responsible approach to implementing the new law, Republicans have chosen to put politics before students.

"H.J. Res. 57 would leave key provisions of the law completely unregulated indefinitely, leaving state systems that serve our nation's more than 50 million public school students in limbo and important civil rights obligations unfulfilled. Faithful implementation of ESSA must honor both the bipartisan intent of Congress and the longstanding civil rights legacy of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This reckless measure flies in the face of both. For these reasons, we firmly oppose H.J. Res. 57."

CONSORTIUM FOR CITIZENS
WITH DISABILITIES,
February 6, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The co-chairs of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) Education Task Force, on behalf of the CCD Education Taskforce, write in opposition of H.J. Res 57 to rescind the accountability regulations under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

The CCD Education Task Force advocates for Federal public policy that ensures the self-determination, independence, empowerment, integration, and inclusion of children and adults with disabilities in all aspects of society. The CCD Task Force sees these principles as critical elements in a society that recognizes and respects the dignity and worth of all its members.

The CCD Ed Task Force believes that the ESSA accountability regulations are critical for meaningful implementation of ESSA. The regulations clarify the statutory language in ESSA, build upon ESSA's flexibility for school improvement and provide a clarified role for families, educators and stakeholders to share in the implementation process. Perhaps, most importantly, the final regulations help assure that States meaningfully develop accountability plans that will create statewide systems to identify schools and districts which need to target funds to intervene and support students not meeting state-determined standards. We view this as critical to helping shine a needed light on the education gap for groups of students, including students with disabilities so they can make important gains and achieve the same education outcomes as their peers.

The passage of ESSA was a successful bipartisan effort to improve education for all students built upon the frame of accountability. To rescind these regulations would not only be a disservice to the spirit of ESSA and diminish the efficacy of the law, but would also serve to undermine the equity of educational opportunity for all students, including students with disabilities.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact any of the co-chairs listed below.

Sincerely,

LINDSAY E. JONES,
National Center for
Learning Disabilities.

LAURA KALOJ,
Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates.

AMANDA LOWE,
National Disability Rights Network.

KIM MUSHENO,
Association of University Centers on Disability.

CINDY SMITH,
National Assoc. of Councils on Developmental Disabilities.

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS,
February 6, 2017.

Keep ESSA Implementation Moving Forward—Oppose H.J. Res. 57.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights and the 29 undersigned organizations, we urge you to oppose H.J. Res. 57 and to support continued implementation of the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). In order for the latest reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to fulfill its purpose as a civil rights law and for implementation to comply with the requirements Congress set forth, federal oversight is critical. The underlying accountability and state plan regulation will help states, districts, and schools to faithfully implement the law and meet their legal obligations to historically marginalized groups of students including students of color, students with disabilities, and students who are English learners, immigrants, girls, Native American, LGBTQ or low-income. Congress should reject the effort to overturn these regulations under the Congressional Review Act (CRA) and should preserve critical protections for marginalized students.

Over the course of legislative debate in 2015, Congress reached several compromises which enshrined both meaningful guardrails and state flexibility into the new law. It was these compromises—the allowance of flexibility while still maintaining core principles of fiscal responsibility and protections for marginalized students—which led to the passage of the ESSA. At the core is an offer to states—federal funding in exchange for compliance with requirements regarding accountability, protections for students, and fiscal responsibility. States must not be permitted to take federal funds while flouting the law's mandates. The accountability and state plan regulation provides clarification and timelines which will support the vital role of the U.S. Department of Education in ensuring that states hold up their end of that deal.

The process of soliciting public feedback on potential ESSA regulations began long before a draft rule was even published. On December 22, 2015 the Department of Education issued a request for information and

noticed two public meetings, “soliciting advice and recommendations from interested parties prior to publishing proposed regulations.” Then, when draft rules were issued more than five months later, the agency received over 21,000 public comments in response to the notice of proposed rulemaking. After considering the voluminous feedback, the Department of Education issued a final rule on November 29, 2016. This robust and transparent engagement process was appropriate and needed—questions regarding the responsible use of federal funds and the need to ensure that every student succeeds generate considerable interest. Support for the CRA and discarding this important regulation diminishes the important time and thought dedicated to this process, and the voices of parents, students, advocates, educators and others who have sought to be heard.

ESSA can and should, “provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.” These lofty objectives, however, require vigilance and oversight by the Department of Education and support from Members of Congress. We urge you to oppose this resolution and to allow for the continued implementation of the law. Should you have any questions, please reach out to Liz King, Leadership Conference Director of Education Policy.

Sincerely,

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; Alliance for Excellent Education; Association of University Centers on Disabilities; Children’s Defense Fund; Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates; Democrats for Education Reform; Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund; Easterseals; The Education Trust; Judge David L. Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law.

League of United Latin American Citizens; MALDEF; NAACP; NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.; National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities; National Center for Learning Disabilities; National Council of La Raza; National Disability Rights Network; National Down Syndrome Congress; National Indian Education Association; National Urban League; National Women’s Law Center; New Leaders; PolicyLink; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC); Stand for Children; Teach For America; Teach Plus; TNTIP; UNCF.

THE COUNCIL OF PARENT ATTORNEYS AND ADVOCATES, INC., DEMOCRATS FOR EDUCATION REFORM, THE EDUCATION TRUST, THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, NATIONAL CENTER FOR LEARNING DISABILITIES, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA, U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

February 6, 2017.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: Over the past two years, our organizations have worked together—across lines that often divide us on matters of public policy—to secure provisions in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) that we all think are vitally important to our nation’s future, and ensure those provisions are implemented well in the states. Our common goals include:

State-adopted standards aligned with the demands of postsecondary education and the workforce;

Annual statewide assessment of all students in grades 3–8 and once again in high school, with a strictly limited exception for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities;

Transparent, accessible reporting of data—disaggregated by race, income, disability status, and English proficiency—at the state, district, and school levels, so educators, parents, and students themselves have objective information on where they are on their journey to college and career readiness; and

Statewide accountability systems that include achievement and graduation-rate goals for all groups of students, rate schools in large part on the academic performance of all groups of students, and require action when any group of students consistently underperforms.

The overwhelmingly bipartisan legislation reflects these principles. It grants states broad discretion to design their systems while holding them responsible for working within-federal guardrails to design systems that ensure genuine equity and excellence for all students.

Since ESSA’s passage, we have collectively been working in states across the country to equip diverse partners to push for and support the development of state systems focused on equity and improvement.

One important piece of this process is the adoption of regulations, which provide clarity and certainty on both the key principles of the statute and the processes for implementation.

The U.S. Department of Education finalized those regulations in November. But just as states and state advocates are putting pen to paper on their state plans, you are considering a resolution disapproving of the regulations. This action will cause unnecessary confusion, disrupting the work in states and wasting time that we cannot afford to waste.

Just as we believe the Every Student Succeeds Act incorporates our principles, we believe the regulations do as well. And they provide states with the clarity they need to move forward. We do not support H.J. Res 57 and we ask you to vote no.

Mr. POLIS. The opposing organizations include Alliance for Excellent Education; Association of University Centers on Disabilities; Children’s Defense Fund; Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities; Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates; Democrats for Education Reform; Easterseals; The Education Trust; League of United Latin American Citizens; Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund; NAACP; National Center for Learning Disabilities; National Council of La Raza; National Down Syndrome Congress; National Urban League; National Women’s Law Center; Southeast Asia Resource Action Center; Stand for Children; Teach For America; United Negro College Fund. And even, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has weighed in on this bill to oppose these efforts to strip away the accountability system from our public education.

I also want to point out that I was opposed to the earlier resolution on the floor today, which would unravel the Department of Education’s regulation on teacher preparation.

The intent of the teacher preparation program, as was argued here, was to

provide more transparency and accountability around the quality of teacher preparation programs.

This Republican quest to abolish accountability for our public schools is exactly the opposite of what I hear from parents and families in my district who want to make sure that we have more transparency and more accountability, not less.

While I think we all can agree that a great education starts with a great teacher, we ought to be able to make sure that teacher preparation programs are charged with adequately preparing teachers and that we have some objective criteria for checking whether teacher preparation programs are doing a good job or doing a poor job.

The regulation also requires that TEACH Grant recipients attend high-performing teacher preparation programs. It is not a matter of picking winners or losers. It is simply a solution towards making sure our limited taxpayer dollars for professional development and teacher training are used effectively. If money is going to be invested in teachers at high-needs schools, we want to make sure that teachers are attending high-quality programs.

Now we have had a robust debate about the implications of accountability and the real impact it has for States, districts, and students; but I want people to focus on the story of parents and families in their district who benefited from the accountability system that previously existed and is improved upon through the Every Student Succeeds Act.

It walks away from accountability—that is what this CRA does. If this CRA passes, it doesn’t just get rid of a particular set of rules around accountability. Everybody might have things they want to change. There is a process for changing those and a new Secretary in place who can certainly begin that process. No, it wouldn’t do that.

It would abolish the entire rules and effectively prevent the Secretary from promulgating new rules around accountability, leaving it completely unknown to the States and the school districts what criteria the Federal Government was looking for in improving State-based accountability programs.

Parents like Jacob’s wouldn’t know if the Federal Government would be there to make sure that school districts had a plan to meet the learning needs of every child.

The reason it is opposed so vociferously by civil rights organizations is none of us would know whether the State accountability plan had a plan to close the achievement gap to make sure that schools can cater to the needs of all kids, regardless of their race or income.

That is what is lacking by passage of this CRA. It would effectively handcuff the Secretary of Education, prevent her from implementing the overwhelming will of this body, Democratic and Republican, to maintain the civil

rights and accountability safeguards of No Child Left Behind; by moving away from the one-size-fits-all accountability formula towards increased State flexibility, so long as the basic goal of meeting the learning needs of all students were met by State level plans.

That is at the heart of why we need accountability in the Every Student Succeeds Act. This is why we need guidance from the Department of Education through rules and regulations.

The resolution before us today would completely undermine the civil rights provisions of the Every Student Succeeds Act and would prevent the Department of Education from even considering new rules and regulations to protect the civil rights of Americans across our country.

Those with learning disabilities and those without, parents across the country have banded together to oppose this Congressional Review Act.

I urge my colleagues to reject this attempt to undermine our public schools and undermine accountability. I oppose this resolution, and I urge a "no" vote.

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

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

The gentleman talks about accountability. I want to reassure all the Members here that will be voting on this joint resolution that we are not throwing accountability out the window.

What we decided last year when we passed the Every Student Succeeds Act is that accountability was a good thing. But the best leaders and the best persons to determine what that accountability should be and what that accountability should look like are found in our States and are found in our local jurisdictions. They know our best assets the best—our best assets being our children. They know what they need.

So we are not throwing accountability out the window. We are saying accountability is to be measured at the State level by the States, by the local jurisdictions, and they are to simply report to the Department of Education what their accountability plan is in a transparent way so that, again, parents, teachers, and taxpayers can decide if that State is doing a good job, so that people like the NAACP—if they are and should be, as we all should be, worried about achievement gaps—could affect how to close those achievement gaps in those respective States and, by the way, perhaps come up with a more effective way, a better plan, a more aggressive plan to close that achievement gap rather than the one-size-fits-all bureaucracy that is the Federal Department of Education. That is the whole point.

Secondly, regarding civil rights. Nothing in this resolution that takes back this draconian rulemaking from the Department of Education affects civil rights. We are very clear in the

Every Student Succeeds Act that the civil rights protections remain. We agreed with that in a bipartisan way, and all of that remains. Don't let the gentleman from Colorado scare you into thinking anything different.

There was a lot of talk about uncertainty from previous speakers—uncertainty for States—and that blocking implementation of these regulations will create that uncertainty. Let me address that for just a couple of minutes.

We, Congress, cannot allow Federal agencies to ignore the clear prohibitions against executive overreach. These regulations clearly attempt to reassert Federal control that was returned to the States by Congress under ESSA.

□ 1630

Repealing these regulations is the only way to give States and school districts the certainty that they need with sufficient time to move the implementation process forward. The law itself provides enough guidance. We were very specific how we wrote this law. We were very specific in the requirements needed. That removes the need to have the kind of rulemaking that the Department of Education, either through habit or through direct intent, is trying to do here. We don't need to do it here.

The law itself lays out clear criteria for the State plans. It states explicitly that the onus is on the Department of Education to demonstrate how a plan does not comply with the law that we wrote and that the President signed into law. It does not require, and the States are not required, to go jump through the hoops that the Department is trying to have them jump through now through this rulemaking.

The law also requires the Department to review the State plans with deference to State and local judgments. The Department is trying to take that judgment away from the States and put it under its own umbrella.

Under the law, as long as States can demonstrate that their plans comply with the statute, they will be approved. We wrote that into the law. Because of this, States can have the certainty that the work they began can continue. The Department, with this rule, is trying to unravel all that. The resolution stops the Department from doing that.

I know Congressman COSTELLO mentioned teacher performance. Others have talked about student assessment participation rates. Let me give you a few examples for the record, Mr. Speaker. ESSA allowed States to determine how to hold schools accountable for assessing students. The final rule limits States to only four options for assessing students and requires schools to implement a plan to address low test participation—not required in the law, not part of what we are doing here. The Department, by doing that, is making up law.

Regarding teacher performance and some things that Mr. COSTELLO referenced, ESSA explicitly prohibited the Secretary from mandating the creation of teacher evaluation systems. As the Federal Government, we are getting out of the business of teacher evaluation systems. It didn't mean the States couldn't do it. It didn't mean that most States wouldn't do it. However, the final rule requires States to establish a statewide definition for what an ineffective teacher means that differentiates between categories of teachers.

Now, if you look at this in effect, in practical terms, it would be almost impossible for States to fulfill this requirement without implementing a teacher and school leader evaluation, something the law specifically didn't require, specifically prohibited. Yet, here we are with the Department's rule basically making States do it. Not what was intended. Not what we wrote. Not what we voted on on the floor of this House, and not what was signed into law by the President of the United States at the time.

So these are the kinds of things that we are fighting against here, Mr. Speaker. These are the kinds of things that H.J. Res. 57, and H.J. Res. 58 for that matter, would stop the Department from doing. H.J. Res. 57 protects the positive reforms Congress made with Every Student Succeeds Act and ensures that those reforms are implemented as Congress intended. In doing so, the resolution preserves State and local control over K-12 education and provides States and school districts the certainty they need to proceed with the plans that they are already in the process of writing.

That is why a number of groups—including the National Governors Association; AASA, the School Superintendents Association; and the Council of the Great City Schools—have spoken out in support of the resolution. It is also why the National School Boards Association supports this resolution, and it is why H.J. Res. 57 is supported by Citizens Against Government Waste.

I am confident that Congress will continue working in a bipartisan manner to empower our State and local communities to take the lead in accountability. There will be accountability. By putting a stop to the Obama administration's flawed and overreaching accountability regulation, however, we can keep the promise we made to reduce the Federal role, restore local control, and ensure all children receive the high-quality education that they deserve.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to voice my strong opposition to H.J. Res. 57, which is another Republican proposal to erode the oversight and enforcement authority of the Department of Education.

In 2015, Congress responded to the voice of the American people by passing the Every

Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) with bipartisan and bicameral support. This sweeping rewrite of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act gave states and local boards of education greater flexibility to implement plans to ensure student achievement, resource equity and greater accountability.

I was happy to support the ESSA after seeking the advice of experienced educators and education stakeholders from Rockdale, DeKalb, and Gwinnett Counties, as well as throughout Georgia.

H.J. Res 57, on the other hand, flies in the face of Congressional intent by gutting a key ESSA rule developed with, and supported by teachers, civil rights organizations, parents and states. H.J. Res 57 removes civil rights protections and blocks improvements to our nation's public education system by dismantling data-reporting requirements that ensure that the needs of underperforming groups in all subgroups are adequately supported. This includes African Americans, Latinos, and students with disabilities. The Administration and my Republican colleagues are playing political games that will ultimately harm taxpayers, teachers, and our nation's most disadvantaged students.

During my time in Congress, I have worked to ensure that all students have access to a world-class education regardless of their background or zip code. I believe that all children deserve a quality education and that no child should ever fall between the cracks. I will continue fighting against republican attempts to divert funding from public education and reduce equal opportunity for all students.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 57. I am pleased to join Congressman TODD ROKITA as an original cosponsor.

As a parent, I know that success looks different for each child. I frequently hear from parents, teachers, and school boards in my district that with more local flexibility, they can better meet the needs of local students. This is why the Every Student Succeeds Act replaced the one-size-fits-all approach to K-12 education, and gave power back to states and school districts. Unfortunately, the previous administration used executive authority to impose an inflexible accountability system and take away the local voices; voices that are critical in determining how schools should be held accountable. Local schools, teachers, and parents, not Washington bureaucrats, know best what success looks like.

Mr. Speaker, let's return authority where it belongs—with teachers, schools, and school districts.

Success and accountability should be about meeting students' needs, not Washington's mandates. I urge my colleagues to support passage of House Joint Resolution 57.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 91, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.J. Res. 44; passage of H.J. Res. 57; and passage of H.J. Res. 58.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

DISAPPROVING RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR RELATING TO BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 44) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior relating to Bureau of Land Management regulations that establish the procedures used to prepare, revise, or amend land use plans pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 186, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

YEAS—234

Abraham	Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)
Aderholt	Cheney	Frelinghuysen
Allen	Coffman	Gaetz
Amash	Cole	Gallagher
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Garrett
Arrington	Collins (NY)	Gibbs
Babin	Comer	Gohmert
Bacon	Comstock	Goodlatte
Banks (IN)	Conaway	Gosar
Barletta	Cook	Gowdy
Barr	Costello (PA)	Granger
Barton	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Bergman	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Biggs	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Bilirakis	Culberson	Griffith
Bishop (MI)	Curbelo (FL)	Grothman
Bishop (UT)	Davidson	Guthrie
Black	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Blackburn	Denham	Harris
Blum	Dent	Hartzler
Bost	DeSantis	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Hice, Jody B.
Bridenstine	Donovan	Higgins (LA)
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Hill
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Buchanan	Duncan (TN)	Hollingsworth
Buck	Dunn	Hudson
Bucshon	Emmer	Huizenga
Budd	Farenthold	Hultgren
Burgess	Faso	Hunter
Byrne	Ferguson	Hurd
Calvert	Fleischmann	Issa
Carter (GA)	Flores	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (TX)	Fortenberry	Jenkins (WV)
Chabot	Fox	Johnson (LA)

Johnson (OH)	Mooney (WV)	Sensenbrenner
Johnson, Sam	Mullin	Sessions
Jones	Murphy (PA)	Shimkus
Jordan	Newhouse	Shuster
Joyce (OH)	Noem	Simpson
Katko	Nunes	Sinema
Kelly (MS)	Olson	Smith (MO)
Kelly (PA)	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
King (IA)	Palmer	Smith (TX)
King (NY)	Paulsen	Smucker
Kinzinger	Pearce	Stefanik
Knight	Perry	Stewart
Kustoff (TN)	Peterson	Stivers
Labrador	Pittenger	Taylor
LaHood	Poliquin	Tenney
LaMalfa	Posey	Thompson (PA)
Lamborn	Ratcliffe	Thornberry
Latta	Reed	Tiberi
Lewis (MN)	Reichert	Tipton
Long	Renacci	Trott
Loudermilk	Rice (SC)	Turner
Love	Roby	Upton
Lucas	Roe (TN)	Valadao
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Wagner
MacArthur	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
Marchant	Rohrabacher	Walden
Marino	Rokita	Walker
Marshall	Rooney, Francis	Walorski
Massie	Rooney, Thomas	Walters, Mimi
Mast	J.	Weber (TX)
McCarthy	Ros-Lehtinen	Wenstrup
McCaul	Roskam	Westerman
McClintock	Ross	Williams
McHenry	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)
McKinley	Rouzer	Wittman
McMorris	Royce (CA)	Womack
Rodgers	Russell	Woodall
McSally	Rutherford	Yoder
Meadows	Sanford	Yoho
Meehan	Scalise	Young (AK)
Messer	Schrader	Young (IA)
Mitchell	Schweikert	Zeldin
Moolenaar	Scott, Austin	

NAYS—186

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Loebsack
Aguilar	F.	Lofgren
Barragan	Ellison	Lowenthal
Bass	Engel	Lowe
Beatty	Eshoo	Lujan Grisham,
Bera	Espallat	M.
Beyer	Esty	Lujan, Ben Ray
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Lynch
Blumenauer	Fitzpatrick	Maloney,
Blunt Rochester	Foster	Carolyn B.
Bonamici	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Boyle, Brendan	Gabbard	Matsui
F.	Gallego	McCollum
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	McEachin
Brown (MD)	Gonzalez (TX)	McGovern
Brownley (CA)	Gottheimer	McNerney
Bustos	Green, Al	Meeks
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Meng
Capuano	Grijalva	Moore
Carbajal	Gutiérrez	Moulton
Cárdenas	Hanabusa	Murphy (FL)
Carson (IN)	Hastings	Nadler
Cartwright	Heck	Napolitano
Castor (FL)	Higgins (NY)	Neal
Castro (TX)	Himes	Nolan
Chu, Judy	Hoyer	Norcross
Ciциlline	Huffman	O'Halleran
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	O'Rourke
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Pallone
Clay	Jeffries	Panetta
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
Clyburn	Kaptur	Payne
Cohen	Keating	Pelosi
Connolly	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter
Conyers	Kennedy	Peters
Cooper	Khanna	Pingree
Correa	Kihuen	Pocan
Costa	Kildee	Polis
Courtney	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Crist	Kind	Quigley
Crowley	Krishnamoorthi	Raskin
Cummings	Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Lance	Richmond
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Rosen
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
Delaney	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Lawson (FL)	Ryan (OH)
DelBene	Lee	Sánchez
Demings	Levin	Sarbanes
DeSaulnier	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Deutch	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
Dingell	Lipinski	Schneider
Doggett	LoBiondo	Scott (VA)

Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi

NOT VOTING—12

Frankel (FL)
Johnson (GA)
Mulvaney
Poe (TX)

Price, Tom (GA)
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)

Thompson (MS)
Webster (FL)
Wilson (FL)
Zinke

□ 1657

Messrs. GOTTHEIMER, RUPPERSBERGER, and BROWN of Maryland changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 83.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO ACCOUNTABILITY AND STATE PLANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 57) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 190, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—234

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine

Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer

Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy

Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaezt
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta

NAYS—190

Adams
Aguilar
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cardenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar

Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal

Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meng

Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley

NOT VOTING—8

Price, Tom (GA)
Rush
Sires

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1703

So the joint resolution was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO TEACHER PREPARATION ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 181, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—240

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine

Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn

Emmer
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador

NAYS—181

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

LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perrino
Pittenger
Poliquin
Posey
Ratchiffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

Hanabusa
Hastings
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray

Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Gutiérrez
Higgins (NY)
Johnson, E. B.
Mulvaney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1710

So the joint resolution was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 6 and Tuesday, February 7, 2017, I was unable to return to Washington, DC for recorded votes due to inclement weather at home in the Puget Sound region. Had I been present, I would have voted:

“Yes” on rollcall vote No. 79 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 689).

“Yes” on rollcall vote No. 80 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 337).

“No” on rollcall vote No. 81 (on ordering the previous question on H.Res. 91).

“No” on rollcall vote No. 82 (on agreeing to the resolution H.Res. 91).

“No” on rollcall vote No. 83 (on passage of H.J.Res. 44).

“No” on rollcall vote No. 84 (on passage of H.J.Res. 57).

“No” on rollcall vote No. 85 (on passage of H.J.Res. 58).

ADJOURNMENT FROM TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2017 TO THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2017; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2017, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2017

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 9, 2017, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Monday, February 13, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

NOT VOTING—11

Poe (TX)
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush
Scott, David

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

Sires
Smith (WA)
Zinke

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 428, RED RIVER GRADIENT BOUNDARY SURVEY ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 42, DISAPPROVING RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO DRUG TESTING OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION APPLICANTS

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–10) on the resolution (H. Res. 99) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 428) to survey the gradient boundary along the Red River in the States of Oklahoma and Texas, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 42) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to drug testing of unemployment compensation applicants, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RANKING A CERTAIN MEMBER OF A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 98

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby ranked as follows on the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.—Mr. Higgins of New York (to rank immediately after Mr. Jeffries).

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1715

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMER) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

FEBRUARY 7, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 5, 115th Congress, I am pleased to reappoint The Honorable James P. McGovern of Massachusetts as Co-Chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

CONGRATULATING THE NEW ENGLAND PATRIOTS

(Mr. POLIQUIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, right here, I congratulated our New England Patriots on winning their fourth Super Bowl championship. Today I am proud to share the excitement of my fellow Mainers to congratulate our Patriots on capturing their fifth world championship.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night, more than 100 million football fans from around the world witnessed the greatest comeback in Super Bowl history. Against an outstanding Atlanta Falcons team, our mighty Patriots battled back from 25 points down with only 17 minutes left to play.

Now, our Patriots, Mr. Speaker, showed the world what can be achieved if you work together and you never give up. We in Congress, all of us, can learn from that example.

Coach Belichick, you have earned your place in history as the greatest coach in NFL history. And co-captain Brady, you, sir, have earned your place as the greatest quarterback of all time.

Mr. Speaker, Maine is so proud of all of our New England Patriots, and I humbly congratulate them. I will see everybody on this team at the White House this spring.

NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of National School Counseling Week and in honor of the many dedicated school counselors in Rhode Island and across the Nation, every day, school counselors are out on the front lines helping our students navigate their educational and career pathways. They provided advice and support during the most formative years of students' lives, helping them develop the skills to succeed in school, in the workforce, and in life.

Unfortunately, in too many schools across the country, students do not have access to school counselors and counselors do not have the resources they need to do their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it is Congress' responsibility to provide schools and counselors with the funding that they need to properly educate and guide our Nation's youth.

In recognition of National School Counseling Week, I ask my colleagues to join me in renewing our promise to fulfill that responsibility. Our students, Mr. Speaker, are depending on us.

SERVING THE NEEDS OF VETERANS WITH SNAP

(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, I rise today to speak on behalf of the veterans that have made incredible sacrifices for our country. Our Nation must ensure that they have access to resources that they need to be successful in civilian life. This certainly includes access to nutritious food.

Out of the 22 million veterans in the United States, about 1.7 million are in households that currently participate in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. Approximately 46 percent of our veterans are senior citizens, including those who served in World War II, Korea, or Vietnam.

Veterans of all ages may also have widely varying levels of disabilities or limitations. Veteran advocacy groups are focused on obtaining a veteran's earned benefits. Often veterans are not connected to SNAP right away and they should be.

As the Agriculture Committee prepares to reauthorize SNAP, we must remain vigilant in our dedication to serve those who have given so much in defense of our Nation. SNAP cannot solve all of the challenges a veteran faces, but it can be a vital component of serving eligible veterans once they return home.

REDUCTION IN STUDENT LOANS FOR STEM MAJORS

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, here in America, we are changing the world with our ingenuity and technological advances.

It is our creative and innovative spirit that allows us to continue to be a leader in the world economy and raise the quality of life of the human race. We know that jobs of the present and the future will require many new students and retrained workers to pursue STEM degrees—those in science, technology, engineering, and math.

While many politicians have talked a good game about encouraging students to pursue these degrees, it is time to put our money where our mouth is. Today I introduced the ASPIRE Act, H.R. 926, the American Science Principal and Interest Reduction and Employment Act. This act would grant a 25 percent reduction in student loans for any student who graduates with a STEM major.

According to the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, one million new STEM jobs are projected to come online between 2012 to 2022, for a total of 9 million, 13 percent growth over the decade. This means we must act now to meet these needs, and I encourage all of you to cosponsor this important legislation.

It is time to create real incentives to encourage our students to aspire to new heights and create the jobs of tomorrow today.

EDUCATION REFORM

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, back in 2015, Congress passed one of the most significant education reform legislation in decades. Even more impressive than repealing No Child Left Behind, scaling back the role of the Secretary of Education and restoring authority back to the States and local school districts was the fact that this legislation was bipartisan, bicameral, and signed into law by President Obama.

But even so, this couldn't exempt our States and schools from the watchful eyes of Washington. President Obama's Department of Education unsurprisingly went over the line by expanding his authority, a role that Congress clearly did not allow for in the law.

That is why today I am delighted to see the House pass H.J. Res. 57 because we have to make the Department of Education follow the law as it was intended by Congress. The Every Student Succeeds Act was written to stop Federal micromanagement of our schools, and Congress is ensuring that that happens. For the last time, Washington bureaucrats do not belong in the classroom.

TRUMP SIDES WITH RUSSIA IN COMMENTS ON UKRAINE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today regarding President Trump's strange admiration for Russia's President Vladimir Putin. Our President seems to side with Russia over Ukraine and is defaulting to tyranny over liberty.

Despite ample evidence from our defense community and European allies, President Trump still casts doubt on whether Moscow is backing Russian forces who have killed over 10,000 innocent Ukrainians and who recently killed at least eight more Ukrainian soldiers and 40 civilians and turned off water and electricity in the invaded region.

When Bill O'Reilly asked our President if he respected Putin, a known killer, the President replied: "There are a lot of killers. You think our country's so innocent?"

The President equates Mr. Putin's actions with those of our country. It is not the first time this has happened.

Every time President Trump says something Putin likes, it is broadcast on Kremlin-owned propaganda machines like RT. This is a dangerous threat to liberty.

President Trump openly admires and appeases Putin, whose tenure is known for human rights abuses, brutal suppression of political dissent, and mysterious deaths of journalists and political opponents, like Vladimir Kara-

Murza who wrote a letter critical of Putin to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee regarding the nomination of Secretary Tillerson. Last Thursday, while in Moscow, he fell into a life-threatening coma believed to be caused by an unknown poison.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to normalize what President Trump is doing. We cannot afford to take our country back to an era of unchecked Russian aggression.

We need freedom. That is what is at stake.

I include in the RECORD a February 6, 2017, article by Julie Hirschfeld Davis.

[Feb. 6, 2017]

TRUMP SEEMS TO SIDE WITH RUSSIA IN
COMMENTS ON UKRAINE

(By Julie Hirschfeld Davis)

WASHINGTON.—President Trump cast doubt on whether Moscow is backing separatists engaged in the recent escalation of fighting in eastern Ukraine, appearing to side with President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia, who has long denied involvement in the conflict despite evidence to the contrary.

Mr. Trump said he did not take offense at the outbreak of a lethal bout of fighting in Ukraine that came within a day of a phone conversation he had with Mr. Putin, saying of the recent clashes, “we don’t really know exactly what that is.”

“They’re pro-forces,” Mr. Trump said of the Ukrainian separatists in an interview that aired on Monday on “The O’Reilly Factor,” on Fox News. “We don’t know, are they uncontrollable? Are they uncontrolled? That happens also. We’re going to find out; I would be surprised, but we’ll see.”

Mr. Trump’s comments were the latest indication that his desire for warmer relations with Russia may be coloring his view of the conflict in Ukraine, which pits the country’s military—trained and equipped in part by the United States Army—against Russian-backed separatists. Moscow has denied involvement in the three-year conflict, despite evidence that it has provided equipment and fighters to support separatist forces in eastern Ukraine.

The president’s push for a friendlier relationship with Mr. Putin has alarmed Ukrainian officials, who fear that the pressure former President Barack Obama applied on Russia to withdraw its unacknowledged military forces from eastern Ukraine will wane.

A telephone call Mr. Trump held on Saturday with President Petro O. Poroshenko of Ukraine raised further questions about his position on the conflict and his administration’s commitment to maintaining sanctions against Russia for the annexation of Crimea.

In an official account of the call, Mr. Trump had said he was willing to work with Kiev and Moscow to resolve the conflict. But the statement referred to helping to “restore peace along the border,” while the violence has been playing out inside eastern Ukraine.

UF HEALTH SHANDS HOSPITAL
PEDIATRIC HEART TRANSPLANT
PROGRAM

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Florida’s UF Health Shands Hospital pediatric heart transplant program for being named one of the best in the Nation. According to the Scientific Registry of

Transplant Recipients, this unit has had zero pediatric heart transplant deaths in the last 2½ years.

Since 2006, the UF Health Shands Transplant Center has performed a total of 120 pediatric heart and lung transplants, making it one of the most active pediatric heart transplant programs in the Southeast. In fact, in the last year, U.S. News and World Report named UF Health number one in the State and fourth in the Nation for pediatric heart surgeries and cardiology. This recognition speaks volumes about the level of care shown by the physicians and their teams at UF Health, and I look forward to watching them continue to be a leader in patient care and innovation in the coming years.

I must end with Go Gators.

PULL THE MUSLIM BAN DOWN

(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, let me again repeat my concern, when the United States is compared to the thuggish behavior of Russian leadership, the attempt to poison individuals who are activists and opponents to that kind of oppression.

But I want to speak today to what is impacting our neighbors, Mr. Speaker, and that is the executive order that has been issued by the President of the United States. I want to dispel any myth that Members of this body who oppose the executive order are against security for this Nation.

I am a years-long member of the Homeland Security Committee, the Transportation Security Committee, the Border Security Committee, and work hard to write a stiff border security bill. But, frankly, this is a Muslim ban, and when a 17-year-old, 16-year-old from my community, from Jordan, was stopped and held for 48 hours and shipped to Chicago, that is a Muslim ban.

What I say to those who have executed it is that you have to realize that the order that you tried to copy from President Obama was not the same. It was stringent review; it was not rejection. You are rejecting Muslims and allowing others.

As a Christian, I know that Christians are not being subjected to the same kind of scrutiny. This is a Muslim ban. I ask the White House, as we go to court this evening: Why don’t you reconsider and pull that Muslim ban down?

□ 1730

WHAT HAS WASHINGTON DONE TO
YOU?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, well, let’s see, I got a phone call from my district—one of several dozen today—and they all are kind of about the same thing: What is going on in Washington? What are they doing in Washington? What is happening? What is happening with ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act? What are they going to do about this wall? People are concerned. People want to know what is happening in Washington.

I suspect a good many of us are trying to figure out what the next steps are. It seems like every other moment something new is erupting from the White House, another tweet or another executive order, and we have had a lot of them. And so what I want to do today is to kind of go back and take a look at what has transpired over these last 2½ weeks. What has happened in Washington these last 2½ weeks?

Besides a lot of confusion, angst, and concern, some very, very important things are happening, and here is my take on it. I am going to kind of put a title on today, and I am going to say: What has Washington done to you, not for you. What has Washington done to you?

Let’s start with the very first day that President Trump was inaugurated. Well, it was all about the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare. So he set out to begin the repeal of ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act.

Oh, by the way, they are one and the same. It depends which way you are looking at this thing, but the repeal of the Affordable Care Act has dire consequences on Americans.

Some 30 million Americans could be affected, according to the Congressional Budget Office, or in my State, we are looking at maybe 5 million people could lose their health coverage, their insurance, as a result of that. There is \$16 billion that immediately flows to the State of California for the expansion of the Medicaid, Medi-Cal program in California. That would be gone. And those people that are on that program would simply not be able to get care.

It goes beyond just those who are in the exchanges. The exchange in California is working quite well. Maybe a 1½ million people in California are covered through the exchange, and they have options in most every part of the State.

In my part of the State, there are some shortcomings because services are not readily available, but there are 34 clinics managed by nine organizations that provide medical services in my district. Every one of those clinics rely upon ObamaCare, or the Affordable Care Act, for the services that they render. If the Affordable Care Act disappears, we repeal ObamaCare, those clinics are out of business.

And what does that mean? It means that thousands, literally hundreds of thousands of people in my district would no longer be receiving medical

services through the clinics, through the Affordable Care Act's expansion, or through the Medi-Cal program. This is serious business.

There is another piece to this, and I would like to put up some charts on that, but let's just go back and quickly review the benefits. The benefits are:

5.1 million seniors receive savings on prescription drugs. You know that famous drug doughnut hole; it has almost disappeared as the result of the ObamaCare Affordable Care Act.

32.5 million seniors receive free annual preventions, health checkups, every year. What does that mean? It means their blood pressure is checked out, their potential for diabetes, for other chronic illnesses, and they get the medicine for diabetes. They get better health care, and the cost of Medicare is reduced.

Also, it strengthens consumer protections for seniors in Medicare part D, and at least 85 percent of Medicare Advantage Plans' revenues go back towards providing senior services. That is just for seniors.

So there are many, many benefits in the Affordable Care Act beyond just those that are getting new insurance policies. It is a big deal for seniors. They are able to get an annual check-up. They are able to get their drugs much cheaper, able to provide them with the necessary pieces of it.

One of the very first acts that has been taken up here by Congress is the budget resolution passed by both Houses. It is now in effect, the first budget resolution, and that budget resolution tells the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee: Repeal the taxes that are associated with the Affordable Care Act. It is a lot of money, somewhere between \$700 million and \$1 trillion of tax cuts directly associated with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare.

Who gets the benefit of those tax reductions? Well, the top 1 percent would receive some 70 percent of the benefit.

What does that amount to? Well, it amounts to—did I say 1 percent? The top one-tenth of 1 percent would receive the great majority of the benefit, or \$200,000 tax reduction for the super-superwealthy. The rest of them, the top 1 percent, get 57 percent of that \$700 billion, and that is over a 10-year period. And everyone else, that would be the other 99 percent, will share in a much smaller portion, the remaining 43 percent.

For an average family, it probably amounts to maybe a tax reduction of \$160. However, those are the people that are able to get their insurance through the exchanges, and so they are getting a really bad deal because the average exchange, for example, in California, is somewhere over \$2,500.

So this is the tax repeal. It is a massive tax cut for the super-superwealthy.

It turns out that to pay for the Affordable Care Act, a very progressive tax was put in place, and it does pro-

vide benefits for those who are uninsured, the Medicaid population across the Nation, as well as providing the buy-down of the insurance policies that are available through the various exchanges.

Keep in mind, when people talk about repealing the Affordable Care Act taxes, what they are talking about is a massive redistribution of wealth in this Nation and a furtherance of this income inequality that has been such a problem in our society and in our economy.

So the repeal of the Affordable Care Act does many, many things, most of which would be quite a problem for working men and women, for the seniors, for the elderly.

I didn't mention here that a good portion of that Medicaid population goes to provide long-term care in nursing homes for seniors who are not wealthy. I don't have the exact percentage, but some people say it is 50, 60 percent of Medicaid benefits across the Nation wind up providing services in the long-term care facilities.

Is that important to seniors? Oh, yeah.

Is it important for children of seniors, you know, those people that are in their forties and fifties whose parents are in their seventies and eighties? They are deeply concerned about this particular issue of the Medicaid expansion being eliminated by a repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and then they wind up in a situation of having to take care of Mom and Dad, trying to figure out how to do it on their insufficient income.

So we need to understand that the very first act undertaken by the President was to set in motion a very serious rejiggering, a reoperation of the entire healthcare system in this Nation, so much so that the standard insurance companies that provide policies to the great majority of Americans are going: Whoa, wait a minute. You eliminate the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, and we don't know how to price in the marketplace for the coming year.

Right now, those insurance companies are in the process of figuring out what their policies are going to be, how they would price them.

One of the things the Affordable Care Act does is to provide an opportunity for those that have preexisting conditions, serious healthcare problems, for those people to be able to get insurance; therefore, the risk is spread. Now, if the Affordable Care Act disappears, would this be part of the replacement? We don't know.

Our colleagues on the Republican side keep talking about repeal and replace. We don't have a replacement plan yet, but what we do have is a probability of a massive tax cut for the very wealthy. We are also looking at chaos in the insurance system.

So let's be aware of what is going on in Washington when we talk about repeal and replace and when you talk

about ObamaCare—which, by the way, is also known as the Affordable Care Act.

I have, today, some of my colleagues joining us. I notice that two of them are here. We could go alphabetically, in which case—well, let me see, P-Q-R. That means PANETTA comes first.

My new colleague from the Monterey Bay area of California will join us here. He wants to talk about some of these issues that confront Americans and explain to all of us what this Congress and what the President is doing to Americans.

I welcome Mr. PANETTA to his very first Special Order hour that I have been able to work with him. I know you have spoken on the floor before, and we look forward to your comments tonight. I thank the gentleman very much for joining us.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, and I rise today to oppose President Trump's anti-immigrant executive orders and to share with you why I feel these orders harm the people across my district and, ultimately, across our Nation.

I am here because my grandfather came here as an Italian immigrant back in 1921. He told us that the reason he came here was to give his children a better life, and he wanted a chance to achieve what I think we all know to be the American Dream.

I am here in front of you living the reality of that dream. And that is why I strive every day as best as I can to give back to my country and community here in Washington, D.C., and especially on the central coast of California.

I do that not only because of my grandfather, but because it was our forefathers that made it clear that this is a nation, this is a country based on "We the People." And so to me, being in this country, being American, means that all of us bear the burden to serve one another and to welcome those—especially those—who are willing to come here and share in that responsibility. I believe that we should embrace them. I believe that we should embolden them with the opportunities to share in that American Dream.

We know that the world looks to the United States for enlightened leadership, but these ill-advised actions send a wrong message about our values as a nation. We are a nation of immigrants. We are stronger because of our diversity and because of the people who have taken the risks to come here just as my grandfather did, to live here and to contribute to our country and our communities.

On the central coast of California, that is the heart and soul of that area. I see hardworking men and women who have come to this country to live in it and contribute to it. The two main industries there on the central coast are agriculture and tourism—big industries.

There are people, workers, owners who contribute greatly not only to those industries, but to our communities, and they are our neighbors, our friends, our families, our children. They sit next to my two daughters and play with them at school. Clearly, without them, my community would be a shell of its former self.

I hear the pain in their voices because they feel that this administration's executive order targets them and makes them feel unwelcome. I see that these types of executive orders drive a wedge in our country, and it drives them further away from participating in our community.

Before I was sworn in on January 3 of this year, I was a prosecutor; and for the 5½ years that I was there at the Monterey County District Attorney's Office, I prosecuted gang crimes. That kind of prosecution, as you can imagine, as you know well, it can be very difficult to have witnesses come forward and participate in one of the cornerstones of our country: our criminal justice system. They are intimidated. They are worried about retribution and retaliation.

Yet now, from what I have heard, they are worried not just about criminals; they are worried about the government, the government cracking down on them if they came forward, cracking down on them and sending them back to where they came from. These executive orders discourage participation in our community. Instead, as a nation, we should encourage people to step up, to step forward, and to be a part of our criminal justice system.

Last weekend, I met with community members and I heard directly from them about their concerns, and this weekend, I am doing it again. I am holding a townhall to continue this conversation.

□ 1745

I believe it is our responsibility to listen to all of our community members and consider the implications of these types of executive orders and the implications that they have on all of our constituents.

When the President of the United States was sworn in, he took an oath to protect all members of our Nation by supporting and defending our Constitution. As a Member of Congress, I took an oath to support and defend that very same Constitution. Rest assured, I will honor that oath, and I will honor the oath to my grandfather and to this country by fighting and resisting unconstitutional orders from this or any other President.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. PANETTA, thank you so very much for joining us this evening. Thank you for your statement of your life and your family's work. We know your father. Leon has been a dear friend of mine and most of us here in the House. You're going to really be a tremendous addition to this House. Your experience as a prosecutor

and in local government and county government positions you very well to bring the message.

Certainly, the Salinas Valley is one in which immigrants are the history, and they are the reality of today. Thank you so very much for watching out for them, for your passion, and for your extraordinary background in making all of us aware of what happens when sanctuary cities, immigration laws, and others are just tossed around without much thought about what the impact is in the community and to families, as well as to the economy of the community. I appreciate that and hope you will come back and join us on another Special Order.

From the other side of the country, we have Mr. RASKIN, another new Member of the House of Representatives. Welcome. You have a fascinating background, and I look forward to your comments today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you so much, Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you for convening us to talk about the first month of the Trump administration. The attacks on our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and the rule of law are coming fast and furious, so it is hard to collect all of them, and I appreciate the effort to try to inventory them today.

I represent the wonderful people of Montgomery County, Frederick County, and Carroll County, Maryland, the Eighth Congressional District, and I am, by training, a professor of constitutional law which I have done for the last quarter century at American University.

So in reviewing the highlights—or the low lights—of the last several weeks, Mr. GARAMENDI, I thought I would start, actually, with my very first day on the job. I went to sign up for health insurance in the basement of the Longworth House Office Building, which I was delighted to do because my job entitles me to sign up for health insurance, and I recognized how fortunate I was. As I was down there, a number of other new Members began to form, and I looked at them.

Then, as I was going through, at the same time, some memoranda that my office had received, I noticed that some of the first bills we were going to be looking at were to set the stage for dismantling the Affordable Care Act, for voucherizing Medicare, for pulverizing Medicaid and downsizing it, for demonizing Planned Parenthood, and for making it impossible for hundreds of thousands of citizens across the country to get basic health care.

I said to myself: Tell me that it is not the case that I am entering Congress with other Members who are going to be signing up for health insurance that they get as part of their job, and then they are going to go upstairs to the floor of the House and vote to strip 22 million Americans of their health care in the Affordable Care Act.

But, believe it or not, this is precisely what has transpired, and there is

a very clear move on to try to dismantle the Affordable Care Act. The majority has voted more than 60 times to repeal the Affordable Care Act, but America has woken up to the fact that it is for real this time, and we have hundreds of thousands—millions—of citizens mobilizing across the country to defend the Affordable Care Act and to demand accountability from their Member of Congress. I am thrilled to see that.

Also, during the last few weeks, we all read a report from 16 intelligence agencies of the United States, including the FBI, the CIA, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and a dozen more, all of them expressing their confidence and their very strong belief that Vladimir Putin, the KGB, and the Russian Government worked a campaign to undermine and sabotage American democracy in the 2016 Presidential election. It included acts of cyber sabotage, espionage, fake news, and propaganda that all entered into American political discourse and our institutions in order to change the outcome of the 2016 Presidential election.

What we have gotten from the President of the United States is a series of blithe dismissals of the whole thing saying repeatedly: Other people do the same.

I think it was yesterday that commentator Bill O'Reilly said that he needed to criticize Vladimir Putin, who was a killer, to which the President responded: Lots of people are killers. And, essentially: Have you looked at what America has done recently?

That kind of talk is absolutely outrageous and scandalous that the President would say that.

The point is not to join the killers of the world. The point is not to participate in the league of bandits, bullies, dictators, despots, and rightwing movements that are forming all over the world. The point is to take them on and to stand up for democracy, human rights, and the real ideals of the country.

So back in the home office, in Moscow, they must be chortling that the President of the United States would establish a moral equivalency between the first democracy—the first constitutional democracy ever created on Earth—and a thug who is presiding over essentially a kleptocratic, authoritarian regime in Russia, a man who has said that the collapse of the Soviet Union was the single greatest catastrophe of the 20th century.

So we have that to deal with.

Meantime, instead of taking on the real authoritarians on Earth, the President summons up all of his courage with Steve Bannon, and they impose a ban on people coming to America from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Sudan, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen; and they invoke 9/11 several times in the course of establishing this unprecedented refugee ban. The only problem is that the terrorist hijackers who came to attack

the country on 9/11 were from Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and the United Arab Emirates. The vast majority of them came from Saudi Arabia, which is the stronghold and the organizing center of Wahhabism, fundamentalism, radical Islamic terrorism on Earth which has been promoting and disseminating militant Islamist ideology all over the world. Yet, the Trump administration did nothing about that, either because they were too powerful for them to take on or because Mr. Trump has had extensive business dealings with Saudi Arabia, as well as in other countries that were passed over in this ban.

Now, of course, because this is a religiously oriented Muslim ban that is meant to whip up propaganda, hysteria, and chaos in the country and has nothing to do with national security, it has been struck down in different parts or in whole by five or six Federal district courts, most recently by the United States District Court in Seattle. The case is now in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

There are so many problems with the executive order in terms of due process, equal protection, free exercise of religion, and so on, that there are multiple judicial decisions that are striking down different aspects of the executive order.

Well, what else do we have going on? Today, in one of the committees that I serve on, the House Administration Committee, there was a 6-3 vote to dismantle the only Federal election entity, the EAC, which is charged with trying to promote the cybersecurity of our elections. That vote was along party lines—6-3—to dismantle the Election Assistance Commission which had been created and established on a bipartisan vote many years ago. That was just taken down.

So I would say that there appears to be an effort to plunge America into a certain kind of chaos at this point. That, of course, has been the explicit wish of Steve Bannon, who has described himself as a Leninist who wants to tear down our system of government and demolish the politics of the country to replace with something else which has gone un-named.

So, my fellow Americans, Mr. GARAMENDI, these are very serious times. I am thrilled that the people of America are organizing in every State of the Union and in every community to build up the capacity to resist these attacks on our Constitution, on our Bill of Rights, and on the rule of law. The majority of the people who did not vote for this President are mobilized, they are galvanized, and they understand that eternal vigilance is, indeed, the price of liberty, and people are going to remain eternally vigilant—and passionately so—during the course of this administration when the attacks continue to come fast and furious on our Constitution and our Bill of Rights.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. RASKIN, thank you so very much.

Indeed, your experience as a professor teaching constitutional law will be a very valuable asset to this House, and particularly in the context of what is transpiring on the floor with the repeal of so many of the regulations that are protecting Americans in so many different ways, and certainly with the incredible array of outlandish executive orders emanating from the White House, not the least of which is the immigration issue.

So as we journey through this period of disruption and chaos, I am certain that we will count upon you to provide us with insight into the way in which all of this fits into the very clear framework of the Constitution.

Mr. RASKIN. I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, there are so many other things to talk about here, and I probably have another 20 minutes to do it. I doubt that I will take all that time, unless my colleague from Iowa wants to engage in a colloquy about some issues of the day which we might find a very exciting and interesting thing to do, Mr. KING. I see you await your turn here.

Over the last week, Congress—the last 2 weeks now, 3 almost—has enacted a series of repeals of regulations that had been passed in the Obama administration. On the floor today, not more than an hour and a half ago, three additional repeals of regulations took place. These were under the Congressional Review Act, a law that is some 25 years old now that allows the Congress to literally repeal regulations that are out there.

I will give you a couple of examples. Today, one of them dealt with the planning process for the Bureau of Land Management. About a quarter of a million acres of land are under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management. This is public land. It belongs to all of us. This land is your land. Well, this is the land that belongs to the American people. The repeal today of a new public review process on land planning is—I don't understand it. I was once deputy secretary at the Department of the Interior, and I oversaw the Bureau of Land Management. I was operating under the law that was old in the 1990s.

But here we are with this repeal of a new process, a process that actually invited into the land planning for the Bureau of Land Management where are the roads going to go, how are they going to manage the various uses of the land, whether it is agriculture, for cattle, or for recreation, or hunting, whatever, that they invite into that process all of the local agencies. The county, the State, environmental groups, hunting, fishing, cattlemen, agricultural groups, whoever would have a stake in that, they were invited into the process. It shortened the process from 8 years down to something probably in the 2-or 3-year range to go through this entire thing, and, for reasons that I will never understand, the

repeal eliminated the use of good science and economics.

So I don't understand what is going on here. This is a good process so that the public would be invited. Yet, the Congressional Review Act—should the Senate agree and the President sign this particular review—the Bureau of Land Management will never be able to go back and enter this process of land planning again.

□ 1800

They cannot issue a new regulation. What is happening here is nonsense. There is mountaintop removal in coal country, where mountains are simply wiped off the face of the Earth and all of that dirt is piled into the nearby streams. We have that regulation.

Providing clean water for the communities and the rivers for recreation or fishing or any other thing is gone and no longer available to protect the communities. It goes on and on.

I know one thing that the President did the very first day was an executive order to eliminate the reduction in the mortgage guarantee fee. This is a fee paid by homeowners—usually low-income homeowners—who, because of their income, because of their financial status, cannot get a regular mortgage unless there is a guarantee. He said this was for the benefit of the homeowner. Baloney. This was for the benefit of the bankers.

We already know that he has appointed three people to his cabinet that are from Wall Street, particularly from Goldman Sachs, and another one from another agency on Wall Street. He was going to do away with Wall Street. No, he brought Wall Street into the cabinet. We are going backwards on this.

I am going to take a deep breath—I need it after all of that—and I am just beginning to get wound up and haven't gone through the other 20 things that are on my list.

I did notice that this is my day to welcome to the floor of the House of Representatives new Democratic members. Mr. RASKIN is from the marvelous State of Maryland. I have two Californians here. RO KHANNA is from the Silicon Valley.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA) to share with us his take on his first 33 days in Congress.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative GARAMENDI for his leadership in the State of California and the country.

I rise today to voice my strong objection and disapproval for FCC Chairman Ajit Pai's decision to roll back a program that would provide internet access to low-income Americans.

I was shocked that this was one of the first decisions that the FCC Chairman made. What he has done is provide few subsidies for low-income Americans who need internet access.

Now, we know that 45 percent of Americans under 30,000 currently don't have internet access. Providing these

folks with internet access is giving their kids a basic shot at digital proficiency and having a job in technology or a chance at the American Dream.

Chairman Ajit Pai has become a poster child with this decision for everything that is wrong with Washington. It is what people complain about. He is writing the rules of modern-day capitalism in a way that privileges these elite telecom companies with concentrated economic power at the expense of low-income Americans.

This Congress must stand united to make sure that an unelected bureaucrat doesn't get to write the rules of our economy in favor of wealthy interests at the expense of ordinary Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I will be circulating a letter to our colleagues that I hope we can send to Chairman Pai, and, hopefully, he will reconsider this decision that is really not in the interest of ordinary Americans.

Mr. GARAMENDI. If I might ask a question of the gentlemen. He represents the Silicon Valley—at least a large portion of the Silicon Valley—and the issue of net neutrality has been bouncing around here for some time.

Basically, the FCC, as I understand it, has decided that there would be net neutrality, which, as I understand it—and perhaps the gentleman can explain it better than I, so I will let him do so—may be the next thing that this new chairman intends to do away with.

Has the gentleman followed that?

Mr. KHANNA. I have. I appreciate the Congressman's leadership on this.

Net neutrality, as the gentleman knows, is a very simple idea. That means that everyone should have equal access to the internet; that you shouldn't get to pay for faster service or you shouldn't get to pay to have more of your message out.

You would think that if anyone would appreciate the importance of it, it is the President, who uses the tool of the internet with Twitter and Facebook.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Oh, the tweets.

Mr. KHANNA. You would think we would want a democracy where every citizen has equal access to these tools.

Well, who doesn't want that?

Some of these big companies that have concentrated economic power and have an interest in making money and not for speech.

This Chairman has shown a consistent pattern already, in a few weeks, of basically siding with these large telecommunication companies at the expense of ordinary citizens.

It may sound like a technical issue. Some folks glaze over when you say net neutrality or you talk about the technical issues of the lifeline program, but I think what they have got to know is you have an FCC Chairman who is siding with wealth interests in telecom companies over what would benefit ordinary people.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentleman for the explanation and the

purpose of net neutrality. In a way, it is one of the things that, in a very real way, protects the individual—by having access.

What is happening with these regulations and many of these executive orders that the President puts out is to remove from the individual protections that they have. I mentioned mountain-top removal in coal country and the protections that the indigent farmer down the stream has for clean water. That protection is gone.

You look at the mortgage guarantee. It is a small amount, but it is an additional \$500 a year that an individual would have to pay, assuming they had to have a mortgage guarantee. Most low-income people have to have that mortgage guarantee in order to buy a home. It is \$500 out of their pockets.

So it is the protections that have been in place. There may be others. I am sure that in the gentleman's area he may know of others, if he would like to share with us, but I really thank him for bringing to us his expertise in the area of communications. I know that he has worked in this area before. He represents a part of America and California where this is a very big issue.

Mr. KHANNA. I thank Congressman GARAMENDI for his leadership and showing what is really happening with the scale-back of all these regulations.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I will use another analogy of flying below the radar.

A lot of this is flying below the radar because we are looking at all of the tweets that come out in the morning, the various news programs focusing on the President, and missing some really important things that protect Americans.

Mr. KHANNA. If I can make one more comment. Everyone says they are not for regulation. That is easy. Every time I get on an airplane, I am very thankful that we have some regulations. Regulations can't just be eliminated with a hatchet, like this administration is doing.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That is so very true.

Let me just go through some of the regulations that are being repealed here in the House over the last couple of weeks.

First of all, let's remember that the Congressional Review Act being used to repeal these regulations has two parts to it. One, it has the ability of Congress to repeal regulations, which I think is a good idea. The second part of it, I think, has some real shortcomings. And that is, once that regulation has been repealed, both Houses vote before the President signs it, then the issue cannot be revisited by that administrative agency.

I gave the example of the BLM, but it applies across the board. Regulations that deal with smoking on airplanes is a regulation. If we repeal that regulation, suddenly there is smoking on airplanes. You can never go back and do a regulation again in that area.

I thank Mr. KHANNA for joining us and for bringing his expertise to us.

I am going to run down a quick list here. Oil and gas companies operate around the world. Our new Secretary of State was the CEO of ExxonMobil, the world's biggest oil company.

Did ExxonMobil pay a fee or a gratuity or corruption to a foreign country?

We will never know now because the Congress has passed a regulation that required oil and gas companies to disclose any fees, any money that they have paid to a foreign government for the opportunity to extract oil or gas from their country.

We happen to know that many of the countries in which these American oil and gas companies operate are rife with corruption. So this is a way for us to do an anticorruption program around the world that involves our national oil companies. That is on the way to being repealed.

How about mentally ill people being able to get a firearm?

I suspect 80 percent of Americans—maybe 100 percent—think that somebody who is seriously mentally ill ought not to be able to get a firearm.

Well, there is a mechanism. It is a national database. We call it the NICS database. It is a database that gun shops have to inquire if an individual is on that database for domestic violence, criminal activity, or for mental illness.

We have had a problem with the mental illness part of this because many mentally ill people do not get on the database for a variety of reasons. The counties, cities, States don't provide that information. In some cases, it is deemed to be proprietary or confidential.

But there is a way. It exists in the regulations today that would require the Social Security Administration—when it makes a payment for disability for severe mental illness to an individual, that individual's name goes on this database. When that individual may want to go down to the gun shop and buy a weapon, the gun shop would query the database and, lo and behold, the individual comes up and he won't be able to get a gun.

It makes sense. It enhances the database. It adds to the database individuals that are so severely mentally ill that they are able to get Social Security disability payments.

Who is to object to that?

Well, apparently a majority of the House of Representatives and the Senate does object to that. Probably the National Rifle Association also. So now we have a situation in which we have a protection for Americans being protected from the mentally ill individual that could not buy a gun now suddenly being able to not be on the national database for those people that are mentally ill. One more protection is gone.

There are others, and I am going to run through them as quickly as I can here.

I don't know whether you believe in climate change, global warming. I certainly do. I have worked on this for

more than 30 years now, and it is a real issue. We know—there is no debate about this—that methane is a very powerful greenhouse gas. In fact, it is far more powerful than carbon dioxide.

So the emissions of methane are one of the things that we would want to reduce going into the atmosphere to add to those elements in the atmosphere that creates global warming, climate change.

Well, the House of Representatives has passed a resolution through the law that allows it to do so—to roll back a requirement that the Bureau of Land Management put in place that requires oil and gas companies that are drilling for oil, drilling for natural gas, to control the leakage of methane from the gas well.

Wow, that is a terrible thing to do. Really? To require that an oil company, a drilling company that is going after natural gas on government—excuse me, your land, the American public's land—that they, in the process of drilling for that natural gas or oil, control, capture the methane that would otherwise leak from that well?

Well, that regulation is gone. The protections of Americans are gone. Greenhouse gas emissions are emitted without regulatory control. Many of these gas wells are in communities and in neighborhoods that will also enjoy more methane emissions.

□ 1815

One more—or maybe more. Oh, yes, labor violations. Labor laws have been on the books for well over 80 years. The labor laws are health and safety, worker safety, requirements on hours, working conditions, hazardous circumstances. There are many different regulations that affect employers. They have to provide a safe working environment for their workers. Some do. Well, I would say most work at making sure that their workplace is safe. Some do not. Some of those who do not provide a safe workplace have been fined by the Federal Government for those labor violations. It is a good thing. It causes those companies to provide a safe working environment for their employees.

A regulation was put forward by the Obama administration that said that if a company wants to contract with the Federal Government, they must disclose their labor violations, where they have violated the various labor laws. It may be hours of work, overtime pay, working conditions, hazardous circumstances, safety. They would have to disclose it. It didn't say they couldn't get a contract, but it did say that they would have to disclose to the public that they have not provided sufficient awareness of the various labor safety and workplace laws. That is on the way to being repealed.

What I want to do tonight is to simply say to the American public: Pay attention. There are many things going on here in Congress and in the administration that are harmful to you, the

American public. The kind of protections that you have counted on—worker safety, environmental protections if you live downstream from a coal mining operation, any of those things—are in the process of being repealed, and your protections along with them. So be aware of what the new administration and the Congress is doing to you, not for you.

I could talk about the wall and about the \$15 billion to \$30 billion that is going to be spent if Mr. Trump gets his way here and builds a 1,400-mile wall. I want to just end with this, and that is my choices. Your representatives, myself, 434 of my colleagues here and 100 Senators and a President, we make choices about how your tax money is going to be spent.

Should it be spent on a wall?

Well, let's consider for a moment spending it on a wall. This is \$15 billion, the minimum amount of money, and it is not going to build much of the wall. But for \$15 billion, what could you do for it?

I am from California. I was once a regent of the University of California and on the board for the California State University, so I am familiar with this system. \$15 billion could fund the entire California State University system for 3 years, and that is nearly a half a million students. You could replace all of the water pipes in Flint, Michigan, 270 times over for \$15 billion.

Choices. Do you want safe drinking water in Flint and other communities around the United States or do you want a wall? Are you concerned about the American military, the Navy, five Virginia-class submarines, or one Ford-class aircraft carrier plus a submarine? Or how about scholarships for undergraduate programs at the University of California, which I had the privilege of graduating from a few years ago?

27,777 4-year, full-time scholarships. That is the undergraduate population at the University of California Davis, which I have the privilege of representing.

There is one more place you could spend \$15 billion or even one part of \$15 billion, and it is on this. These are the deadly diseases in America. Let's see. Breast cancer, over the last decade we have seen breast cancer actually decline. Prostate cancer has declined by 11 percent, heart disease by 14 percent, stroke by 23 percent, HIV/AIDS by 52 percent. Alzheimer's has not declined. It has increased by 471 percent, and it is going to go even more.

What could we do with \$15 billion of research on a disease that affects every American family?

We could almost assuredly find a cure for Alzheimer's. I thank my colleagues here in the House of Representatives for increasing the budget for Alzheimer's research from around \$500 million to just under \$1 billion. That was done last year. If we can increase that funding another \$1 billion a year, the researchers indicate to us that we have a high probability of delaying the

onset of Alzheimer's by 5 years. With another \$1 billion after that, we probably could find a cure for this disease that is going to bust the American bank. Medicare and Medicaid, that is where the big money is going to be spent.

So my plea to our President and those who want to build a wall is: We have choices. You want to do something for the American public? Let's spend that \$15 billion to \$30 billion on education. You want to do something for every American family? Spend some portion of that \$15 billion to \$30 billion by doubling the amount of money that we are spending annually on Alzheimer's research. You want to do something for the security of our Nation? Meet those critical needs that our military has. Whether it is a new submarine or an aircraft carrier we can debate, but we do know that we have expenditures that are necessary in that area.

So, Mr. President, don't waste our money. Don't waste our tax money on a wall. By the way, we know Mexico is not going to pay for it. Don't get in a fight with our trading partner and our neighbors to the south and Australia.

Be aware, Americans. Watch closely to what is happening here in Washington. If you are concerned, so am I concerned about where we are headed and about what this government is doing to you, not for you, but rather to you.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

IMMIGRATION AND THE RULE OF LAW

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and to have the privilege to participate in this great deliberative body that we have and are.

On occasion, I come down here and listen to my colleagues from the other side of the aisle. They have been known to change the subject on me, or I have changed the subject that I came down here to speak about because I have listened to the things that they had to say. It is good for us to have that kind of debate, Mr. Speaker, because certainly I disagree with the conclusions that have been drawn here.

I want to take this from the top, and I will get to the wall situation along the way. I think those numbers are a long ways off, myself. I will start the immigration issue, Mr. Speaker. There has been a long battle that has gone on. For me, it goes back into the early

part of this millennium when we had a group of Senators who decided they were going to solve the immigration problem back in about 2006 or so, and so they brought their big immigration bill and pushed it hard.

Here in the House we brought an enforcement bill and pushed that back against the Senate. We held hearings for that enforcement bill around the country, in places like Arizona and Dubuque, Iowa, as I recall. There were a number of others around the country. We made the case that we have to be a nation of laws, and the rule of law has to prevail, and that the effort on the other side was to waive the application of the law. They said: We want to be able to tell people that we feel sorry for you. Therefore, we are going to sacrifice the rule of law out of our sympathy for the condition that you left in order to come in to America.

Well, that fits some people, but it doesn't substitute for the rule of law. It doesn't substitute for the respect for the law that we must have if we are going to be a law-abiding, first world nation. Plenty of Third World nations don't have respect for the rule of law. Most of the nations that these illegal aliens come from are coming from countries that don't have respect for the rule of law. One of the things they are trying to get away from is the erosion of the law that they have had in their home country.

I mean, think of Mexico, for example. Driving down the street in Mexico, you might be pulled over by a police officer there and they will leverage a thing called *mordida* against you, which is you pay the police officer on the spot and he will let you go. Well, that is paying off the law enforcement. They use that to generate income for themselves, and they get by with it in a country that is corrupt.

Mr. Speaker, when I travel to Mexico and to some of the worst places in the world, and when I look at the circumstances there, whatever they may be, I can generally put together—and I will say almost always put together—a proposal, a strategy on how to put that country back in shape again and get it functioning the way it should function.

In Mexico, for example, they have a lot of natural resources. They have good, hardworking people. They have got a continuity of family. They have got a culture that goes deep back for centuries, but they can't make it work, and they haven't made it work for a long time. I don't know if they have ever made it work.

At the heart of this is the corruption that exists. The corruption is there due to lack of respect for the rule of law. If we import that contempt for the rule of law and if we adopt it as our national policy, which would be amnesty, we would be adopting the policy of accepting the violation of law and rewarding the lawbreakers for their objective that they had when they broke the law.

If we do that, America, the shining city on the hill, continues to devolve

downward toward the Third World from the first world. Our job should instead be lift up the Third World to the standards that we are here in the first world. And one of those things would be to promote the rule of law in the countries where they don't have it, as in Mexico and many of the Central American countries. That is the center of this immigration debate, Mr. Speaker.

Out of all this discussion that goes on, I hear the individual narratives, I hear the heartbreaking stories, I hear all of the laments that are out there about, oh, woe are somebody's constituents because they are subject to the application of the rule of law and they want to be exempted from that. Meanwhile, as soon as they are exempted from the rule of law, if that should happen, and the destruction of the rule of law in this country, they are going to be asking for the law to protect them in some other area. That is how this is going on in this country.

I would take this back to 1986, more than 30 years ago, Mr. Speaker, when this debate was going on. It is the same debate that has been going on in this country for more than 30 years. There were approximately a million illegal aliens in the United States, as far as the estimates were concerned, at the beginning of the debate when the House and the Senate eventually passed the 1986 amnesty act; a million.

The discussion was: Well, we can't possibly address these million people that are in America and we can't possibly deport them all, so let's make an accommodation to them. Let them stay, give them a fast track—it turned out to be a path to citizenship—then what we will do is we will promise America that there will never be another amnesty again ever.

That was the language that was used. There will never be another amnesty again ever. At least at the time, they were honest enough to admit it was an amnesty.

So they set about passing the legislation in the House and the Senate that granted amnesty, they thought, to a million people. That amnesty legislation went to the Ronald Reagan's White House, where he was surrounded by a group of people in the Cabinet who were his advisers. I am sure they had the best interests of the country's and the President's in mind, but they had decided to advise Ronald Reagan that he should sign the amnesty act because he could put this issue away, well, maybe forever, but for the duration of our Republic because we were always going to enforce immigration law from that point forward.

□ 1830

And Ronald Reagan, I don't have inside knowledge on what he was thinking on the deliberations that went on. I just know that most of his Cabinet advised him to sign the Amnesty Act. He ultimately signed the Amnesty Act.

Consequently, when they began processing these illegal aliens, there were

only going to be—I say “only.” They thought it was a huge number—1 million. There were going to be 1 million of them to process. Well, they processed 3 million instead of 1 million.

Why? One, they probably underestimated and undercounted. The other half of the equation was there was a lot of fraud that got in the door that was processed also.

And so we end up with about 3 million newly amnestied Americans that have a pass to citizenship who have been rewarded for violating America's immigration laws, many of them rewarded for committing the crime of unlawful entry into the United States of America and many of them operating with false documents. That was the path 30 years ago.

After that bill was signed and the results of it became evident, then President Reagan reversed his position and announced that he regretted that he had signed the Amnesty Act of 1986. I remember those days. And I have since had the conversation with then-Attorney General Ed Meese, who has informed me about the inside workings of this to a degree.

I lament that that decision was made in 1986 by President Reagan to sign the Amnesty Act because it started us on a 30-year debate. Once debate was out there and once the public understood and once people in foreign countries began to believe that if they could, once, get into the United States, there would sooner or later come along and be another Amnesty Act that would include them and they would have their path to citizenship and lawful presence in America and all of the benefits that have grown massively since 1986, once you put the carrot out, once you break the mold of the principle of protecting the rule of law, then after that it is easier the next time and the next time and the next time.

Our virtue that we had a respectable virtue on enforcing immigration law in '86 has been ratcheted downwards because of the '86 Amnesty Act and at least six much smaller but subsequent amnesty acts since that time.

I looked into the language in the early part of this millennium more than a decade ago, and they say, well, first of all, it is not amnesty, and they tried to redefine it. I have had this discussion with Karl Rove during the George W. Bush administration: Well, it isn't amnesty if they pay a fine. It isn't amnesty if they get a background check. It isn't amnesty if they abide by our laws. It isn't amnesty if they learn English.

Well, I am not very thrilled about that. I would say the proposal then was a \$1,500 fine in order to waive the criminal charge of unlawful entry into the United States of America. Under that argument, somehow that mitigated violating the law, so you wouldn't be able to call it amnesty. And I defined it then. I said: No, whatever the penalty is on the books when the crime is committed, if you waive

that penalty, you have provided amnesty for a class of people.

So the more precise definition of amnesty, to grant amnesty, is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their violation or their crime, as the case may be—pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crime.

What is this proposal with DACA and DAPA that President Obama so unconstitutionally advanced forward? It is just that. It is the most blatant form of amnesty for the largest classes of people that has ever been created in the history of the United States of America. Of course, we only have to look back to 1986 to find the first amnesty, and then there have been the six or so subsequent amnesties that I have mentioned.

But Barack Obama, constitutional scholar, at least as high a standing as Mr. PANETTA from California who spoke here on the floor a little bit ago, but Barack Obama, constitutional scholar, 22 times on videotape, in different speeches in various places around the country, said to America that he didn't have the constitutional authority to waive the application of the immigration law against people who claim that they came to America before their 18th birthday and presumably were brought in by their parents.

If you look at the DACA language that has been advanced here in the House—or let's go across the rotunda to the Senate and look at DICK DURBIN's language there. It is, if you have come into America before your 18th birthday, for any purpose whatsoever, then you get amnesty. And some of those people now, according to the older drafts of the bill, would be 38 years old, getting amnesty to stay in the United States of America at age 38.

People believe that that is the humane thing to do, to reward them with the objective of their crime. Now, they could have carried a backpack of marijuana into the United States the day before their 18th birthday—I have been telling the truth about pretty much all of that, except they are supposed to not commit any other crimes—and they would be granted this level of amnesty under DACA. The President's DACA acronym stands for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.

So that policy that he advanced, after Barack Obama, 22 times, told us he didn't have the constitutional authority, he was right. Just a couple of weeks before he issued this DACA policy, he stood over here at a high school in Washington, D.C., and explained to them that he didn't have the authority.

He said: Congress passes the laws; I, in the executive branch, enforce the laws; and the courts interpret the laws. Pretty simple. That is a nice, concise description of the balance of powers that we have in this country. But he said he didn't have the authority because he can't write law.

Two weeks later, the President announces the policy to grant work permits and Social Security numbers to illegal aliens that are in the United States who assert that they came in before their 18th birthday. So he created an entire class of people.

I read carefully through the Morton memos. I read the memo that launched all of this. It was signed by Janet Napolitano, then-Secretary of Homeland Security. Janet Napolitano's memo said, seven times, on an individual basis only—on an individual basis only—in this page and a third of the document that established the policy.

I remember her testimony before the Judiciary Committee. She knew very well that they had to make an argument that this was on an individual basis only in order to try to sustain any kind of facade before the courts, when they would almost certainly be sued for DACA and later on for DAPA.

Well, it was never on an individual basis. There were huge classes of people that were created. They created four separate classes of people in those memos. Still they assert that they have a right to do this, and now I hear the gentleman say it is unconstitutional.

It is unbelievable to me that anybody could argue when President Obama said it was unconstitutional—he was the last one that was going to admit this—and he went ahead and committed an unconstitutional act. So that takes care of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.

Then Obama came with the policy DAPA, the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans. That is an illegal who has a baby in America. If they sneak into America and they have a baby, they call that birthright citizenship. The President grants them a legal presence because they violated our laws, and some of them, many of them, for the express purpose of coming here to have a baby that would be granted the practice of American citizenship.

We see between 340,000 and 750,000 of those babies born in America every year. Think of the population that America is carrying that doesn't have a moral claim to citizenship, doesn't actually have a legal claim to citizenship, just can point to the practice that we began awarding citizenship to babies born to illegals many years ago. There were only a few of them. It wasn't significant. By the time it gets around to where it is significant, now they have created their own constituency group here in America.

But both of those policies, DACA and DAPA, are clearly unconstitutional.

And DAPA, Texas brought that case against the United States of America and has prevailed so far in court before Judge Andrew Hanen. The DAPA policy is now at least suspended and held in place because one wise judge in Texas decided to draw the line. He had the clearest constitutional understanding DAPA is unconstitutional and the President can't write the law.

Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking from a lack of experience on this or lack of knowledge on this. I am not here speaking off of talking points that came from anyone other than a handful of notes I scribbled a few minutes ago, but here is one of my experiences on the separation of powers.

When I was in the State Senate in Iowa, our newly elected Governor at that time was Tom Vilsack, who served 8 years and did a respectable job as a Democratic Governor in those 8 years. Very early in his term, he issued an executive order also, Executive Order No. 7, that granted special protective status for sexual orientation and gender identity.

When that executive order came down, I looked at that. I was appalled that a Governor would think that he could legislate by executive order. I made my calls to my Republican attorneys and made my case. They all told me I didn't understand it, that it was drafted in such a deft way that it fit with nuances such that it was a constitutional executive order and that I had to submit to it. My answer was, no, the Iowa General Assembly has, within the boundaries of its State constitution, the same legislative authority that this Congress has and that it was clear to me that he was legislating by executive order.

I initiated legislation to push on it and I initiated a lawsuit. That lawsuit is easy to look up. It is *King v. Vilsack*, and it was decided exactly on the same kind of principle: whether an executive officer, a Governor, or a President can write law.

Our Founding Fathers would agree with no concept that said that either the executive branch or the judicial branch of government could write law. Instead, they separated these out and they gave us Articles I, II, and III of our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, it is pretty clear. They didn't write it someplace later on in the Constitution. They put it right up front, Article I, section 1: "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States"—not a President of the United States, not a judicial branch of the United States, but a Congress of the United States—"which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Then they set about laying out the structure of the Senate and the House of Representatives, all legislative powers. And then the Congress has delegated some legislative powers. There is no delegated legislative power here for the President of the United States to write immigration law, but he did that.

Then we had to bring two lawsuits. The one is *Texas v. The United States*, decided by Judge Hanen. That decision stands. It was appealed up to the Supreme Court, where there was a 4-4 tie, which means that the Fifth Circuit decision by Hanen prevails. Well, good. Congratulations. It is held in place now.

But DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals—and that is kind of an odd acronym that doesn't necessarily match somebody that is 38 years old—I pulled the people together to initiate that lawsuit. It turned out to be *Crane v. Napolitano*. That case is still being litigated. It has been pushed off onto a side rail. The president of the ICE union has been directed to litigate against the Justice Department because it is a grievance with their employees rather than getting at the constitutional question. It has been pushed off on the side by a judge. So that case is still being litigated, but it remains unconstitutional.

The former President of the United States knows that. Not only that, our current President, Donald Trump, knows that. He has said many times during the campaign that very early on in his Presidency he would eliminate the unconstitutional executive orders that bring about these components of amnesty. That includes DACA and DAPA.

It needs to also include the Morton memos. I have got a nice little packet I can send to the White House. I really did expect that very early in his administration he would address DACA and DAPA and the Morton memos. So it was a bit of a surprise to me to learn as far as, I will say, as recently as January 23—and this is the only confirmation I have of this—that United States Citizenship and Immigration Services is still issuing DACA permits and still extending DACA permits. That is a number that runs up to about 800 a day at the pace, at least, that they were doing, with tens of thousands in backlog yet.

□ 1845

The simple thing to do would be to freeze any action on DACA and DAPA. I would rescind the executive order and invalidate every DACA permit and every DAPA permit. We have got a database also to address that, Mr. Speaker. The simplest thing right now would be to just simply suspend any action that is affirmative in continuing this unconstitutional act. From my standpoint—and I think it should be the standpoint of the President of the United States and of the Vice President of the United States and all who have taken an oath—his oath is to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States; and the Constitution requires that he take care that the laws be faithfully executed. I think he was very sincere when he gave that oath, and I think that Vice President PENCE was even more sincere when he gave his oath. It was very moving to me to witness that testimony out here on the west portico of the Capitol.

I want to remind the administration that this action continues, at least as far as the report is concerned; and United States Citizenship and Immigration Services may just need a memo from the White House to cease and de-

sist the unconstitutional actions taking place at USCIS—very simple, very abrupt, and not very traumatic to anybody in this country—and then start the process of undoing the lawlessness that we have had to submit to under Barack Obama's regime.

My strongest encouragement: the earlier that DACA and DAPA are addressed by this President in the keeping of his solemn oath—and that is to the American people—the easier it is going to be. I am encouraging that it happen early and that it not be delayed, because the problems created by Barack Obama are now being compounded by USCIS.

I want to also, Mr. Speaker, speak in favor of accelerating the construction of this wall. That is another solemn pledge of President Trump's. By the way, of that agenda that he laid out for America that Thursday night in Cleveland, as I listened to plank after plank after plank in his platform, it was a solid and a strong agenda. He has people in place who are listening to all of the pledges that he has made, and he has been going down through that list in an impressive fashion, keeping his oath time after time after time, keeping his promises to the American people time after time. I am looking at the exceptions, but the rule has been a very consistent and a very aggressive approach to keeping these promises.

I know that a week ago Saturday, President Trump sat down at a table with a small group of people behind him and he went through three executive orders. One of them was a reorganization of the National Security Council. The second of the three was for the Department of Defense to produce a strategy to defeat radical Islamic jihad—or at least ISIS—and to produce that strategy within 30 days. When it was over, I realized three executive orders had been signed, and I thought: How long did that take?

I backed my television up; set my stopwatch on my iPhone; and in a minute and 40 seconds, the President of the United States had signed three executive orders and moved this country dramatically in the right direction again, again, and again.

So I am not here in broad criticism. I am here with targeted encouragement. I am not concerned that the wall hasn't moved quickly enough. I am here, though, Mr. Speaker, reinforcing that promise to the American people, who, by the tens of thousands and event after event after event, chanted: "Build the wall. Build the wall." We even had an individual come to an event in Iowa who had a "wall" costume on. It looked like he was made out of flexible cement blocks. It is a movement in this country, and it is a promise to America.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that Donald Trump never said, "I think we will build some fence," or "we are going to do something virtual." He said that we are going to build a wall—it will be a big wall; it will be a beautiful

wall; and the Mexicans are going to pay for it. That is the line. I have said that I think that Donald Trump has been an expert at building things big and that he has been an expert at building them beautiful. I am going to leave it up to him to figure out how to get the Mexicans to pay for it, but I am pretty confident he is going to get that done, and I am intending to be supportive of that effort.

But when I hear the gentleman from California speak about how expensive the wall is—and his numbers were \$15 billion to \$30 billion, I think he said, to build 1,300 miles of wall—we have got 2,000 miles of border, and we have got, oh, a few miles built that are adequate barriers right now, but much of it that we even call a fence or a wall needs to be completely reconstructed so that we have an effective barrier. Of the estimates of about \$15 billion to \$30 billion or the numbers that go, on the Republican side, even up to \$25 billion, if anybody is telling you it is a number that is \$15 billion or higher, you should understand they don't want that wall built at all. That is why they have an inflated number in their heads.

So who gives them that number?

I read those documents, and I have questioned those numbers considerably, but I don't know if there is anybody in the United States Congress who has more years and more experience in building things and in being in the construction business than I do. We are in our 42nd year of construction with King Construction, and we do a similar kind of work that gives us the ability to make a legitimate estimate on the cost of this wall.

I have designed a wall. Many people know, Mr. Speaker, that I built it down here on the floor more than 10 years ago and that I put an estimate into that, which is now on YouTube, that has gone semi-viral. That estimate that I uttered then that night holds up pretty well when I put our modern software estimating to work and—I will say this—thanks to my oldest son, David King, who owns that company today, as he committed some days of pro bono work to put together an estimate on what it would take to build a concrete wall with at least a 5-foot-deep foundation in it and a wall that comes up to be a minimum of 12 feet functioning in height, with wire on top. An estimate of a wall of that nature is sophisticated. It is about six pages of spreadsheet—five and a half to be a little more accurate—but it is all built into the interrelational databases that are necessary to add your materials and your labor and your overhead and your costs to be able to build a wall.

Now, here is what is really going on. We are spending, Mr. Speaker, \$13.4 billion a year in defending and protecting our southern border—\$13.4 billion. That turns out to be \$6.7 million a mile. The Border Patrol has come to the committee on numerous occasions and given testimony.

I have asked them: What percentage of those who attempt to cross the border do you interdict successfully?

Their answer before the committee has been: We think about 25 percent.

They get about one in four who try to get across the border. So, presumably, three out of four make it in. I would call that a 25 percent efficiency rate.

Then I go down to the border and I talk to the officers and the agents down there. This includes Border Patrol and ICE.

I ask: So you are stopping about 25 percent?

Their answer that comes back to me as the most consistent is: No. Ten percent has to come first.

I have had estimates by ICE officers who operate near the border who will say they think it is closer to 2 to 3 percent. Now, I don't know that that is the right number, and I don't want to assert here, Mr. Speaker, into this Record that I think we are only stopping 2 to 3 percent of those who attempt to get across the border. I am suggesting that that is certainly a number that is plausible. It comes from the people who should know the most, and if the Border Patrol on the border says 10 percent has to come first, they might be thinking that 2 to 3 percent sounds all right. I am not even focused on those numbers of 2 to 3, up to 10 percent. I will take it to a 25 percent number and say that could be an inflated number, but it is still an awful number to consider for return on investment if you are going to spend \$13.4 billion a year every single year and get 25 percent efficiency on \$6.7 million a mile.

I need to put this into a context so that people understand what it really is. And that is that a lot of us live out in the country on gravel roads. And in the flat country in Iowa, we have a gravel road at every mile.

Now, let's just say General Kelly came to me now—and I really would have said Janet Napolitano or maybe Jeh Johnson—and said: I have a proposal for you. I want you to secure a mile of country road—a gravel road out there—and I am going to offer you \$6.7 million a mile to secure that for each year on a 10-year contract. So here is \$67 million in contract, and you are going to have to guard this mile for a year, and you can let 75 percent of the people through who are trying to get across that road, and I am still going to pay you.

Does that sound like a good deal?

There is hardly any American who wouldn't take that deal. That is not a very good deal. President Trump will recognize how bad a deal that is. It is a terrible deal. Yet we are stuck with that \$13.4 billion, 25 percent efficiency, and \$6.7 million a mile. Now, these numbers, probably, are blurring some people in their minds, Mr. Speaker; so I take it back to this: \$6.7 million a mile. We have built a four-lane Highway 20 across Iowa, with just a few miles left to go, and we will finish it very soon—the stretch through the ex-

pensive Iowa cornfields, crossing rivers with expensive bridges, and building that four-lane highway that is everything, except in name, the equivalent of an interstate highway: four lanes, a median in the middle, fences on either side, seeding, signage—all of the things—the bells and the whistles—that it takes to build an interstate highway.

I am going to pause for just a second while people think: \$6.7 million a mile to guard our southern border, and we are building nothing down there? How much does it cost to build that interstate highway across expensive Iowa cornfields?

\$4 million a mile in the books and nearly completed. It will come in right at that number, and that is with buying the expensive cornfield; it is doing the archaeological and the environmental and the engineering; the land acquisition; the grading—and I have spent over 40 years in the earthmoving business—and the paving—and we do structural concrete work.

By the way, I scooped some of the concrete into the last forms up there in Highway 20, and I am proud of it and am happy to have had the privilege to have done it—painting the stripes on the highway, shouldering it, seeding it, fencing it. We shouldn't forget that this is four lanes of highway and a fence with a median in the middle and all of the bells and whistles that go on with an interstate highway for \$4 million a mile. And they are telling me it is going to cost what to build, \$15 billion to \$30 billion?

Let's see. \$13 billion is 6.7; so you are at about \$8.5 billion or so. So he is suggesting a price per mile that is multiples of the cost of what it is costing us to build an interstate highway.

I don't have any doubt that we can go down there and build a concrete wall. I want to build a fence, a wall, and a fence. So we have two no-man's-lands—one on either side of the wall—and I have it wide enough that you can turn a patrol vehicle around in that no-man's-land. If you catch anybody in that no-man's-land, I want it to be the presumption that you are unlawfully present in the United States of America, and then they will get an immediate deportation. If they want to appeal the deportations, they can do so from their home countries and not be sitting here on welfare in the United States of America. That is the objective of what we can do.

As for the number that I put into the record back in 2005 that, I said, upholds today, I will just say this: it is less than \$2 million a mile. If we reached into that \$13.4-billion-a-year budget and just carved out \$1 billion a year until we get the fence, the wall, and the fence constructed, we would soon have this done. We would have it done in a reasonable time, and we would have it done with a little squeeze into the budget. If they want to go into another account, that is okay with me, but let's get this done. We can do slip

form concrete with a slip form notch in the center of that to drop precast panels in. We can pour those precast panels right down there on the job site. We can make them any height that the President wants it to be. They can be tongue and groove. They can be latched together. We can build fixtures right into that concrete to mount any kind of devices we like for monitoring.

Here is what America needs to understand, Mr. Speaker: it is not a fence. It is a wall. The wall is the centerpiece—a fence, a wall, and a fence. The centerpiece is a concrete wall that is designed to keep people out, not to keep people in.

My colleagues on this side of the aisle constantly are bringing up the topic, asking: Do you want to create another Berlin Wall?

I looked throughout history. In fact, I asked the question of one of America's best historians—among the top two favorite authors that I have—Victor Davis Hanson of southern California. I asked him as I have asked the question many times: Do you know of any barrier in history—a fence or a wall—that was designed to keep people in that was a national boundary or a barrier that was built by a nation-state other than the Berlin Wall?

He thought for a while, and he said: You might say that the fence and the structures in between North and South Korea are at least, in part, designed to keep North Koreans in.

□ 1900

I will concede that point. There is a fence and a wall between North and South Korea designed to keep the subjects of Marxism in their country because they want to escape to freedom. And the Berlin Wall was designed to keep the people in East Berlin from a Marxist society because they wanted to escape to freedom. Those barriers are immoral for those reasons, because they are fencing people in that want to escape to freedom.

But when you are a nation-state, and you are having a flow of people coming from without, there are many examples in history where there have been barriers, particularly walls, that have been built to keep people out. It is fundamentally different to have a wall to keep people out rather than a wall to keep people in.

If we forget the history of what built the Great Wall of China, think of this: the Great Wall of China was built originally to keep the Mongols out of greater China. As they were running raids down and doing the things that happen with raids—raping, pillaging, stealing, and heading back to Mongolia—the Chinese decided that they only had a couple of things they could do. They could submit and be raped, murdered, and robbed incessantly and relentlessly; and the fruit of their labor would be taken by the people who would kill them and assault them. They could mount raids to go back up

to Mongolia and punish the perpetrators and maybe they would quit coming back in.

They concluded that that wasn't going to stop it. The punitive raids that were coming down into China were not going to end. So they began building the Great Wall of China.

They had many segments of the Great Wall of China. It wasn't a continuous 5,500 miles, as we used to declare it to be. It is now 13,000 miles long. It was segments where they thought it would do the most good.

Then, by 245 B.C., that is Before Christ as Western civilization counts time, the first emperor of China, Qin Shi Huang, came to power. He decided that he would connect the segments of the Great Wall of China so it was one continuous wall. He sent the laborers to work doing that, and they completed the Great Wall of China.

In the last few years, the Chinese have examined that wall with satellite images and concluded it was longer than 5,500 miles. It was 13,000 miles long altogether, which means it had to be ziggity-zaggity or it would have run a long ways from there. That is an impressive structure.

We are not talking about 13,000 miles or 5,500 miles. We are talking about 2,000 miles. And we are not talking about something that you can march troops on top of, which the Japanese surely did when they invaded China.

Instead, we are talking about a barrier that is roughly 6 inches thick of concrete that goes up as tall as the President wants it to go with wires on top that have a signal in them. And if anyone attempts to breach the top of that wall, that signal will send it to our control stations. It will immediately focus enforcement to that location. It will have vibration sensors so that if anybody tries to dig underneath it, it will pick that up as well. It will have monitoring cameras and all the bells and whistles, the accessories necessary for us to protect all of it. It will pay for itself, and it will pay for itself likely before we even get it completed. Here are some of the reasons why.

I had some law enforcement officers in my office today, and they are fighting the drug problems that we have in the United States. They would assert that in the upper 90th percentile is the percentage of some of the illegal drugs that come into the United States of America, like the opioids, the heroin, the methamphetamines. The ratios of those are in the 90th percentile and above.

Marijuana is a little bit lower than that because Colorado and California are taking some of that market. Thanks, Colorado and California, and a number of other States. What they have done is spread marijuana in big numbers across this land, and it is a gateway drug.

The illegal drugs consumed in America, according to the Drug Enforcement Agency, are 80 to 90 percent. And these categories I am talking about with her-

oin, opioids, and methamphetamines that are in the 90th percentile, they come from or through Mexico.

So it doesn't mean that they are producing them all in Mexico, but they might be produced south of Mexico. They might be produced in China and come on into Mexico and then be brought into the United States because the border is so porous.

It is not just the illegal aliens. It is also the criminals, the drug smugglers, and the drug trade. The Mexican Government has announced, in less than a decade, they have had 100,000 people who were killed in the drug wars. The drug wars are coming about because there is a huge demand in the United States for these drugs, some \$60 billion market for illegal drugs in America. So that demand is being met by, in many cases, Mexicans, but also Central and South Americans who set this network up and this drug distribution chain.

I asked the Drug Enforcement Agency: What happens if magically tomorrow morning everybody wakes up in their home country and there is not a single illegal alien in the United States of America, not one person unlawfully present in America; what happens to the illegal drug distribution system then?

They tell me it severs at least one link in every distribution chain of illegal drugs in America. It severs at least one link and, in some cases, every link and, in most cases, many links. That means that we have an illegal immigration problem and an illegal drug problem that are tied together, it creates the stream within which this traffic flows, and it brings about the crime and the death.

Mr. Speaker, we have people now who are sitting in there thinking: Well, but how did 100,000 people become victims of a drug war homicide or drug wars? How did 100,000 people get killed in Mexico? We don't have anywhere near that level of death in the United States.

Oh, we don't categorize it that way is why. There were 762 homicides in Chicago last year. How many of those were drug related? Well, I would say most of them, to some degree or another.

When I ask our law enforcement personnel: How many people would be in prison if there was no abuse of illegal drugs or alcohol? Would there be 10 percent?

Their answer is: Probably not. Probably fewer than 10 percent would be the population of our prisons if we could put an end to drug abuse. Also included in that is alcohol abuse, substance abuse.

So a lot of lives were lost in Mexico distributing the \$60 billion worth of illegal drugs into the U.S. economy. How about the lives lost in Chicago and the major cities when you have the drug wars, the gang wars that are fueled by drug abuse and fueled by the drug distribution? That is only a small part. The 762 homicide victims in Chicago are a small part.

The National Institutes of Health has some data out that shows that over 55,000 Americans died in the last fiscal year due to drug overdose. So the Mexicans lost 100,000 people in the drug wars over a period of less than a decade. In America, we are losing that many people in 2 years just to drug overdose; and that doesn't count the homicide victims who are part of these drug wars that are going on in the streets of America.

There is a disaster in this country. We can't tolerate the lawlessness that exists in this country. We have to address the border security. And for those who say that we don't need to build a wall, we can build a virtual wall, well, if you look up the word "virtual," do you know what it says? "Not real." It is not real.

So that means, if they want to build a virtual wall, they want to build a not real wall. I recall being down there to weld some landing wall on the Arizona border with then-Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff, who I happen to appreciate his personality. He was a good enough judge to pick up the welder and weld some of that himself with his own hand. But I welded some, and that is more my trade than it was his.

I handed the welder back, and I said: Now, I have welded the literal wall here. Why don't you hand me that virtual welder, and I will weld the virtual wall with that?

I wanted to make my point that it didn't work.

They promoted the virtual wall under the Bush administration, and I don't know if they actually even tried to even do that under the Obama administration. They came in and set up cameras and towers. They had ground-based radar, and they were going to track everybody that came into America and chase them down and abduct them. They ended up with cameras laying out in the desert that were never installed and a software package that was supposed to coordinate that never happened. And, in fact, hundreds of millions of dollars were wasted trying to build a virtual wall.

So I say this: If you want a virtual wall, if you want to put balloons in the air, if you want to do vibration sensors in the ground, if you want to run electric signals up on top of the wall, if you want to set cameras up there, I am fine. Do all of that.

Let's build the wall, as the American people demanded and chatted and as President Trump promised. Let's build a solid, structural, reinforced, concrete wall that is thick enough and tall enough and deep enough so that it is difficult to get over, under, around or through. If we do that, we have to man it and defend it. And if we put on the accessories, the bells and whistles, the vibration sensors, the cameras, and we build a fence, a wall, and a fence so that there is a double no-man's-land—one on either side of the wall—we can do that with far less manpower.

If I am assigned to guard my one-mile road that runs west of my house in the country in Iowa, and they hand me a contract for \$67 million, I can tell you, I would build a fence, a wall, and a fence right down through the middle of that road. I would have a patrol road on either side. I would have the fences and the road ditches the way they are. I would grade that thing out so I would have fast track to patrol it. I would have sensors along there. I would make the infrastructural investment that would not be \$4 million a mile. It would be someplace around that zone of a couple million dollars a mile.

Then I would monitor that, and I would have some people who are assigned to patrol it just enough that I could call in the reinforcements when we needed them. We would get a lot more than 25 percent efficiency out of that wall. We would get someplace equivalent to Israeli-level security efficiency if we build that entire structure end to end.

Now, I have said that we don't have to build a full 2,000 miles of it, but we have to be certain that we don't equivocate on the mission to build it until they stop going around the end. If they stop, fine. If they don't stop, we have got to be committed to add another section and another section until such time as we have completed this in the same fashion that the first emperor of China, Qin Shi Huang, did when he completed the Great Wall of China, 13,000 miles long which the armies marched on top of.

Build a wall and enforce the laws that we have on the books and bring into play local law enforcement so that we can work in cooperative fashion. Every level of law enforcement has always cooperated with the other levels of law enforcement. I grew up in a law enforcement family. I believe that the men around me all wore uniforms. It just was a natural thing to see. And if they weren't in uniform, they weren't at work. If they were either on their way or at work, coming home from work or at work, they wore uniforms.

Each level of law enforcement, whether it was city police, whether it was county sheriff and deputy, whether it was highway patrol division of criminal investigation—DCI in my State or DPS in a State like Texas, for example—or whether Federal officers, Federal Marshals, FBI, they cooperated with each other. No one took the posture that said it is not my job. When they encountered somebody violating the law, they enforced the law against them. There is Federal statute that reinforces such a thing.

Who would think that we could get to a place in this country where city police, county officers, or State law enforcement officers would be directed to plug their ears and close their eyes—and I am saying this figuratively—and essentially not gather any information on people who are unlawfully present in the United States of America, bringing about the circumstances where a

Kate Steinle would be murdered or where a Sarah Root would be murdered or where a Dominic Durden would be murdered, or where a Jaz Shaw would be murdered? All were murdered by criminal aliens who had no business being in this country, all who were murdered by those who had been encountered by law enforcement and who had later on turned them loose onto the streets of America resulting in the death of these innocents, including Brandon Mendoza. There are many, many others. There are thousands of others.

President Trump has said thousands of families are grieving the loss of their loved ones at the hands of illegal aliens who are violent, who should have been deported. They were not deported; they were turned loose on the streets of America, usually in sanctuary cities, sanctuary counties, sanctuary States.

Now we have the emergence of sanctuary campuses or sanctuary school districts. I will make the mention that it is a quarter after 6 p.m. in Iowa now, Mr. Speaker. And in an hour and 45 minutes, the Des Moines public school board is preparing to pass a sanctuary resolution that tells all the employees of the school district that you can't work with, cooperate, transfer, disseminate information, or allow access to students or family to any Federal immigration officers. It all has to go through the superintendent, and he has to approve it. They won't even allow an ICE officer to talk to a parent of any of the students there, unless the superintendent approves it. Of course, it is designed for him to say: No, sorry. We are going to close the door in your face, and we are a sanctuary school system, and we are going to defy Federal law.

□ 1915

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have existing laws to address this, and I want to remind the school district that there are a couple of sections of the code that apply, and one of them is U.S.C. 1324, harboring illegal aliens. There is a penalty of from 5 to 10 years for violation, depending on whether it is a class D or a class C felony. Anyone who harbors or shields from detection, including in any building or any means of transportation; anyone who encourages an alien to come to, enter, or reside; anyone who engages in any conspiracy; anyone who aids or abets the commission of such crimes is guilty of a class D or a class C felony, facing potential penalty of a maximum of 5 or 10 years, depending on the class.

I have the section of the code here, Mr. Speaker, and I include in the RECORD this copy of 8 U.S.C. 1373 and also 1324.

8 U.S. CODE § 1324—BRINGING IN AND
HARBORING CERTAIN ALIENS

(a) CRIMINAL PENALTIES

(1)

(A) Any person who—

(i) knowing that a person is an alien, brings to or attempts to bring to the United

States in any manner whatsoever such person at a place other than a designated port of entry or place other than as designated by the Commissioner, regardless of whether such alien has received prior official authorization to come to, enter, or reside in the United States and regardless of any future official action which may be taken with respect to such alien;

(ii) knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that an alien has come to, entered, or remains in the United States in violation of law, transports, or moves or attempts to transport or move such alien within the United States by means of transportation or otherwise, in furtherance of such violation of law;

(iii) knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that an alien has come to, entered, or remains in the United States in violation of law, conceals, harbors, or shields from detection, or attempts to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection, such alien in any place, including any building or any means of transportation;

(iv) encourages or induces an alien to come to, enter, or reside in the United States, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that such coming to, entry, or residence is or will be in violation of law; or

(v)

(I) engages in any conspiracy to commit any of the preceding acts, or

(II) aids or abets the commission of any of the preceding acts,

shall be punished as provided in subparagraph (B).

(B) A person who violates subparagraph (A) shall, for each alien in respect to whom such a violation occurs—

(i) in the case of a violation of subparagraph (A)(i) or (v)(1) or in the case of a violation of subparagraph (A)(ii), (iii), or (iv) in which the offense was done for the purpose of commercial advantage or private financial gain, be fined under title 18, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both;

(ii) in the case of a violation of subparagraph (A)(ii), (iii), (iv), or (v)(II), be fined under title 18, imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both;

(iii) in the case of a violation of subparagraph (A)(i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) during and in relation to which the person causes serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365 of title 18 (usc/18/1365)) to, or places in jeopardy the life of any person, be fined under title 18, imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

(iv) in the case of a violation of subparagraph (A)(i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) resulting in the death of any person, be punished by death or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, fined under title 18, or both.

(C) It is not a violation of clauses⁽¹⁾ (ii) or (iii) of subparagraph (A), or of clause (iv) of subparagraph (A) except where a person encourages or induces an alien to come to or enter the United States, for a religious denomination having a bona fide nonprofit, religious organization in the United States, or the agents or officers of such denomination or organization, to encourage, invite, call, allow, or enable an alien who is present in the United States to perform the vocation of a minister or missionary for the denomination or organization in the United States as a volunteer who is not compensated as an employee, notwithstanding the provision of room, board, travel, medical assistance, and other basic living expenses, provided the minister or missionary has been a member of the denomination for at least one year.

(2) Any person who, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that an alien has not received prior official authorization to come to, enter, or reside in the United States, brings to or attempts to bring to the United

States in any manner whatsoever, such alien, regardless of any official action which may later be taken with respect to such alien shall, for each alien in respect to whom a violation of this paragraph occurs—

(A) be fined in accordance with title 18 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; or

(B) in the case of—

(i) an offense committed with the intent or with reason to believe that the alien unlawfully brought into the United States will commit an offense against the United States or any State punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year,

(ii) an offense done for the purpose of commercial advantage or private financial gain, or

(iii) an offense in which the alien is not upon arrival immediately brought and presented to an appropriate immigration officer at a designated port of entry,

be fined under title 18 and shall be imprisoned, in the case of a first or second violation of subparagraph (B)(ii), not more than 10 years, in the case of a first or second violation of subparagraph (B)(i) or B(ii), not less than 3 nor more than 10 years, and for any other violation, not less than 5 nor more than 15 years.

(3)

(A) Any person who, during any 12-month period, knowingly hires for employment at least 10 individuals with actual knowledge that the individuals are aliens described in subparagraph (B) shall be fined under title 18 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

(B) An alien described in this subparagraph is an alien who—

(i) is an unauthorized alien (as defined in section 1324a(h)(3) of this title ([/uscode/text/8/iii.usc:t:8:s:1324a:h:3](#))), and

(ii) has been brought into the United States in violation of this subsection.

(4) In the case of a person who has brought aliens into the United States in violation of this subsection, the sentence otherwise provided for may be increased by up to 10 years if—

(A) the offense was part of an ongoing commercial organization or enterprise;

(B) aliens were transported in groups of 10 or more; and

(C)

(i) aliens were transported in a manner that endangered their lives; or

(ii) the aliens presented a life-threatening health risk to people in the United States.

(b) Seizure and Forfeiture

(1) IN GENERAL

My conveyance, including any vessel vehicle, or aircraft, that has been or is being used in the commission of a violation of subsection (a), the gross proceeds of such violation, and any property traceable to such conveyance or proceeds, shall be seized and subject to forfeiture.

(2) APPLICABLE PROCEDURES

Seizures and forfeitures under this subsection shall be governed by the provisions of chapter 46 of title 18 ([/uscode/text/18/iii.usc:t:18:ch:46](#)) relating to civil forfeitures, including section 981(d) of such title, except that such duties as are imposed upon the Secretary of the Treasury under the customs laws described in that section shall be performed by such officers, agents, and other persons as may be designated for that purpose by the Attorney General.

(3) PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE IN DETERMINATIONS OF VIOLATIONS In determining whether a violation of subsection (a) has occurred, any of the following shall be prima facie evidence that an alien involved in the alleged violation had not received prior official authorization to come to, enter, or reside in the United States or that such alien had

come to, entered, or remained in the United States in violation of law:

(A) Records of any judicial or administrative proceeding in which that alien's status was an issue and in which it was determined that the alien had not received prior official authorization to come to, enter, or reside in the United States or that such alien had come to, entered, or remained in the United States in violation of law.

(B) Official records of the Service or of the Department of State showing that the alien had not received prior official authorization to come to, enter, or reside in the United States or that such alien had come to, entered, or remained in the United States in violation of law.

(C) Testimony, by an migration officer having personal knowledge of the facts concerning that alien's status, that the alien had not received prior official authorization to come to, enter, or reside in the United States or that such alien had come to, entered, or remained in the United States in violation of law.

(c) AUTHORITY TO ARREST

No officer or person shall have authority to make any arrests for a violation of any provision of this section except officers and employees of the Service designated by the Attorney General, either individually or as a member of a class, and all other officers whose duty it is to enforce criminal laws.

(d) ADMISSIBILITY OF VIDEOTAPED WITNESS TESTIMONY

Notwithstanding any provision of the Federal Rules of Evidence, the videotaped (or otherwise audiovisually preserved) deposition of a witness to a violation of subsection (a) who has been deported or otherwise expelled from the United States, or is otherwise unable to testify, may be admitted into evidence in an action brought for that violation if the witness was available for cross examination and the deposition otherwise complies with the Federal Rules of Evidence.

(e) OUTREACH PROGRAM

The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, as appropriate, shall develop and implement an outreach program to educate the public in the United States and abroad about the penalties for bringing in and harboring aliens in violation of this section.

(June 27, 1952, ch. 477, title II, ch. 8, 274,66 Stat. 228 ([http://uscode.house.gov/statviewer.htm?volume=66&page=228](#)); Pub. L. 95-582 ([http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/L?d095:/list/bd/d095pl.lst:582\(Public_Laws\)](#)), §2, Nov. 2, 1978, 92 Stat. 2479 ([http://uscode.house.gov/statviewer.htm?volume=92&page=2479](#)); Pub. L. 97-116 ([http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/L?d097:/list/bd/d097pl.lst:116\(Public_Laws\)](#)), §12 Dec. 29, 1981, 95 Stat. 1617 ([http://uscode.house.gov/statviewer.htm?volume=95&page=1617](#)); Pub. L. 99-603, title I ([http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/L?d099:/list/bd/d099pl.lst:603\(Public_Laws\)](#)), §112, Nov. 6, 1986, 100 Stat. 3381 ([http://uscode.house.gov/statviewer.htm?volume=100&page=3381](#)); Pub. L. 100-525, ([http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/L?d100:/list/bd/d100pl.lst:525\(Public_Laws\)](#)), §2(d), Oct. 24, 1988, 102 Stat. 2610 ([http://uscode.house.gov/statviewer.htm?volume=102&page=2610](#)); Pub. L. 103-322, title VI ([http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/L?d103:/list/bd/d103pl.lst:322\(Public_Laws\)](#)), §60024 Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 1981 ([http://uscode.house.gov/statviewer.htm?volume=108&page=1981](#)); Pub. L. 104-208, div. C, title II ([http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-104publ208/html/PLAW-104publ208.htm](#)), §§203(a)-(d), 219 title VI, §671(a)(1), Sept. 30, 1996, 110 Stat. 3009-565 ([http://uscode.house.gov/](#)

[statviewer.htm?volume=110&page=3009-565](#)), 3009-566, 3009-574, 3009-720; Pub. L. 106-185 ([http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-106publ185/htm/PLAW-106publ185.htm](#)), §18(a), Apr. 25, 2000, 114 Stat 222 ([http://uscode.house.gov/statviewer.htm?volume=114&page=222](#)); Pub. L. 108-458, title V ([http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-108publ458/htm/PLAW-108publ458.htm](#)), §5401, Dec. 17, 2004, 118 Stat. 3737 ([http://uscode.house.gov/statviewer.htm?volume=118&page=3737](#)); Pub. L. 109-497, title VII ([http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-109publ97/html/PLAW-109publ97.htm](#)), §796, Nov. 10, 2005, 119 Stat. 2165 ([http://uscode.house.gov/statviewer.htm?volume=119&page=2165](#)).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, 8 U.S.C. 1373 addresses sanctuary cities, and it prohibits the sanctuary jurisdictions by Federal law. And that is exactly what they intend to carve out at 8 o'clock tonight in Des Moines, Iowa, to establish themselves as a sanctuary jurisdiction for the entire school district, the largest school district in the State of Iowa—not the most proficient in educating our precious Iowa students, but the largest.

So they make a political statement just at the time when the President has said that he is prepared to suspend all Federal dollars going to sanctuary jurisdictions, and that would include school districts and it would include, of course, cities and counties and States and any campus that decides they want to be a sanctuary campus.

This President will keep his word.

I would equate this showdown that they are building here, thinking that they can stare the President down and that he will blink and that somehow he won't have the nerve to address sanctuaries, the law-defined jurisdictions in America, the hole-in-the-wall gang holed up in San Francisco with more people being murdered in San Francisco—when I say “hole-in-the-wall gang,” I want to remind people, Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid, they had a place in a canyon where you ride through a hole in the wall, and then they had a sanctuary for robbers and murderers and killers, but they had a code among them that they didn't kill each other very often. So they lived in this sanctuary. They were protected from the law; and they guarded and protected each other, and they guarded the notch through the stone wall in the canyon.

That is what these cities are and what the campuses are and some of the States and the counties, sanctuary jurisdictions like the hole-in-the-wall gang where they are harboring lawbreakers. Somehow, we are supposed to let this grow in America and not address it?

We had a Presidential election that focused exactly on this.

And, by the way, I brought amendments to the floor time after time to defund these sanctuary jurisdictions. Every one of them here in the House of Representatives since I have been here has succeeded. There is no unconstitutional act and no amnesty act that has been unchallenged here in the House of

Representatives—by amendment, at least—that I and others have brought. Every time the rule of law prevailed.

Now we have elected a President on the rule of law, and this President will not blink. I will remind the public as I speak to you, Mr. Speaker, that when Ronald Reagan was elected President, the air traffic controllers decided they would go out on strike. The President warned them: If you go on strike, you have got a contract, and you are, by law, prohibited from striking because it puts too many people at risk.

They said: Too bad. If we don't get what we demand, we are going on strike anyway.

They challenged the President of the United States. And what did Ronald Reagan do? He said: If you don't go back to work on the date that I tell you, I will fire anyone that doesn't show up.

And so they called the President, thinking it was a bluff. Mr. Speaker, it wasn't a bluff. Ronald Reagan fired every air traffic controller that didn't show up for work in defiance of the Federal law, and he put the military air traffic controllers to work to control the skies over America without one single fatal accident brought about by any of that. Ronald Reagan was called out by the air traffic controllers. They thought he was bluffing. He was not bluffing.

Now we have jurisdiction after jurisdiction that think they are going to be leading a national movement to accelerate the sanctuary city jurisdiction endeavor, and they think that President Trump is going to back up from them because there are a lot of them and somehow he won't be able to take this on.

I will submit this: If Ronald Reagan had blinked in the stare down between the air traffic controllers union, his Presidency would have collapsed. His power base would have diminished. He would have been an asterisk in history except for the snickers behind the hand of people that would have laughed at him because he would have caved in the face of first adversity.

Donald Trump faces a similar circumstance here with sanctuary jurisdictions. He has no choice. If he is going to have an effective Presidency—and I guarantee you, he is committed to an effective Presidency—there will be no sanctuary jurisdiction left in this country within several months or a year as this grinds through and as people like Mayor Rahm Emanuel are brought to bear and they begin to be reminded by, hopefully, the new Attorney General, maybe as soon as tomorrow, JEFF SESSIONS, that 8 U.S.C. 1324 means what it says: It is a felony to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection or attempt to conceal, harbor, or shield from detection any such alien in any place, including a building or transportation—meaning anywhere. It is a serious felony.

8 U.S.C. 1373, sanctuary cities, just the policy is a violation of Federal law.

And then when you have control of the purse strings, Mr. Speaker, and you cut off the Federal funds going to these jurisdictions, there isn't hardly anybody that is going to face this. I think I would start with maybe the mayor of Chicago, then the mayor of New York. I bet he can communicate with Mayor de Blasio.

The center of it all is this: Restore the respect for the rule of law. You have to enforce it if you are going to have laws. Once we do that, we will respect each other and America can go back to its constitutional foundation, and we can turn our focus to building our families, restoring our country, and helping other countries get up to speed into the first world.

Mexico can get to the first world, but they can't be there if it is going to be corrupt. They can't be there if they are going to be the main provider of \$60 billion worth of illegal drugs in this country. They can't face another 100,000 people murdered, we can't face 55,000 drug overdose deaths in this country every year, and I haven't yet mentioned even the terrorists that are sneaking across that border on at least an irregular basis.

Mr. Speaker, it is serious business, and I urge that we get this done. I urge that the American people follow through and encourage the President of the United States, let's end DACA, let's end DAPA, and let's end the sanctuary jurisdictions. Build a wall. America will be in a better place.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the attention and your ear this evening. It has been my honor to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate my friend, colleague—actually, dear friend—STEVE KING, and his points he is making—right on track.

I hesitated for a number of days now about making public reference to this, but it needs to be addressed and it needs to be looked at, and people need to be aware so that mistakes do not continue to be made. This is a story from John Stanton, February 2, 2017, BuzzFeed: "Congressional IT Staff Under Investigation In Alleged Procurement Scam."

And this is February 2, so several days ago—5 days ago. It says: "A lawmaker briefed on the matter had said House officials had told staff from affected offices that contractors had been arrested, but late Thursday night US Capitol Police spokesperson Eva Malecki told BuzzFeed News that no arrest had been made. The USCP is investigating House IT support staff."

Now, that is the technologically proficient staff members that work on congressional computers, that work on our technology, so it was quite disturbing to see this some days back.

This says: "Five men who had access to the House of Representatives' entire computer network are under investigation Thursday evening following a months-long investigation by federal law enforcement officials, according to a lawmaker briefed on the raid."

Well, it sure wasn't me because I didn't know anything about this until I read it a few days ago.

"Although the lawmaker said House officials had told staff from affected offices that contractors had been arrested, late Thursday night, US Capitol Police spokesperson Eva Malecki told BuzzFeed News that no arrest had been made, but that USCP are investigating members of the House IT support staff."

"At the request of Members of Congress, the United States Capitol Police are investigating the actions of House IT support staff," Malecki said in a statement. "No Members are being investigated. No arrests have been made. It should be noted that, administratively, House staff were asked to update their security settings as a best practice. We have no further comment on the ongoing investigation at this time."

"According to the member, the chiefs of staff for 20 lawmakers were summoned to a closed-door meeting with House administration officials, who briefed them on the incidents. The chiefs were told the men were conducting a procurement scam, although officials acknowledged the men—whose staff were told were brothers—had access to virtually all of the computer systems used by the affected lawmakers. Members were also told Thursday night to change the passwords to their email and other applications."

"The news has rattled nerves on Capitol Hill, especially after the series of high-profile political hackings over the last year. 'They said it was some sort of procurement scam, but now I'm concerned that they may have stolen data from us, emails, who knows,' the lawmaker said."

Then this was added: "This post has been updated and corrected with new information from US Capitol Police, which said no arrests have been made but there is an active investigation ongoing into IT staff who were involved in alleged procurement scam. A lawmaker briefed on the situation had told BuzzFeed News that arrests were made."

And then yesterday we had this update from Politico, "House staffers under criminal investigations still employed," by Heather Caygle.

"Multiple Democratic lawmakers have yet to cut ties with House staffers under criminal investigation for wide-ranging equipment and data theft."

"Imran Awan, a longtime House staffer who worked for more than two dozen Democrats since 2004, is still employed by Rep. Debbie Wasserman

Schultz, though his access to the House IT network has been blocked since last week.

“At this time we are continuing to gather information from House officials and will determine the best approach to move forward once we have reviewed that information,” David Damron, communications director for Wasserman Schultz, said in an email when asked by POLITICO if Awan was still working for the Florida Democrat.”

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, I might insert parenthetically that although you can't judge much from a name, one can't help but wonder, because of all of the outcry about the Russians, if maybe these brothers—well, I started to ask—have some Russian connection, but there doesn't appear to be any.

“Multiple relatives of Imran Awan, including his wife Hina Alvi, Abid Awan and Jamal Awan—all House staffers until recently—are also being investigated in connection to the alleged procurement scam, according to a senior House official close to the investigation.

“Alvi has worked for more than a dozen House Democrats and the House Democratic Caucus since 2007. At least one member, Rep. GREGORY MEEKS, New York, is still employing her.

“My office is in the process of gathering information to make a determination in the near future about the employment of Ms. Alvi with our office,” Meeks said Monday in a statement to POLITICO.

“Five House staffers are accused of stealing equipment from members' offices without their knowledge and committing serious, potentially illegal, violations on the House IT network, according to multiple sources briefed on the investigation.

“Top staffers for lawmakers impacted by the scam were briefed last Thursday. A source in the briefing said the Sergeant-at-Arms confirmed the U.S. Capitol Police is conducting an active criminal investigation but said no arrests have been made.

“Imran Awan was first employed on Capitol Hill by former Rep. Robert Wexler in January 2004 as an ‘information technology director.’ Awan has worked for at least 25 other House Democrats since that time as a shared employee providing technical support including to previous House Democratic Caucus Chairman Xavier Becerra, currently the California attorney general.

“Imran Awan has a longtime relationship with some members, including working for Meeks and Becerra starting in 2004 and joining Wasserman Schultz's office in 2005.

“Several Members who have employed Imran Awan and Alvi in the past confirmed to POLITICO they terminated their employment late last week.

“Jamal Awan worked as a House IT staffer for more than half-dozen House

Democrats since 2014, according to LegiStorm, a website that tracks congressional employment. Abid Awan worked for more than a dozen House Democrats as a systems administrator since 2005, according to congressional records.

“Another House staff with connections to Imran Awan is also under investigation, according to the senior House official.

“No one named in this POLITICO report as being under investigation returned multiple calls and emails requesting comment over the past several days.”

Capitol Police have not returned calls.

So it is extremely disconcerting. All of us have to hire people to help us with our jobs, and most all of us need computer assistants. I can't help but reflect back, there is a new policy last year that was instituted that requires every employee that may have access to the computer systems, the massive databases and emails of Members, such confidential information, they need a background check, but at the same time, there was the requirement that had to be certified by the Member or the administration officer in a congressional office, you either certify that this person has had the required background check to be allowed to access this confidential information on computers in the congressional offices. Some of these Members were part of the Intelligence Committee having access to top secret information. So this is quite serious.

There was another—there were two possibilities. One, you certify this person had the proper background check done. And, number two—it was an “or in the alternative”—if this person works for more than one person—which computer personnel often do because you don't need them full-time, you just need them when something goes wrong or perhaps when they're needing to break into your computer and steal your data—you could sign and certify that this person works for more than one Member of Congress. Therefore, I don't believe the background check is necessary.

So I hope all of my colleagues will make note that there may be people on the Hill that don't have the best intentions with our computer data, including access to classified information. So no matter who they are, even if somebody is worried, because of their background or where they were born, that somebody might scream bias or prejudice, we just need to have everyone who has access to classified information to have a background check even if they work for multiple people. We just need to do that. Lessons, apparently, are still being learned in that regard.

As we continue to hear from some friends here in Washington and some going nuts around the country about a Muslim ban, which is completely false and completely untrue, something we

are not hearing a lot about is the horrors being experienced by Christians in the Middle East. Even Secretary John Kerry had acknowledged there was an effort, a genocide, in other words, an effort to wipe out every Christian because of their religious beliefs in the Middle East.

So you would think that if we were going to be the big-hearted nation, which we have repeatedly been throughout history—not always, but certainly most of the time, more than any other nation in history—then you would think that our hearts would go out to the Christians being persecuted in far greater percentages than any other religious or racial group in the Middle East.

Yet this story from Townhall, “Christians Were Persecuted In Every Corner of Globe in 2016,” points out: “Not only did the persecution of Christians increase in 2016, it also spread to every corner of the globe, according to Open Doors USA's latest World Watch List.

“The annual report ranks the worst 50 countries for Christians trying to live out their faith, and while some findings are not surprising, like North Korea topping the list for the 16th consecutive year, the group is troubled by the overall rise in the number of incidents considered persecution.”

It is getting worse than ever. Of course, the current Secretary-General, when asked a year and a half or so ago why the percentage of Christian refugees from the Middle East being helped is so much lower than the actual percentage of Christians living in the area, his response was, in essence, that, well, they were so historically important to the areas in which they lived, it was important that they be left there. In other words, we need to leave them where they are being murdered to extinction.

Then that guy with that kind of sensitivity for a genocide gets promoted to be Secretary-General of the U.N., which, to me, is all the more reason it is time to get out of the United Nations. Since a Rockefeller Foundation of some kind controls the land and it is to be used by the U.N., as long as the U.N. remains the main headquarters, then all we have to do is start denying visas and privileges to come in until we have extreme vetting for people that may be improperly using their positions at the U.N. If that proves too much of a burden, then they can go to Brussels or Istanbul or wherever. We might as well let them go to Syria. That seems to be where they want to be most involved, I guess.

It was certainly worth noting Jordan Schachtel in Conservative Review has pointed out: “The Middle East country of Kuwait issued its own ‘Muslim ban’ in 2011, citing the ‘instability’ from several terror hotbeds in the Middle East.”

That is rather interesting because the United States has not and does not have a Muslim ban at all. Christians,

atheists, Jews, and Hindus were all just as prohibited as any Muslim from the seven countries that the Obama administration named as being troubled. And the Trump administration didn't just name them as troubled; it actually took action and did something about it.

We have this story from Liam Deacon, Breitbart, that the Islamic State is paying migrants smuggling fees for them if they join a jihad. So more good news. As President Trump is trying to protect America, more stories emerge that make what President Trump did even more important.

I was hearing something on FOX News. They had a panel. There was one panel member that repeated—and I know she didn't mean it to intentionally misrepresent the facts, but she did in saying that no one has been arrested from one of those seven countries for any terrorist activity. Or maybe she said not committed any.

So it seems that it is worth taking a look at Neil Munro's article from Breitbart: "Seattle Judge Was Ignorant About Jihad Convictions Prior to Imposing Refugee Reform Ban."

"The Seattle judge who temporarily banned the White House's refugee reform plan acted after mistakenly claiming the federal government has not arrested jihadi migrants from the seven Muslim countries covered by the reform.

"But the federal government has arrested and jailed at least 76 people since 2001 from the seven countries covered in the first stage of the president's reform, which was announced late January.

"That fact means there is a huge error in the judge's rationale for imposing a 'Temporary Restraining Order' ban on the president's popular reform of the expensive refugee and immigration programs.

"In a hearing before the decision, Judge James Robart told a lawyer from the Department of Justice that the federal government has not arrested people since 2001 from any of the seven countries named in the reform, since the 2001 atrocity in New York. 'How many arrests have there been of foreign nationals for those seven countries since 9/11?' he asked.

"The justice department's lawyer replied, 'Your Honor, I don't have that information,' prompting Robart to answer his own question."

The judge said: "Let me tell, you, the answer to that is none, as best I can tell. You're here arguing on behalf of someone that says we have to protect the United States from these individuals coming from these countries and there's no support for that."

□ 1945

All of us are ignorant of some areas. What is incredibly problematic is when you have a judicial official, a Federal judge with a lifetime appointment not only ignorant, but uses his ignorance as the basis of an illegal, unconstitu-

tional order and then adds arrogance to his ignorance. This is sheer, unadulterated, arrogant ignorance by Judge Robart.

So, as a former judge and chief justice, I can sure understand someone who is not a lawyer or somebody who was a lawyer and somebody who was a former judge or even a current judge saying this is a so-called judge.

You would like to think that judges, if they are going to be arrogant, they will be arrogant about their knowledge in some area that others don't have, instead of being arrogant about ignorance that puts the American public in jeopardy.

The Constitution and the laws passed by this Congress and signed by our President make clear that the President has the authority to do exactly what he did. Whether you like it or not, whether I like it or not, he does have that authority, based on our national security, because we gave it to him.

What we did not give the President was authority to do an amnesty program, as President Obama pointed out more than 20 times. He just didn't have authority to do what he ultimately did when he realized the Senate would not work with the House to stop him.

A judge who should know better and who is allowed to remain a judge only so long as he is acting in good conduct appears to be acting in very bad conduct.

A database was built by the Senate's Immigration Subcommittee. Why would they have to build this? Because President Obama made sure that his administration kept as much secret as they could about who was operating as terrorists in America.

Not only that, when some of us would try to gather such information like my repeated requests to the Obama administration and to the Justice Department, Would you let Congress have the documents that you gave to people convicted of terrorism in the Holy Land Foundation discovery phase, we repeatedly were shunned, and there was just repeated obfuscation. They did not produce what they should have, and America is more at risk now than it has been in a long time.

So what can we expect from the Ninth Circuit? Well, they have a history of not following the Constitution, not following precedent. They are rather liberal. I am hoping we can do something about that circuit. I would like to restrict their jurisdiction to controversies that arise in their building. We have total authority to eliminate them.

I see I am joined by my friend, Mr. ROHRBACHER. I didn't know if the gentleman desires to speak.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I will speak after the gentleman completes, but I would also just like to note that I agree with everything that he has been talking about for the last 20 minutes. I hope the American people start paying attention.

The fact is, the two of us are in a very small cadre of patriots that have been here in Washington for the last 20 years trying to stop this massive flow of illegal immigrants into our country, realizing that this doesn't only mean that people's wages would go down because we have people bidding down the wages of our people, not only is the crime in our area worse, not only is the money being drained from our health systems and schools—money that should be going to our own citizens are going to illegals—as we have always realized, with a flood of illegals into our country, some of the people riding that wave of illegals are terrorists who mean to destroy the American way of life and would kill our people in order to terrorize our Nation into retreat from involvement in the world.

I have been very honored to stand with the gentleman from Texas in these battles over these last 20 years. I would hope that the election of President Donald Trump reflects the fact that the American people are waking up to the significance of this issue.

We see people on the Senate side shedding tears for a temporary halt in immigration from areas where terrorism is known to exist and radical Islamic terrorism exists there. But they are shedding tears that a couple of hundred people, yes, were put in a bad situation. A couple of other lives were disrupted. They were innocent people.

But in order to save American lives, we are not going to put foreigners who are trying to come here at some kind of discomfort? Well, I think Donald Trump has demonstrated his primary objective is to secure the safety of the people of the United States of America.

I have been so proud to stand with the gentleman from Texas in getting behind Mr. Trump on this very important goal.

Mr. GOHMERT. I am so grateful to my friend from California. We have traveled around the world and stood for people who weren't able to stand for themselves, and I look forward to continue doing that.

Just to continue on, Ken Klukowski has a terrific article, "Travesty of Legal Errors in Immigration EO Lawsuit." It is a great article pointing out problems with Judge Robart's decision.

Then, this article from Hans von Spakovsky on February 6 from Daily Signal, he points out:

"This fact is obvious from an examination of his seven-page order, which contains absolutely no discussion whatsoever of what law or constitutional provision the president has supposedly violated. That temporary restraining order is now on an emergency appeal before a panel of the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals."

It contrasts a 21-page opinion issued by Massachusetts District Court Judge Nathaniel Gorton. "Unlike Robart, who totally ignored the federal statute, 8 U.S.C. 1182(f), cited by Trump in his executive order, Gorton bases his decision denying the temporary restraining

order on an examination of the extensive power given to the president under that statute. . . .”

The article goes on: “That is exactly what the president has done.”

Whether you agree or disagree, he had the power to do it.

The order signed on January 27 on Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States suspends for only 90 days, unlike the 180 days President Obama did for Iran, the issuance of visas to anyone—not Muslims—just to anyone from those countries of concern as classified by the Obama administration.

And then Gorton goes on to make further notes, saying “the decision to prevent aliens from entering the country is a ‘fundamental sovereign attribute’ realized through the legislative and executive branches that is ‘largely immune from judicial control.’”

And then it goes on in this article to quote the Supreme Court.

“Robart’s opinion ends with a claim that seems like a joke.

“He says that ‘fundamental’ to his work is ‘a vigilant recognition that—the court—is but one of three equal branches of our federal government. The work of the court is not to create policy or judge the wisdom of any particular policy promoted by the other two branches.

“Instead, says Robart, his job is ‘limited’ to ‘ensuring that the actions taken by the other two branches comport with our country’s law, and more importantly, our Constitution.’”

That shows that he intentionally and knowingly abused his authority as a judge by not citing either one.

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

FEDERAL MARIJUANA POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to ask my colleagues to join me in the legislation that I have submitted today, which is the Respect State Marijuana Laws Act.

For too long, Washington’s decision-makers have pursued the same policies over a whole range of issues without regard for whether those policies are actually beneficial to the American people. In fact, they continue to support policies that have utterly failed—many of these things—because the intent sounds so good.

So, over and over again, we see failed policies remain in place, wasting money. Rather than evaluating the reason for the policy failures and ultimately deciding to change course in Washington, the habit has been simply doubling down on regulations, personnel, and tax dollars spent, believing that that will have and bring a different outcome.

Last November, the American people registered their dissatisfaction with this way of thinking by electing Donald Trump to the Presidency.

President Trump’s statements on the campaign trail loudly and aggressively challenged the status quo. We haven’t had someone here shaking up the status quo for a long time, but he did so by promising to revisit a whole host of failed Federal policies that have been crying out for attention for years and, in some cases, decades.

Once such failed policy has been the U.S. Government spending billions of dollars and wasting the time of Federal employees—hundreds of thousands, if not maybe tens of thousands of Federal employees—in order to prevent adults from smoking a weed, marijuana.

Candidate Trump told the voters this was an issue to be left up to the States, especially when it comes to medical marijuana.

At a 2015 rally in Sparks, Nevada, then-Candidate Trump said:

“Marijuana is such a big thing. I think medical should happen—right? Don’t we agree? I think so. And then I really believe we should leave it up to the states.”

It should be a State situation, I think.

“In terms of marijuana and legalization, I think that should be a state issue, state-by-state.”

I could not agree more with the President. Indeed, it is the very approach that I have advocated for several years.

In this vein, I have reintroduced today, as I said, the Respect State Marijuana Laws Act earlier today, along with Republican colleagues TOM MCCLINTOCK, TED YOHO, DON YOUNG, DUNCAN HUNTER, JUSTIN AMASH, and TOM MASSIE, as well as Democratic colleagues STEVE COHEN, MARK POCAN, EARL BLUMENAUER, DINA TITUS, JARED POLIS, and BARBARA LEE.

My bill, which has not received a designation yet but is entitled the “Respect State Marijuana Laws Act,” will permit residents to participate within the confines of a State’s medical and recreational marijuana program without running afoul of Federal law.

Admittedly, my personal preference would be to lift the Federal Government’s prohibition on marijuana entirely. However, I understand that this approach would be a nonstarter for many of my colleagues, which is why I have promoted an approach that simply gives the States and their residents the room they need to take a different approach to this issue, should they choose to take that different approach.

Under my proposal, if a resident or business acts outside the boundaries set by a particular State, or if a State has chosen not to allow medical or recreational use of marijuana by their residents, the Federal Government would still be empowered to enforce Federal law in those instances. If that is what the people of the State want—it to be legal—the Federal Government can still get involved.

Of course, the number of States that have resisted the shift in national opinion on this issue is small. To date, 44 States, including D.C., Guam, and Puerto Rico, have enacted laws that allow, to a varying degree, the cultivation, sale, and use of marijuana for medical or recreational purposes. For those States and territories that have discarded strict marijuana prohibition, my bill would align Federal policy accordingly.

□ 2000

This is to those States and the people of those States who have decided they don’t want the marijuana prohibition. My bill would then make sure that Federal law is aligned with the States’ and the people in those States’ desires so that the residents and businesses wouldn’t have to worry about Federal prosecution. For those few States that have thus far maintained a policy of strict prohibition, my bill would change nothing. I think that this is a reasonable compromise that places the primary responsibility of police powers back in the States and the local communities that are most directly affected.

Over the past few years, the disparity between State and Federal marijuana policies has confused and stifled banking, proper taxation, research, natural resources development, law enforcement, and related activities. A plethora of bills, many of which I have happily cosponsored, have been introduced in the House to tackle these problems on an issue-by-issue basis. However, my bill is the only one that would solve all these problems in one fell swoop.

My bill is short, straightforward, and easy to understand. It amends the Controlled Substances Act to add a new rule that reads as follows: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this subchapter related to marijuana shall not apply to any person acting in compliance with State laws relating to the production, possession, distribution, dispensation, or administration or delivery of marijuana.”

The major difficulties that landlords, dispensaries, banks, and others find themselves in in those States where the majority of people—maybe the vast majority of people—have voted to make marijuana legal in their borders stems from the fact that the Federal Government law considers that activity still illegal. By explicitly stating that as long as these folks are following the State law, their actions are, by definition, not illegal to the Federal Government, if we do that, many of these obstacles, many of these confusions that people have to deal with in those States, in the States where people have voted to make sure they don’t want marijuana illegal, well, their problems and the complications, the banking rules and everything else would be solved immediately.

Now that we have established President Trump's policy preference as it relates to this issue, which is he believes it should be left up to the States, as well as my legislative proposal, let us turn to the reasons why Federal policy ought to change.

First, as a matter of philosophy, I, as a constitutional conservative, have great faith in the ideals articulated by our Founding Fathers. Their experience with the British monarchy, an all-powerful, centralized British Government in which people had little representation and no right to control their own lives and liberty, led them to establish—meaning, led our Founding Fathers to establish—a decentralized system of government, totally different from that of the British, that their government was meant to protect the freedoms of the citizenry.

One of the most important tenets of this system of government was the idea that nearly all police power should be reserved to and exercised by the State and local governments. Yet today, Congress continues to fund an enormous Federal bureaucracy that is built around the idea that we—meaning, the Federal Government—can and should regulate what people may or may not choose to consume and has justified the Federal Government's establishing a Federal police force and justified Federal police actions directly on the citizens throughout our country.

This is totally contrary to what our Founding Fathers meant. There was never an intent to have criminal law being taken care of by the Federal Government. All of our Founding Fathers would have opposed it and today would be supporting my legislation by bringing things back to the ideals which they had in mind of limited government, especially limiting the Federal Government's control directly over our lives.

Tragically, these laws, the laws which have been implemented and the laws that have been encouraged by the Federal Government, these laws concerning marijuana, disproportionately impact on the poorest communities in our country. There is an incorrect perception that poor people, particularly people of color, disproportionately break Federal marijuana laws, leading to their disproportionate representation in Federal prisons. However, as I indicated, that is an incorrect perception.

Statistics show that affluent citizens are just as likely to grow, sell, and use marijuana illegally as poor citizens. The sad difference between these two, however, is that the poorest among us are somehow unable to avoid prison time for similar offenses.

There is much that can be said about why this is. Some may respond to this unfairness with the idea that we should just lock up more of the affluent young people and older people as frequently as we lock up their poor counterparts.

Well, I happen to believe that the Federal Government shouldn't be lock-

ing up anyone for making a decision of what he or she should privately consume, whether that person is rich or poor, and we should never be giving people the excuse, especially Federal authorities, that they have a right to stop people or intrude into their lives in order to prevent them and prevent others from smoking a weed, consuming something they personally want to consume.

We have been down this path before, of course. In the 1920s, a coalition of progressives and evangelical Christians thought it would be a good idea to institute a national prohibition on alcohol, which was something else that people can do in excess—and do in excess—which hurts them when they do it in excess or when they do it when they are not totally in control, and they hurt their lives.

People do hurt their lives on alcohol, no doubt about it, just like in all these other drugs and just as some people do on sugar, for example. But the motives of the movement, no matter how well intended, indeed, certainly they wanted to help the people that they were going to stop from drinking. But like most efforts to limit freedom, the freedom of Americans, they ultimately succeeded in convincing—they did convince—the country to enact an amendment to the Constitution that actually prohibited the production and sale of alcohol in the United States.

What happened? Well, predictably, the policy failed at achieving its intended goal, which is trying to prevent people from consuming a liquid intoxicant, alcohol; and instead of just achieving that goal, instead it resulted in a torrent of collateral damage that harmed everybody in this country and created problems that we still have today. The rise of organized crime, the death of people consuming booze that was contaminated or otherwise deadly, that is what was going on during Prohibition.

The mobster scene first arrived in America. We had organized crime. We had people who were consuming alcohol from stills, and they had no idea what company or what people were making this stuff that they were consuming. They ended up dying in great numbers, and we ended up with the Mob.

Does that sound familiar?

Fortunately, for future generations, the country wised up and repealed the Prohibition amendment just about a decade after it was put into place.

Today, the scourge of marijuana prohibition has fueled organized crime here and south of our border and in our inner cities and throughout the world. We now have organized crime on steroids, and there is little that we can do to stop that because we keep feeding them with money by having outlawed drugs that people want to consume, and especially that drug that we are looking at tonight, which is marijuana.

Yet despite the well-documented death and destruction permeated by or-

ganized crime, the two groups who are most tragically harmed by the Federal Government's intransigence—it is not necessarily the groups that they are trying to save, but, in reality, they are trying to save these people. They are putting them in jail. They are destroying people's lives in that way, but they are also victimizing American seniors and our veterans—yes, our veterans.

The Federal Government remains so fixated on the need to restrict marijuana use that it has effectively promoted an opioid addiction. The possibility that marijuana might be a viable alternative to the management of pain and certain chronic disorders has been ignored and, yes, suppressed. Thus, we have senior citizens who are in their senior citizens homes, people over 70 and 80 years old, and they are being prohibited from using marijuana that might make their day a little bit easier or might bring back their appetite. Marijuana is now, instead, designated as a schedule I substance and has prevented any meaningful use that might be, as I say, for our senior citizens.

It has also prevented a robust research of the drug to find out exactly what it could be used for in a positive way. Last year, to the credit of the Obama administration, at the insistence of myself and others here in Congress, the Drug Enforcement Administration announced a policy change to expand the number of DEA-registered marijuana manufacturers. That meant that they were able to expand that number.

Historically, only the University of Mississippi had been registered with the DEA to produce marijuana for research purposes. Well, what we have had in the past has limited the research supply of marijuana both in quantity and in quality, making access particularly difficult to legitimate scientists and practitioners. Thus, we have made it very difficult, if not impossible, for us to get a full understanding: If there are dangers, what are they? If there are some potential positive uses of marijuana, what are they?

Through the policy that we have had, it has been a negative impact on those people who are suffering who, needlessly, don't need to suffer. They do not need to suffer, whether they are our veterans coming home or whether it is our people who are basically older or are suffering from other types of diseases. The policy change that we have made is a positive step in the right direction so that now there can be more research into marijuana to find out what the dangers are and what the benefits can be.

We now can expect that research to pick up to some degree, although barriers remain. It is unfortunate that barriers remain because a plethora of anecdotal evidence suggests that this plant and its constituent parts may offer relief from ailments such as post-traumatic stress disorder, cancer, chronic pain, epilepsy, glaucoma, and multiple sclerosis; and, yes, we know

that in some cases they have noted childhood problems where people go into seizures, and it has been effective in that.

Why have we held marijuana back and not researched it even?

This paranoia has had severe negative consequences on the American people, and that is not even considering the number of people whose lives have been affected. You arrest some person who doesn't have the money for a lawyer and they can't get it expunged from their record, for the rest of their lives they have lower pay and they have trouble getting jobs. We have trapped people in our poorer areas because we have put this stigma on them when what we are talking about is the consumption of a weed—not hurting somebody else, the personal consumption.

I can't think of anything that our Founding Fathers thought that some people have a right to control their lives, especially what they consume. I, of course, don't agree that we should outlaw cups bigger than this because some people might drink more soda pop if we have bigger cups, no. People need to be responsible for their own lives. That is what freedom is all about, and that is when people will start being more careful about what they do.

□ 2015

Yes, we also know that marijuana can adversely affect the mental development of an adolescent brain. As such, it is vitally important to discourage our youth from chronic use. Right now the youth won't even believe what we are talking about half the time when it comes to marijuana. So now we need to establish our credibility that we are not being paranoid, we are being responsible, and we are being realistic. We need to discuss with our young people and discourage the chronic consumption of marijuana, just like we do when we discourage them from the chronic consumption of alcohol use, which also is bad for young people's brains.

But the fact is we do not know more, and we need to know more, about the use of medical marijuana and the use of marijuana, period—both positive impacts and negative impacts. The fact that we don't know what it can be used for positively or what the negative impact is because we haven't done the research, that is a travesty. That is a travesty.

It is a crime against older people who sit there and are being denied the use of something when they are over 70 or 80 years old that might enlighten their day and might bring back their appetite after they have had some sickness.

It is a travesty when our veterans come home and they are given opiates instead of maybe something they can derive from marijuana. We need to research that. And our veterans end up killing themselves because now they are addicted to an opiate. The Federal

Government should not stand in the way of the scientific community in learning more about marijuana.

Many who oppose the change in course for Federal marijuana policy will cite any number of excuses: Oh, but it is dangerous if people use marijuana and then get behind the wheel of a car.

Well, that is something that needs to be worked out. We need to make sure that we understand there are other challenges we have to face once marijuana is legal and how we are going to protect people from being in a situation. Well, I happen to believe that there will be no more people smoking marijuana and driving a car if it was legal than they are today. However, that may be an issue we need to look at.

What we need to do is find ways to discourage young people from driving while drinking. Let's have drug testing in our schools not aimed at putting young people in jail, not aimed at saying: Oh, you have tested positive for marijuana, you are going to get arrested. By the way, you can't do that because you can't force these kids to testify against themselves by giving them a blood sample or a drug test. But you can do it in order to say: If you test positive for drugs, we are going to talk to your parents about it. If you test positive for drugs and you are in school, you are going to have to take a class to show you what you are doing to your brain.

Ultimately, this is all about freedom. It is all about whether adults, not children, can use their decisionmaking process. This is the land of the free and the home of the brave. Too many people get so wrapped up in micromanaging our lives for our own benefit—of course, it is always for our own benefit—that sometimes they end up causing great harm to the people that they want to control for their own benefit.

Well, many of my Republican colleagues have joined me in letting the States do this. That is right. I understand it. I respect them. I hope more will go along with the constitutional provision that those things not enumerated in the Constitution are powers that should be granted to the States.

I hope that my Republican colleagues will join me in recognizing that, when we talk about individual freedom, this is what individual freedom is. It also includes individual responsibility on the other side of the coin. When we talk about limited government, we want limited government and we want government that is closest to the people, the State marijuana laws in the name of helping people. So that they won't consume a weed by their own choice, we are destroying all of those principles which we claimed as Republicans.

I believe in those principles. I think my fellow Republicans do as well. That is why we need to talk about it and have this type of discussion that I am opening up tonight on the floor of the

House. In fact, if someone says they believe in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution—we have heard it, and we will hear it in this body over and over again—let's send that back to the States. That is supposed to be a State rule of who is going to control the environment, who is going to control the gun laws or marriage laws, et cetera. We are going to hear that. But if someone really believes in the Tenth Amendment, they will respect the State marijuana laws, and let the States decide, and the people therein decide, what the laws should be.

Remember, as we discuss people's health care, Republicans over and over again say: You shouldn't get in between a doctor and his patient. We believe in the doctor-patient relationship. That is true for medical marijuana as well.

Do we believe in these principles?

I say the Republican Party does believe in those principles. We need to have a discussion and we need to make sure that the American people understand that we are not just down here saying that we can control their life when we think it is best. No. We are down here because we do believe in liberty, we do believe in freedom, we do believe what our Founding Fathers had in mind when they decided not to follow the dictates of the king, not to permit the British government to establish control over their lives here in the United States that they had in Great Britain where they had fled from to get away from that type of authority. We do not want to have Federal police—no matter what they call them, DEA or anything else—down in our cities and our towns conducting law enforcement operations.

That is not what our Founding Fathers had in mind. They had in mind also that people would be responsible for themselves. Yes, when people are free, some of them are going to make wrong decisions in their lives. We need to make sure that we understand that when we legalize medical marijuana, or even recreational use of marijuana, some people will hurt themselves, just like with alcohol.

It is up to us not to try to put them in jail, not to try to hurt them, not to try to force them to do what we want, but to try to reach out to them, to help people who are in need, help people make the right decision in our churches and our schools. This is the way to conduct when you have a problem that threatens to bring down the society, not establishing a Federal Gestapo to go and enforce laws that are going to make everybody just prim and proper. I am sorry. What we need is to reassert what our Founding Fathers had in mind for America: limited government, personal responsibility, individual freedom, and, yes, the Tenth Amendment.

I would ask my Republican colleagues to join me in supporting the Respect State Marijuana Laws Act. It presents us with a unique opportunity to support legislation that responds to

our constituent demands because across America, people are understanding the reality of this. They don't want to put people in jail, they don't want to have Federal law strike forces in their community just to prevent adults from consuming a weed in their backyard. It makes no sense at all. They know that people, once they are arrested for just smoking a weed that is not hurting anybody else, their lives are damaged and it is harder for them to become a decent citizen. Americans are concerned about each other, and we know we can't just leave it up to the government to control our lives.

With that said, I hope that my colleagues support this legislation and support Congressman BLUMENAUER and myself and others in the Cannabis Caucus that is being established in order to be consistent with the goals and ideals of American liberty to make sure that we have limited government and unlimited freedom in this country. That is what America was supposed to be all about.

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

JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on February 06, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following joint resolutions:

H.J. Res. 41. Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Disclosure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers".

H.J. Res. 38. Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Stream Protection Rule.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 9, 2017, at 2:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

517. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a withdrawal of previous certification of satisfactory service for General Arthur J. Lichte, United States Air Force, in the grade of general issued on November 13, 2009; to the Committee on Armed Services.

518. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau (CGB), Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Structure and Practices of the Video Relay Service Program [CG Docket No.: 10-51]; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and

Speech Disabilities [CG Docket No.: 03-123] received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

519. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's interim rule — Recruitment and Selection through Competitive Examination (RIN: 3206-AN46) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

520. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Major final rule — Medical Qualification Determinations (RIN: 3206-AL14) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

521. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2017 Gulf of Alaska Pollock and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts [Docket No.: 150818742-6210-02] (RIN: 0648-XF104) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

522. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary orders — Fraser River Sockeye Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Orders (RIN: 0648-XE860) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

523. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Possession and Trip Limit Modifications for the Common Pool Fishery (RIN: 0648-XF074) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

524. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2016 Recreational Closure for Hogfish in the South Atlantic [Docket No.: 140819686-5999-02] (RIN: 0648-XF042) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

525. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2016 Commercial Accountability Measures and Closure for Atlantic Migratory Group Cobia [Docket No.: 101206604-1758-02] (RIN: 0648-XF056) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

526. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery;

Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 150903814-5999-02] (RIN: 0648-XF061) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

527. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for the State of New York [Docket No.: 140214138-4482-02] (RIN: 0648-XF043) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

528. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 151130999-6225-01] (RIN: 0648-XF069) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

529. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reopening of Recreational Sector for the South Atlantic Other Jacks Complex [Docket No.: 120815345-3525-02] (RIN: 0648-XF046) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

530. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting notification that during Fiscal Year 2016, no payments were made from the Victims Compensation Fund, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3525(b); Public Law 98-473, Sec. 1208; (98 Stat. 2162); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

531. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustments [Docket ID: OSM-2016-0015; S1D1S SS08011000 SX064A000 178S180110; S2D2S SS08011000 SX064A00 17XS501520] (RIN: 1029-AC74) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

532. A letter from the National President, Women's Army Corps Veterans' Association — Army Women United, transmitting the annual audit of the Association as of June 30, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

533. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations, temporary regulations, and removal of temporary regulations — Guidance for Determining Stock Ownership; Rules Regarding Inversions and Related Transactions [TD 9812] (RIN: 1545-BL00; 1545-BM45) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

534. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Certain Transfers of Property to Regulated Investment Companies [RICs] and Real Estate Investment Trusts [REITs] [TD 9810] (RIN: 1535-BN06) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

535. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure: Management Contracts Safe Harbors (Rev. Proc. 2017-13) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

536. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Income from Discharge of Indebtedness (Rev. Proc. 2017-24) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

537. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Extension of the Due Date for a Section 35 Health Coverage Tax Credit Election [Notice 2017-16] received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

538. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Changes to Rev. Proc. 2010-46 (Rev. Proc. 2017-22) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

539. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Qualifying Income from Activities of Publicly Traded Partnerships With Respect to Minerals or Natural Resources [TD 9817] (RIN: 1545-BM43) received February 3, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on 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. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 99. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 428) to survey the gradient boundary along the Red River in the States of Oklahoma and Texas, and for the other purposes, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 42) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to drug testing of unemployment compensation applicants (Rept. 115-10). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROYCE of California (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 898. A bill to require Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to establish procedures for considering certain credit scores in making a determination whether to purchase a residential mortgage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H.R. 899. A bill to terminate the Department of Education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GUTIÉRREZ:

H.R. 900. A bill to recognize Puerto Rico's sovereign nationhood under either independence or free association and to provide for a transition process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. BASS, and Mr. LABRADOR):

H.R. 901. A bill to place restrictions on the use of solitary confinement for juveniles in Federal custody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 902. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire psychiatrists; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 903. A bill to restrict funding for the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 904. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code, to increase the requirement for American-made content, to strengthen the waiver provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Homeland Security, 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. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 905. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide that the first sale doctrine applies to any computer program that enables a machine or other product to operate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 906. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISSA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan):

H.R. 907. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the care provided by

the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to newborn children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 908. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate a provision under the Medicare Advantage program that inadvertently penalizes Medicare Advantage plans for providing high quality care to Medicare beneficiaries; 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 Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DENHAM, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KEATING, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. YODER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DENT, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. FASO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. JONES, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SIREs, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. POLIQUIN, Ms. ESTY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. FALLONE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr.

SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MARINO, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BEYER, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. MENG, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. BASS, Mr. KATKO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 909. A bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 910. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to provide a safe harbor related to certain investment fund research reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. JONES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. BLUM, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 911. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MENG, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 912. A bill to provide for punishments for immigration-related fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 913. A bill to provide for improvements in the treatment of detainees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 914. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to expand coverage under the Act, to increase protections for whistleblowers, to increase penalties for high gravity violations, to adjust penalties for inflation, to provide rights for victims or their family members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 915. A bill to permanently extend the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 916. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to prohibit the use of guarantee fees as offsets; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOK (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 917. A bill to control the export of electronic waste in order to ensure that such waste does not become the source of counterfeit goods that may reenter military and civilian electronics supply chains in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. KILMER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BERGMAN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 918. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish mental health care to certain former members of the Armed Forces who are not otherwise eligible to receive such care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 919. A bill to require compliant flame mitigation devices to be used on portable fuel containers for flammable liquid fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 920. A bill to provide that Executive Order 13767 (82 Fed. Reg. 8793; entitled "Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements"), shall have no force or effect, to prohibit the use of Federal funds to enforce the Executive Order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 921. A bill to provide that Executive Order 13768 (82 Fed. Reg. 8799; entitled "Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States"), shall have no force or effect, to prohibit the use of Federal funds to enforce the Executive Order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself and Mr. MCEACHIN):

H.R. 922. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rehabilitation expenditures for public school buildings to qualify for rehabilitation credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. EMMER):

H.R. 923. A bill to repeal the Cybersecurity Act of 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Armed Services, the Judiciary, Foreign Affairs, Science, Space, and Technology, and 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. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 924. A bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to establish a three-judge independent examination review panel; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COOK, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JONES, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 925. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility for monthly stipends paid under the Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for certain members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 926. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reduce the principal amount on loans made to STEM majors; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 927. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the eligibility for beneficiary travel for veterans seeking treatment or care for military sexual trauma in specialized outpatient or residential programs at facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. YOHO, Mr. COLE, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 928. A bill to clarify that a State has the sole authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing on Federal land within the boundaries of the State; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 929. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax-preferred Small Business Start-up Savings Accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANCE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 930. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment; 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. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BARR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BOST, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FASO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HECK, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. RENACCI, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 931. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. LEE, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 932. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to develop performance measures for assessing transportation connectivity and accessibility for highway and public transportation systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 933. A bill to strengthen the current protections available under the National Labor Relations Act by providing a private right of action for certain violations of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 934. A bill to reduce prescription drug costs by allowing the importation and reimportation of certain drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 935. A bill to codify an office within the Department of Homeland Security with the mission of strengthening the capacity of the agency to attract and retain highly trained computer and information security professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce,

and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Homeland Security, 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. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 936. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a space-available transportation priority for veterans of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAT (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. GRIFFITH):

H.R. 937. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create Universal Savings Accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 938. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide clarification with respect to the liability of third party payers for medical assistance paid under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. JONES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 939. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to extend and expand the provision requiring the use of iron and steel products that are produced in the United States in projects funded through a State drinking water treatment revolving loan fund; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 940. A bill to secure communications of utilities from terrorist threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 941. A bill to increase the number of operational aircraft carriers of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 942. A bill to extend the right of appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board to certain employees of the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 943. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to award competitive grants to combat the certain species of lionfish in the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 944. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit certain State election administration officials from actively participating in electoral campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 945. A bill to codify the objective of Presidential Policy Directive 21 to improve critical infrastructure security and resilience, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 946. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow all eligible voters to vote by mail in Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SMITH

of Washington, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. POCAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. MENG, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. POLIS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BERA, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NADLER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MOULTON, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

H.R. 947. A bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 948. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to replace the mortgage interest deduction with a nonrefundable credit for indebtedness secured by a residence, to provide affordable housing to extremely low-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 949. A bill to increase Federal Pell Grants for the children of fallen public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 950. A bill to require a report and assessment regarding Department of Homeland

Security responses to terrorist threats to Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 951. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 952. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to clarify and expand food donation under the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BOST, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOHO, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BABIN, Mr. COLE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 953. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 954. A bill to remove the use restrictions on certain land transferred to Rockingham County, Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 955. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to conduct a study on the feasibility of establishing a Cyber Defense National Guard; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 956. A bill to regulate monitoring of electronic communications between a prisoner in a Bureau of Prisons facility and that prisoner's attorney or other legal representative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 957. A bill to require that State and local law enforcement agencies conform to Federal guidelines in using cell simulator devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 958. A bill to eliminate certain programs of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Agriculture, and 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 Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 959. A bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to extend ad-

vanced education nursing grants to support clinical nurse specialist programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. HURD, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. PERRY, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 960. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax-exempt financing of certain government-owned buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 961. A bill to prohibit aquaculture in the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 962. A bill to prohibit operation of aquaculture facilities that contribute to pollution of wild and scenic rivers; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JONES, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 963. A bill to provide for free mailing privileges for personal correspondence and parcels sent to members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty in Iraq, Afghanistan, or other designated hostile fire areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 964. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 965. A bill to redesignate the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site as the "Saint-Gaudens National Historical Park", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 966. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for the TIGER discretionary grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. MACARTHUR (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 967. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Alice Paul, in recognition of her role in the women's suffrage movement and in advancing equal rights for women; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 968. A bill to enforce the Sixth Amendment right to the assistance of effective counsel at all stages of the adversarial

process, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide declaratory and injunctive relief against systemic violations of such right, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 969. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a corporation to advocate on behalf of individuals in noncapital criminal cases before the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 970. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to require the submission of data relating to diversity by certain contractors, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the submission of such data by issuers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 971. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to treat small businesses, owned by surviving spouses of members of the Armed Forces killed in the line of duty, as small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans for purposes of contracting goals and preferences of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. GRIMALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 972. A bill to increase the availability and affordability of menstrual hygiene products for women and girls with limited access, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HURD, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 973. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify the criteria for selecting communities to participate in the Small Community Air Service Development Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 974. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POCAN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCLINTOCK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. AMASH, Ms. LEE, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 975. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for a new rule regarding the application of the Act to marijuana, 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. ROSS (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 976. A bill to grant a Federal charter to the National Academy of Inventors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 977. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to create a demonstration project to fund additional secondary school counselors in troubled title I schools to reduce the dropout rate; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KIND, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 978. A bill to establish an independent advisory committee to review certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIRES (for himself and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 979. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to encourage Canadian tourism to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. POCAN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 980. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. TORRES (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 981. A bill to prohibit any hiring freeze from affecting the Indian Health Service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 982. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for payments to States for substance abuse services furnished to inmates in public institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 983. A bill to bar prosecution under section 844(f)(1) of title 18, United States

Code, in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 984. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VELA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.J. Res. 65. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, and Ms. FOX):

H.J. Res. 66. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by States for non-governmental employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Mr. WALBERG, and Ms. FOX):

H.J. Res. 67. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by qualified State political subdivisions for non-governmental employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.J. Res. 68. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5 of the United States Code of a rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to standards for measurement and reporting of gas removed or sold from Federal and Indian lands and areas subject to communitization agreements; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.J. Res. 69. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of the Interior relating to "Non-Subsistence Take of Wildlife, and Public Participation and Closure Procedures, on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. EVANS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution recognizing the difficult challenges Black veterans faced when returning home after serving in the Armed Forces, their heroic military sacrifices, and their patriotism in fighting for equal rights and for the dignity of a people and a Nation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 95. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H. Res. 96. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Budget in the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROYCE of California (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 97. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 98. A resolution ranking a certain Member of a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. JONES, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. FOX, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H. Res. 100. A resolution recognizing the significance of the Greensboro Four Sit In; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H. Res. 101. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means in the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. SOTO):

H. Res. 102. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate actions by United States Customs and Border Protection in apparent violation of judicial orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H. Res. 103. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Agriculture in the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KEATING, Ms. TITUS, Ms. LEE, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. VELA, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 104. A resolution reaffirming a strong commitment to the United States-Mexico partnership; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. JUDY CHU

of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BASS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. VELA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. NORTON):

H. Res. 105. A resolution expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives that an Independent Judiciary is Fundamental to American Democracy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H. Res. 106. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H. Res. 107. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H. Res. 108. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of February 6, 2017, through February 10, 2017, as "National School Counseling Week"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H. Res. 109. A resolution deploring the actions of the Palestinian Authority to join the International Criminal Court and undertake legal action through the Court against Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H. Res. 110. A resolution recognizing February 26, 2017, as the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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. ROYCE of California:

H.R. 898.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution to regulate commerce.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 899.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution vests all legislative powers in Congress, not in the Executive Branch or an agency of the Executive Branch. In addition, the Tenth Amendment states that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." The Constitution does not give the federal government the authority to control education.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Constitution, Article IV Section 3

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 902.

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. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, Constitution of the United States

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3, 4, and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of our Land and Naval Forces.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 912.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 913.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 8, Clause 4. Congress has the power to "establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization."

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 8, Clause 4. Congress has the power to "establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization."

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mr. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have power to regulate the regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the

power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 providing that "Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . ."

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and the sixteenth amendment

[Page H1826]

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)."

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which states:

"The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which states:

"The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 935.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause XII–XIV of the Constitution of the United States, which gives Congress the authority to:

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution grants Congress "power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration." Left undefined in the amendment, the "incomes" appropriate for taxation must be determined through legislation passed by Congress. Congress therefore has the power to exclude from income taxation such sources as it deems appropriate.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress 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 the Constitution in the government of the United States or in any department or office thereof.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 939.

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 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 940.

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, Clauses 1, 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"to provide for the common defense", "to provide and maintain a Navy", and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The "necessary and proper" clause of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, clause 3

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 4:

"The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations . . ."

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 945.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 4:

"The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations . . ."

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 and Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 950.

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 4, Clause 1 and Article 2, Section 1, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, Congress may enact laws necessary and proper to the execution of its enumerated powers. As this legislation solely amends the amount of time available for execution of previously granted authority, it is merely technical in nature and an appropriate exercise of Congress' authority to amend its previous actions through necessary and proper statutes.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the Constitutional authority for this legislation in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, that grants Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested by Congress in the Constitution of the United States or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Property Clause of Article IV, Section 3—The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 955.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 18 (“Congress shall have the power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution . . . all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”). [Page H101]

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

US Const. Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3 (“Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”)[Page H2151]

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 “all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.”

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The necessary and proper Clause of the US Constitution (Article one, Section 8, Clause 18)

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to, among other things, regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, section 8, clause 18:

Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. 1. Section. 8.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of the rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. TORRES:

H.R. 981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the power to regulate commerces and relations between the United States and Indian Tribes, and to pass all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution of the foregoing powers, as well as all other power vested by the Constitution.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.J. Res. 65.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two-thirds of both chambers deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.J. Res. 66.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:
H.J. Res. 67.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CRAMER:
H.J. Res. 68.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To accompany Mr. Cramer's joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5 of the United States Code of a rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to standards for measurement and reporting of gas removed or sold from Federal and Indian lands and areas subject to communitization agreements:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is in clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:
H.J. Res. 69.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 29: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 36: Mr. BARR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 37: Mr. MITCHELL and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 82: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 91: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 99: Ms. NORTON, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 113: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 115: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 140: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 147: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 173: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BUDD, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 198: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 202: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 244: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 245: Mr. VELA.

H.R. 257: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 303: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 305: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 308: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 350: Mr. KIND and Mr. SCHRADER,

H.R. 367: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 371: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 377: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 390: Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 400: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 406: Mr. HIMES and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 411: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 429: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 463: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GRJALVA.

H.R. 482: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 490: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 496: Mr. BACON and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 502: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 530: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 544: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 545: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BABIN, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 564: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 568: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 585: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 608: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 613: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 628: Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 630: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 631: Mr. HILL, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. PERRY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. HURD.

H.R. 637: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 639: Mr. YOHO and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 647: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 656: Mr. JONES, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 662: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 664: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 667: Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 669: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 704: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 711: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 712: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 721: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 724: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 739: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 747: Mr. BUCK and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 748: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CORREA, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 755: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 769: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 772: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 778: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 781: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 785: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 787: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 789: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 792: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 800: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KIND and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 804: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BERA, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. COOPER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 806: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 807: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 813: Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COSTA and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 816: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 820: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HECK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BARR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 823: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 830: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 837: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 844: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 849: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 850: Mr. BIGGS and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H.R. 852: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 857: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.J. Res. 42: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. ROUZER.

H.J. Res. 43: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.J. Res. 53: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.J. Res. 57: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.J. Res. 59: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. BUCHSHON.

H. Con. Res. 10: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. WALBERG.

H. Res. 31: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H. Res. 78: Ms. GABBARD.

H. Res. 84: Mrs. TORRES and Mr. VALADAO.

H. Res. 85: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Akron, OH, relative to Resolution No. 2-2017, urging Speaker of the House Paul Ryan and Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell not to reduce or eliminate funding to Planned Parenthood as this organization provides essential reproductive health services to Ohio women, especially those living in poverty and young women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

11. Also, a petition of the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, VA, relative to a Resolution urging Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, Senator Mark Warner, Senator Tim Kaine, and all United States Senators to reintroduce the Marketplace Fairness Act into the United States Senate during its 2017 session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

12. Also, a petition of the Electors of the Village of Mount Horeb, WI, relative to Resolution No. 2016-11, seeking to reclaim democracy from the expansion of corporate personhood rights and the corrupting influence of unregulated political contributions and spending.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DISAPPROVING A RULE SUB-
MITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR

SPEECH OF

HON. BILL JOHNSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Resolution of Disapproval under the Congressional Review Act that we consider today, if enacted, would void the Stream Protection Rule (SPR). In light of an independent analysis of the potential impacts of the rule including the loss of at least one third of existing coal mining jobs, this resolution is absolutely critical for our Nation's coal miners, their communities, and the related industries that support and rely on coal mining.

If enacted, the joint resolution disapproving the SPR would bar the Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) from reissuing the rule in substantially the same form, or issue a new rule that is substantially the same as the SPR, unless specifically authorized by subsequently enacted legislation. The SPR represents a near-complete regulatory re-write by adding, amending or modifying 475 different regulations under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) program. The unlawful and offending features of the rule include impermissibly duplicating and conflicting with other federal and state laws; diminishing the exclusive regulatory jurisdiction of States with approved programs under SMCRA; interfering with the primary governmental responsibility SMCRA delegates to States for developing, issuing and enforcing regulations for surface coal mining and reclamation operations within their borders; applying to underground mining operations standards and requirements intended for surface mining operations despite the distinct differences between surface and underground mining; and, requiring changes to approved state programs without a demonstration that the state program is no longer effective in meeting the purposes of SMCRA. Therefore, any rule which includes any of these components is substantially the same as the SPR for purposes of the Congressional Review Act.

An example of impermissible duplication or conflict with other federal and state laws or the authorities of other agencies would be a recently completed biological opinion and memorandum of understanding (MOU) between OSM and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the SPR allows the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to effectively veto any SMCRA permit simply by withholding approval. Issuing SMCRA permits is the exclusive province of SMCRA regulatory authorities, which in most cases are the States with approved SMCRA programs. Nothing in SMCRA or the Endangered Species Act (ESA) gives the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service the power to disapprove, veto, or otherwise withhold a SMCRA permit.

Any rule subsequently promulgated by OSM which gives the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service the authority to directly or indirectly disapprove SMCRA permits would be substantially the same as the SPR and therefore impermissible.

There are many other provisions which overlap, duplicate, or conflict with the requirements of other state and federal laws, which is prohibited by Section 702 of SMCRA. For example, the SPR violates both the Clean Water Act (CWA) and SMCRA by claiming for OSM the authority not only to enforce the CWA, but to also superimpose regulations that duplicate, conflict with and override CWA programs. Similarly, OSM vastly expanded the applicability of the ESA by requiring states and operators to account for species proposed for listing as threatened or endangered, which runs counter to the intent of the ESA and would have circumvented the rulemaking process established in the Administrative Procedures Act. Such self-deputization and usurpation of authority is a cornerstone of the SPR and any future rulemaking by OSM which attempts to duplicate, usurp, conflict with, or otherwise overlap with the existing requirements of other state and federal laws and the authorities of other state and federal agencies would be substantially the same as the SPR.

The SPR includes dozens of provisions which diminish the states' authority under SMCRA. Because of the wide diversity in physical conditions across the nation's coal fields, Congress expressly delegated to the states the authority for developing and tailoring SMCRA's requirements to those conditions. A good example of how the rule tramples the states' authority is its attempt to set a national definition for "material damage to the hydrologic balance outside the permit area." With the diversity in physical conditions and hydrology across the states and even within a state, it defies commonsense to promulgate a federal definition. It also robs the states of their delegated authority to tailor their rules in a manner that is suitable for meeting that statutory objective. To make matters worse, the rule precludes states from making appropriate adjustments on how SMCRA objectives should be achieved for distinct types of operations such as surface or underground mines. The rule is replete with examples of the mindset that only Washington knows best. Ironically, it's the states that possess the vast experience of regulating 97 percent of the coal mines in this country since SMCRA was passed in 1977. A rule that attempts to repeat this "one-size-fits-all" model would be substantially the same as the SPR.

IN HONOR OF SABU J.R. SHAKE,
THE PAISANO OF THE YEAR

HON. JIMMY PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sabu J.R. Shake, the Paisano of the

Year, for all that he has done for our community on the central coast of California.

The fourth son of Isabella Shake and the late Sabu Shake, Sr. and brother to Benji, David, Chris, Angelo, and Tene, Sabu was born and grew up in Monterey, California. He is the proud father of five children and grandfather of two.

From a young age, Sabu understood the value of hard work. He worked at the family restaurant, Old Fisherman's Grotto, as a busboy and worked his way up to become a maître d', cashier, and manager. Through this experience, he learned all aspects of the restaurant business.

Building on his early experience in the hospitality business, Sabu and his brother Chris opened The Fish Hopper restaurant on the historic Cannery Row in 1995. With the huge success of that restaurant, Sabu opened another Fish Hopper in Kona, Hawaii and, recently with Chris, Scales Seafood & Steaks on the Fisherman's Wharf in Monterey.

While Sabu is a pillar in the business community, he is also a steadfast servant to the community he calls home.

As a past board member of the Boys & Girls Club and current member of the Paisano Club, Chaine des Rotisseurs, Compari Club, Sheriff's Advisory Council, and Italian American Cultural Center Foundation, he has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to community service.

In memory of his father, Sabu Shake, Sr., Sabu organized the first Sabu's Safari to raise money for The Salvation Army's Monterey Peninsula Corps in 2007. Today, the annual gala is attended by close to 500 people and raises thousands of dollars for The Salvation Army. To date, this event has raised more than \$1,725,000.

In 2012, Sabu initiated a Turkey Drive challenge by reaching out to friends and business colleagues for donations to purchase turkeys for people in need during the holidays. The Turkey Drive has become an annual tradition which provides nearly 1,500 turkeys every year.

Sabu also hosts an annual Christmas Toy Drive. Through that event each year, nearly 300 toys are collected for The Salvation Army to give to children during the holidays.

Following Hurricane Iselle, which hit Hawaii in 2014, Sabu raised more than \$15,000 for The Salvation Army in Hawaii to aid recovery efforts. Later that fall, Sabu hosted the first annual Red Kettle Kickoff for The Salvation Army at The Fish Hopper in Kona, Hawaii and it was a huge success.

Due to his incredible generosity, The Salvation Army gave Sabu the M. Temple Elliott award and The Others Award, which is the highest national award given to a civilian by The Salvation Army.

Mr. Speaker, I know the whole U.S. House of Representatives joins me in honoring and congratulating Sabu J.R. Shake on being chosen as the Paisano of the Year.

Thank you, Sabu, for your service to our Central Coast and nation.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

HONORING ETHAN MICHAEL CUPP

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ethan Michael Cupp. Ethan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1351, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Ethan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Ethan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Ethan has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Ethan Michael Cupp for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING THE THOMAS
IRVINE DODGE NATURE CENTER**HON. BETTY McCOLLUM**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the volunteers, staff, visitors and supporters of the Thomas Irvine Dodge Nature Center in West Saint Paul, Minnesota on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the center. Founded in 1967 by Olivia Irvine Dodge, the center has served as a pioneering venue for environmental education and a premier outdoor classroom for generations of Minnesota students.

Dodge Nature Center is a rare jewel, located on 460 acres of land minutes from downtown Saint Paul, where visitors can hike for miles through prairies, hardwood forests, lakes, wetlands, and visit a working farm, orchard and bee apiary. The various biomes and landscapes provide an ever changing classroom for which to learn about the natural environment of Minnesota.

Olivia Irvine Dodge was a true trail blazer in environmental education, and the core mission of Dodge Nature Center is teaching children about the inherent beauty and complexity of the natural world around us. Throughout the past five decades, environmental educators at the center have developed an expansive environmental curriculum that has introduced hundreds of thousands of students from the Twin Cities to the science of the great outdoors. Because of the vision of Olivia Irvine Dodge and the center board and staff, children and adults alike learn how to care for and appreciate the incredible splendor of Minnesota's natural surroundings.

Growing up in neighboring South Saint Paul, I was fortunate to have many opportunities to visit and learn at Dodge Nature Center both as a child and as a young. Leading groups of children through the nature center to learn about the plants and animals around us was

a highlight of my summers as a YMCA camp counselor. Then as it is now, the Dodge Nature Center is an integral part of our community that allows children and adults alike to connect with nature, and enables them to learn about science and conservation. Today, opportunities to visit Dodge remain special events for me. Whatever the season, I look forward to walking trails to experience nature right in the backyard of Minnesota's capital city.

On February 9th, Dodge Nature Center staff, volunteers, friends, family and supporters will gather to celebrate five decades of the center's mission to connect people to nature through education. In honoring this occasion, it is particularly fitting that Richard Louv will headline the gathering. As a world renowned author and environmental educator, Mr. Louv literally wrote the book about how to counter nature-deficit disorder and reconnect children and their families with the natural world. His work has sparked an international movement for the great outdoors that builds on the foundation forged by Olivia Irvine Dodge.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in rising to recognize the 50th Anniversary of Dodge Nature Center, and commend the passion and dedication of so many volunteers, staff and board members for providing exceptional environmental education for today's youth and for future generations of Minnesotans.

RECOGNIZING MAX WARD

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a longtime business leader in north Georgia, Max F. Ward, who passed away on January 25th. He was a loving husband, devoted father, and loyal friend, and his innovation and dedication to his work expanded and strengthened the poultry industry of the Ninth District.

Mr. Ward graduated from Vanderbilt University in 1942 and continued his education at the University of Memphis Law School. Shortly after graduating, Mr. Ward joined the 20th Air Force Division, where he served for four years during World War II. During his military career, he earned a Presidential Citation, the Good Conduct Medal, two bronze stars, and several theater ribbons.

In 1950, Mr. Ward moved to Gainesville and joined the poultry industry, serving as President of Mar-Jac Poultry and Vice President of CWT Farms International, both successful job-creators in Gainesville, GA.

When he was not growing the district's poultry industry, Mr. Ward was serving the community in other ways.

Mr. Ward was also an Eagle Scout and the Scoutmaster for Troop 16 of the Gainesville First United Methodist Church. In 1993, he was voted Rotary Club Man of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the life and accomplishments of this influential leader of industry in northeast Georgia, Mr. Max Ward. May his family and our communities be encouraged by his legacy.

IN HONOR OF HENRY "HANK"
ADAMS**HON. JEFF DENHAM**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the life of an exemplary leader in the Turlock Assyrian community, Henry "Hank" Adams. The beloved husband, brother, father, and grandfather died at the age of 92 on Friday, February 3, 2017.

Born and raised in Turlock, California to Reverend Isaac and Sarah Adams, Henry was one of eight children. His father is known as the patriarch of Turlock's Assyrian community and is honored each year at the annual Assyrian Festival. Isaac Adams was the driving force behind Turlock becoming home to the largest Assyrian population in California. He encouraged his fellow Assyrians to join him in the Central Valley and farm in the rich soils of the region.

In 1943, at the age of 18, Henry graduated from Turlock High School and received his draft notice to serve in World War II. Instead, he drove to Castle Air Force Base in Atwater, California and enlisted in the Army Air Corps. Henry completed over 20 bombing missions in Japan on the Lucky Lady B-29 bomber. On August 6, 1945, he remained on standby, waiting for an order to take off in case of retaliation after the Enola Gay dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima while stationed on Tinian Island.

Discharged at the rank of Lieutenant in 1947, Henry moved to San Francisco where he married his wife, Joanne Tuohey. He later worked at Lockheed Martin Missiles and Space in Sunnyvale and retired in 1989. Following his retirement, the couple traveled across the world and settled back down in Henry's hometown of Turlock.

Henry had a genuine love for his country and his community. He was known for his service and contributions to the Assyrian community, where he continued the legacy that his father left behind. Henry leaves behind the love of his life and his wife of sixty-two years, Joanne, their two daughters, Nora Adams and Nellie Adams-Morse, two grandchildren, and sister Florence Essa Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing the life of Henry "Hank" Adams for his service to his country, his unwavering leadership and many accomplishments and contributions to the Turlock Assyrian community. God bless him always.

HONORING MITCHELL KARL
WOLBERT**HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Mitchell Karl Wolbert. Mitchell is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1351, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Mitchell has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Mitchell has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Mitchell has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Mitchell Karl Wolbert for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House Chamber for roll call votes 79 and 80 on Monday, February 6, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea" on roll call votes 79 and 80.

IN HONOR OF MONSIGNOR
MICHAEL J. DOYLE

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Monsignor Michael J. Doyle on the occasion of the City of Camden, New Jersey naming a street in his honor on Monday, February 6, 2017. This street is in proximity to Sacred Heart Church, which Father Doyle has shepherded since 1974.

Monsignor Doyle is a man of conviction who was born in Ireland in 1934 and came to the United States of America by boat. He chose the Catholic Diocese of Camden for his priestly vocation in the late 1950s and started serving the City of Camden in 1967. Before taking the helm at Sacred Heart, he taught students in Diocesan schools.

Always willing to fight for what he believed was right, Monsignor Doyle helped plant crosses memorializing Camden City's murder victims in front of Camden City Hall when he felt more could be done to stem rampant violence. In the 1970s, he was a staunch opponent of the Vietnam War. He's known to those in his parish as someone who is not afraid to fight for peace.

Monsignor Doyle is also known for his service to the poor, as well as his poetry. Actor Martin Sheen narrated a documentary entitled "Poet of Poverty" which focused on Monsignor Doyle's poetry and letters to his congregation.

While the City of Camden has its challenges, Monsignor Doyle chooses to focus on the beauty of the community he calls home. His congregation consists of people from the City, but also a large number of individuals visit Sacred Heart from surrounding suburbs.

Monsignor Doyle has been a champion of the arts and community gardens. He has been a longtime advocate for improved housing, better medical care, community beautification and better educational opportunities for his neighborhood. He believes his two greatest

achievements are keeping his parish school open, and opening a community gym called the Doyle Fieldhouse, where all are welcome.

For these reasons and countless more, it is fitting that we honor this man for his great works and contributions. His dedication to God, the City of Camden, his parishioners and his community are unrivaled. I am fortunate to know him. And as a resident of the City of Camden, I can say our City is grateful to have him as a faithful steward. Thank you, Monsignor Doyle for what you continue to do for us all.

HONORING CHERYL REDGATE

HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National School Counseling Week, and to honor a treasured member of my community and school counselor at Santa Fe High School, Cheryl Redgate. Ms. Redgate has been a counselor at Santa Fe High School for 35 years and is an inclusive and caring support system for her students. She has dedicated her life to empowering students and instilling in them the values of selflessness and giving, and she has made a tremendous impact on the lives of every student she meets.

In addition to her position as counselor, Ms. Redgate serves in many leadership roles at Santa Fe High School. She has been the leading representative for the school's anti-drunk driving program "Every 15 Minutes," leading parent debriefs for the parents of those who participated. She designed Parent Education Day and the Service Learning Program, which acknowledges students for their participation in community service and reinforces her dedication to teaching the values of selflessness and giving.

Ms. Redgate has devoted her life to helping others. She founded the Christmas Family Program to provide gifts for those in need during the holidays, and the Serenity Center which acts as a safe zone on campus where licensed clinical social workers are available for students.

Santa Fe High School is a special place because of dedicated professionals like Ms. Redgate, and I couldn't be more proud to honor her today. If more people were like Ms. Redgate, the world would be a much nicer place. In honor of National School Counseling Week, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking all the school counselors who are making a positive impact in the lives of our students.

HONORING COLBY LAYNE
MATTHYS

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Colby Layne Matthys. Colby is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active

part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1351, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Colby has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Colby has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Colby has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Colby Layne Matthys for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

RECOGNIZING CALIFORNIA'S
VITAL FLOOD PROTECTIONS

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the investments in flood control infrastructure made by local flood control agencies in California, as well as by the State itself. Water in California is feast or famine. For the last five years we have had a famine, and now we have a feast.

During the massive California floods of 1997, 9 lives were lost, 120,000 people were evacuated and roughly 23,000 homes and businesses were damaged across the state. The greater Sacramento area, part of which I represent, is the 2nd most flood prone region in the United States, behind only New Orleans. Mr. Speaker, my constituents take flood protection very seriously.

Because of this, there are many local agencies spearheading critical projects throughout my district that I'd like to recognize, including the Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency, the Yuba County Water Agency, the Marysville Levee District, the City of Woodland, the City of West Sacramento, Reclamation District 2140, the State of California, and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has also played a pivotal role in all of these projects and should be commended.

Mr. Speaker, floods do not recognize the boundaries of congressional districts. Therefore, Congressman LAMALFA and Congresswoman MATSUI should also be praised for their work on flood control as many of the projects undertaken by the agencies I mentioned have a footprint in all of our districts.

There is no question that investment in flood control pays dividends. In 2006, California voters passed Proposition 1E which provided \$4.09 billion in flood control infrastructure. To date, almost all of that funding has been allocated. These bonds, in tandem with investment from local flood control agencies and the federal government, have funded significant improvements in many, but not all of, the levees that protect my constituents.

Those improvements were highlighted this winter, when almost all of the state's rivers and reservoirs were filled to capacity. Statewide rainfall between October and December of 2016 was 143 percent of the historical average while combined inflows to California's reservoirs were the 2nd highest in recorded history. Yet the levees held and we were able to avoid any major flooding.

Given all of this, Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to urge my colleagues and the new Administration to continue to prioritize federal investment in flood control infrastructure.

CHLOE BARTINE EARNS GIRL
SCOUT GOLD AWARD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Chloe Bartine of Katy, TX, for earning her Girl Scout Gold Award.

The Gold Award is the highest achievement a Girl Scout can earn. To earn this distinguished award, Chloe had to spend at least 80 hours developing and executing a project that would benefit the community as well as have a long-term impact on girls. For her Gold award project, Chloe designed and built two Little Free Libraries for Neighborhood Kidz Club in the Western Pines and Trinity Hunters Place communities in Katy, TX. She wanted to develop an easy, free way for children to have access to books during the summer or holiday breaks. Chloe hosted a book drive with over 25 volunteers to make sure the libraries were fully stocked. Chloe has volunteered for Neighborhood Kidz Club's summer reading program the past few summers. She will graduate from Seven Lakes High School and plans to attend the University of Alabama in the fall.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Chloe Bartine for earning her Girl Scout Gold Award. We are confident she will have continued success in her future endeavors. We are very proud.

COMMENDING MARIA LOHMEYER
FOR HER ROLE WITH THE 58TH
PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION

HON. GREGG HARPER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable gratitude that I rise today in order to recognize Maria Lohmeyer and the staff she assembled to host a historic and successful 58th Presidential Inauguration.

Through her role with the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, Maria led the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies which was charged with the responsibility of planning and executing the swearing-in ceremonies for the President and Vice President of the United States. Additionally, the Joint Congressional Committee was responsible for planning the Inaugural Luncheon where Congress came together to welcome the new administration following the inaugural swearing-in ceremonies at the U.S. Capitol.

The Presidential Inauguration has been the hallmark of American democracy since 1789. During this ceremony, individuals elected by the people stand before God and the country

and swear an oath to uphold the sacred duties to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

On Friday, January 20, 2017, America again came together as we have so many times before to witness this peaceful transition of power from one Administration to the next. As Americans, we celebrated both an honorable ending and a hopeful new beginning.

The success of the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies is due to so many individuals, from staff to our law enforcement and first responders. However, none of the ceremonies would be possible if not for the careful planning and implementation by superb and patriotic individuals.

Maria is one of those special individuals who rose to the challenge of planning the 58th Presidential Inauguration. I thank her for her stewardship over the inaugural ceremonies, which has played such an important and impactful role in our shared history.

HONORING LUCAS MATTHEW
HODSON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Lucas Matthew Hodson. Lucas is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1351, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Lucas has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Lucas has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Lucas has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Lucas Matthew Hodson for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

DEBORAH SHAPIRA AND BARRY L.
STERN

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two community leaders, Deborah Shapira and Barry L. Stern, who are being recognized as the Guests of Honor at this year's 48th Annual SAR Anniversary Dinner. Deborah and Barry have been intimately involved in SAR's outreach and operations, and are integral to the organization's success. They are most deserving of this wonderful recognition.

Ask anyone and they'll tell you, Deborah and Barry are among SAR's most thoughtful,

humble and gracious members. Deborah serves on the SAR Board of Trustees, and is Chair of the SAR Academy Board of Education. Together, they served as Regional Vice Chairs for the 2014 Dinner, where Barry was involved in strategy and outreach. Deborah is a most active volunteer, working as a grade representative, class parent, Learning to Look volunteer, and committee member for the Academy's Chanukat Habayit, and regularly offering her wisdom on an array of academic issues. They have opened their home for parlor meetings and 'meet and greets' to introduce and mentor SAR's new families.

Deborah, a graduate of the HaSha'ar teacher training program at the Drisha Institute, taught at Beit Rabban Day School in Manhattan. She currently serves as Board Chair for the Pardes Institute of Jewish Studies, North America. Barry is Associate Clinical Professor of Medical Psychology at Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons. He also has a private psychotherapy practice in midtown Manhattan.

But for Deborah and Barry, their true passion and love is first for family. They have three beautiful children, Pearl, Kayla, and Matan, and they are their pride and joy.

Congratulations again to Deborah and Barry on receiving this wonderful recognition, and thank you for all you've done in the community.

HONORING BRIAN AND JENNIFER
FULLEN, AND BRIAN RICHARD

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave contributions of Brian and Jennifer Fullen, and Brian Richard, citizens of Walla Walla, Washington.

On December 2, 2016, an early morning fire broke out in an apartment building in Walla Walla. Awakening to the commotion and seeing the growing danger, Brian and Jennifer Fullen immediately called for help and left the safety of their own home to assist those escaping from the growing blaze. The call for assistance was answered by Brian Richard, a teacher at Pioneer Middle School and a volunteer firefighter, who rushed to the scene to lend a hand.

Mr. Fullen and Mr. Richard, without regard for their own personal safety, kicked in a door to the apartment building and searched for those who may have been trapped. They even assisted in the evacuation of a neighboring building as a precautionary measure. Mrs. Fullen assisted those who escaped the fire before emergency responders arrived at the scene.

Mr. and Mrs. Fullen and Mr. Richard have been recognized by both the Walla Walla Public Schools and the Walla Walla Fire Department for their heroic efforts.

The contributions of Mr. and Mrs. Fullen and Mr. Richard are prime examples of bravery and courage in the face of danger. I am proud to honor Mr. and Mrs. Fullen and Mr. Richard for their valuable and selfless contribution to the community of Walla Walla.

RICHMOND, TX SENIOR SELECTED
FOR VOLLEYBALL ALL-STATE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Valerie Valerian of Richmond, TX, for being selected for the Texas Girls Coaching Association volleyball all-state.

The George Ranch senior was selected for all-state after leading her team, the Lady Longhorns, to a playoff victory. Throughout the playoffs, Valerie had a team-best of 564 kills while hitting .343 and leading with 4.1 digs per set. Following the playoffs, Valerie was also awarded the District 23–6A Offensive MVP and was selected as Player of the Match for over 20 volleyball games over the last two seasons.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Valerie Valerian for being selected for volleyball all-state. We are proud of her talent and know she will represent TX–22 well at all-state.

HONORING JONAH ANDREW HOPPE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jonah Andrew Hoppe. Jonah is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1351, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jonah has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jonah has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jonah has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jonah Andrew Hoppe for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CONGRATULATING MR. & MRS. MICHAEL MILLER ON THEIR GOLDEN WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. and Mrs. Michael Miller on the 50th Anniversary of their marriage on February 23, 1967. Their 50 years of dedication and love for one another should be an inspiration to us all.

Michael Joseph Miller and Margret Anne Miller met in Plymouth, England in 1965 while Michael was on assignment as a submariner

in the Royal Canadian Navy. Following their marriage and the birth of three children, Sarah, Mark, and Simon, the Millers lived and worked in both Canada and England before moving to Michigan in 1979 just prior to the birth of their youngest child, Miles.

On July 4, 1996, the day of our Nation's independence, Mr. and Mrs. Miller became naturalized U.S. citizens. Inspired by this, all of their children have become naturalized citizens, while their youngest son, Miles, currently serves as a Captain in the United States Army.

In 2007, Michael and Margret retired to Lakeway, Texas, which is in the district which I represent. They live happily there to this day, enjoying the natural beauty of the Texas Hill Country.

Mr. Speaker, I would once again like to congratulate them on this happy day for them, their 50th Wedding Anniversary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, on February 6 and 7, 2017, circumstances beyond my control necessitated my absence from the House and I, therefore, am requesting a leave of absence from the House.

COMMENDING THE ACTIVITIES OF
THE MCL AND OTHERS TO BRING
FREEDOM TO CUBA

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the activities of Cuba's Christian Liberation Movement, which works to bring freedom, democracy, and the rule of law to Cuba. The movement was founded by the late Oswaldo Paya, an activist who courageously struggled to bring freedom to Cuba until his death at the hands of the Castro regime in 2012.

Today, another activist and leader of the Christian Liberation Movement, Eduardo Cardet, remains imprisoned in Holguin for simply opposing the totalitarianism of the Castro dictatorship. He was arrested in November 2016 and faces a fifteen year sentence. Other courageous activists such as artist Danilo Maldonado "El Sexto" and labor activist Ivan Hernandez Carrillo have been brutalized, threatened and imprisoned for shouldering the cause of liberty. Others such as Rosa Maria Paya, who bravely carries on the mission of her father Oswaldo, have chosen to continue the struggle for freedom in Cuba despite grave personal risks. The malevolent Castro regime has the blood of many innocents on its hands, and those who dare to oppose its tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the determination and bravery of these and so many others who continue to press for human rights, basic liberties, and a genuine democratic transition in Cuba. They eloquently and effectively bring attention to the egregious human rights abuses

that occur daily in Cuba. While repression continues to escalate in Cuba, so does the resolve of Cuba's pro-democracy movement. Today, Cuba's future is already being shaped by those working to bring about democratic change.

The Cuban people will be free, and the perpetrators of their oppression will be held accountable for their crimes. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I pray for the safety of those who continue the struggle for freedom in Cuba despite the enormity of the risks. I take this opportunity to express my wholehearted and unwavering solidarity with them, and urge my colleagues to continue their efforts in hastening their freedom.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE ALVIN BALDUS FOR HIS LIFE OF SERVICE IN THE U.S. CONGRESS, WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE, AND ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished life of Alvin Baldus, who passed away on February 2, 2017 at the age of 90 in Menomonie, Wisconsin. An honorable veteran, public servant, and friend, Al's service to this country is an inspiration to not only the state of Wisconsin but anyone who aspires to be in public service. I had the distinct honor to get to know Al and his wonderful family and am proud to have modeled my public service career after Al's civil and accessible nature.

Born in Garner, Iowa, Al graduated from Elkton High School in Minnesota, attended Austin Junior College in Austin, Minnesota, and served in the U.S. Merchant Marine during World War II from 1944 through 1946. During the Korean War, Al again answered the call to serve his country in the U.S. Army with the 2nd Infantry Division from 1951 through 1953, receiving the Bronze Service Star medal for his bravery and courage, which included action in the Battle of Old Baldy.

In 1959, Al married the love of his life, Anna Lorayne "Lolly" Reiten and the two of them began to raise their family in Menomonie, Wisconsin. Soon after in 1966, Al's community elected him to the Wisconsin State Assembly. For eight years, Al served Dunn County with integrity. For Al, this was just the beginning.

Al not only served his fellow Wisconsinites in the State Assembly, but he also represented the voices of the Third Congressional District in this body, the U.S. House of Representatives, from 1974 through 1980 during the 94th, 95th, and 96th Congresses. Al spent his years in the House as a strong voice for agriculture fighting for legislation that promoted environmental conservation, agricultural safety, and milk price supports. Al used his leadership as the chairman of the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee to fight for farmers in the U.S. Congress. In 1989 Al's strong commitment to serving his community convinced him to resume his lifelong joy of public service in the Wisconsin State Assembly until his retirement in 1997.

I vividly remember meeting with Al, Lolly and his children with my wife Tawni to talk

about my future as a Congressional Representative. They graciously welcomed us into their home, and I was struck by how well behaved and kind his children were. As our visit went on, I grew to understand that everything about Al and Lolly was authentic and accessible.

It has been an honor for me to serve in the same seat that Al held many years ago. On behalf of my family, Wisconsin and a grateful nation, I would like to thank and commend Al for his years of dedicated service. Al's colleagues remember him for being kind, gracious, civil, and approachable. May his legacy continue to live in this chamber and across the nation.

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION FOR
PLYMOUTH

HON. TOM McCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Plymouth, California, for the celebration of its centennial anniversary as a city. Plymouth is the site of the Amador County Fair and the gateway to the beautiful Shendoah Valley vineyards.

When we think of the California Gold Country, the image of the lone miner packing up a hillside with his mule, pick, and shovel come to mind. In reality, the Gold Rush, while a defining moment in our region's history, lasted just a few years.

According to the Amador County Historical Society, "there was not a single discovery of gold or a defining site that became the center of activity" in Plymouth. "The town was established in 1873, long after other mining camps had already become ghost towns."

With the easy gold taken from the streams, Green Alden and the Hooper family began to consolidate a number of hard rock mining camps in the region. They constructed a simple trading post, described by the California Office of Historic Preservation as "all windows and doors of cast iron, with gun ports still in some of the windows. Walls at the base are 30" thick, with beams in the basement that are 12" x 12." The basement was dynamited out of shale rock and the entire foundation is visible."

While the gold was hard to get, the Plymouth mine produced more than \$13.5 million in gold and continued to be worked until 1947, an ample source of wealth for the area.

While some gold seekers left, either enriched or disillusioned by their experience in the rivers, creeks and mountains, many others were determined to stay here and find other ways to make a living.

Plymouth became a hub trading center, and grew during periods of prosperity, wars, depressions and local tragedies including several catastrophic fires. Each time the town rebuilt with the gritty pioneer spirit of determination which marks our region's culture.

Today, that heritage is celebrated at the Amador County Fair, which has gained a statewide reputation as one of the most authentic fairs in California. Filled with rolling

green lawns, heritage oak trees, and spotless grounds, the Amador County Fairgrounds is simply a must see for anyone who wants to have a true Gold Country experience.

Today, Plymouth has over 1,000 residents contributing to the local economy by accessing small businesses, farms, and orchards.

Mr. Speaker, the City of Plymouth continues to work with state and federal partners to improve its infrastructure for its citizens and provide a wonderful quality of life. Plymouth has enjoyed a century of progress and prosperity and is poised for a lucrative future.

IN MEMORY OF GENIE
MUNNERLYN DUNCAN

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Midlands of South Carolina has lost a beloved civic leader with the death of Genie Duncan. Services were conducted by Presiding Minister Rev. Donna Stone Eidson and Pianist Christopher A. McCroskey at Trinity United Methodist Church. The following obituary from the church program was heartfelt and appropriate:

Genie Munnerlyn Duncan, 79, was born May 24, 1937, in Marion, SC, and passed away Wednesday, Feb. 1, 2017. She was the daughter of the late Joseph and Catherine Munnerlyn and graduated from Marion High School and Columbia College. She will be deeply missed by her five children, Donald (Laurie), Susan, Madison, Brian (Shannon), and Jody, as well as her five grandchildren, Ashton, Hunter, Landon, Taylor, and Skylar. She is also survived by her brothers, Jody (Ginger) and Sammy (Diane) Munnerlyn. She was preceded in death by her husband of 35 years, Donald A. Duncan.

Genie lived a full and extraordinary life. She was passionate about her family, faith, her side of politics, USC sports, and "holding court" at Nick's on Sunset Blvd. She touched everyone she met in a deep and meaningful way. Her greatest gift to the world was the love she shared with everyone. The love she leaves behind will warm our hearts and conversations for years to come.

In memory of their sisterly friendship with Genie, the Honorary Pallbearers are carrying a red rose given to them by the family per Genie's request.

Memorials may be made to Trinity United Methodist Church Maintenance Fund, 1201 Mohawk Dr., West Columbia, SC 29169.A07FE8.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DEREK KILMER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 06, 2017, I missed two votes due to unavoidable travel delays in route to our nation's capital. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On roll call No. 79—H.R. 689, the Bolts Ditch Access and Use Act, I would have voted yes.

On roll call No. 80—H.R. 337, the Black Hills National Cemetery Boundary Expansion Act, I would have voted yes.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION
TO REMOVE THE RESTRICTIONS
ON CERTAIN LAND TRANS-
FERRED TO ROCKINGHAM COUN-
TY, VIRGINIA

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to remove deed use restrictions on one acre of property used for the Plains Area Day Care Center in Broadway, Virginia. For over 25 years, the Plains Area Day Care Center has utilized this land to provide childcare on a sliding scale to many families who otherwise could not afford such a benefit.

In 1989, the federal government deeded, with restriction, three acres of land to Rockingham County, a county in the Sixth Congressional District of Virginia, which I represent. The government transferred this land to the county on the condition that this property be used for public purposes. Rockingham County then decided that the non-profit day care center could benefit from the use of the old buildings already housed on the land. Therefore, in 1990, Congress enacted Public Law 101-479, which allowed a specified portion of the three acres of the transferred land to be used for a child care center.

Donations by the community totaling \$75,000 turned the garage building into a nursery, daycare, and afterschool care facility. Additionally, the creation of the day care center provided for the construction of a playground that the center supports, which is open for public use. As one would imagine, after two decades of consistent use, the day care facility is in desperate need of repairs. Unfortunately, because of the narrow way Public Law 101-479 was drafted and because of the terms of the deed, the day care center has been unable to secure a loan to complete the much-needed renovations.

To solve this issue, my legislation would remove the deed use restrictions from the one acre of property on which the building resides. This would allow the day care center and Rockingham County to make needed upgrades. This legislation, which was approved by the House of Representatives by a vote of 407-0 in the 114th Congress as H.R. 2288, is a simple formality. However, it is of great importance to those being served by this day care center in the Rockingham County community.

By passing this legislation and allowing Rockingham County more authority over the land, it will ensure that more children and more of the community will be served by this land. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation in the 115th Congress.

HONORING RABBI ADAM
BALDACHIN

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and welcome a new leader in the community, Rabbi Adam Baldachin, who on February 5, 2017 will be installed as the new Rabbi of Shaarei Tikvah in Scarsdale.

Rabbi Baldachin joined Shaarei Tikvah in July 2016, drawn by the community's energy and warmth. He previously served as the Rabbi of Montebello Jewish Center in Rockland County. There, he founded the Rockland Clergy for Social Justice, a group of Jewish, Christian and Muslim clerics advocating for fair and equitable education for the public school students of East Ramapo, a district controlled by an ultra-Orthodox school board.

Rabbi Baldachin has also served communities as close as Riverdale, which is also a part of my district, and as far as Israel and Uganda. In Uganda he worked with the Abayudaya, the local Jewish Community, teaching Hebrew, leading services, and helping to build sustainable businesses.

A native of New Providence, NJ, Rabbi Baldachin earned his undergraduate degree from the Joint Program of Columbia University and the Jewish Theological Seminary. He then completed his Rabbinical Degree with an M.A. in Midrash at the Seminary, where he received the prestigious Gladstein Fellowship in Entrepreneurial Rabbinic Leadership. He also completed extensive training in community organizing with JOIN for Justice and in pastoral care, interning as a chaplain at Self Help with Holocaust survivors.

When not serving his congregation, Rabbi Baldachin loves spending time with his beautiful family. He and his wife, Maitel, have three wonderful children and they are his pride and joy.

I know that Shaarei Tikvah is in very good hands with Rabbi Baldachin, and I know his presence will only strengthen our community further. Congratulations to him on this day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEITH ELLISON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, due to other commitments, I missed the following roll call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Roll call No. 79, I would have voted yes.

Roll call No. 80, I would have voted yes.

LAURYN RICHARDSON EARNS ACADEMIC ALL-STATE RECOGNITION

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lauryn Richardson of Richmond,

TX, for earning volleyball all-state recognition by the Texas Girls Coaching Association.

A sophomore at Foster High School, Lauryn received academic all-state recognition while leading her team, the Lady Falcons, to a play-off victory. She had 169 blocks and averaged 2.1 kills per set during the sets.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Lauryn Richardson for earning volleyball all-state academic recognition. We are proud of her and look forward to seeing her excel in the future.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE BURNS
BROTHERS CLEANERS

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize a local business in Virginia's 10th Congressional District that will be closing their doors this year after over six decades of service. Burns Brothers Cleaners, the landmark cleaners and laundromat located in downtown McLean, Virginia, has served the community for the past 67 years and is one of the oldest family-operated businesses in the area. Since founding the mom-and-pop shop in 1949, Don and Bob Burns have been exemplary small business owners and operators.

Before opening Burns Brothers Cleaners, Don Burns worked in several different dry cleaning establishments where he learned the trade and also gained a valuable customer service skillset. Since opening, Don's customer-first attitude helped yield diverse and high-profile clients ranging from U.S. Cabinet Members to local shopkeepers. Yet despite some important clientele, the business never lost sight of its origins and the core values of a family-owned small business. In fact today, Amy Burns, one of Don's daughters, manages and operates the cleaners as her father once did.

In today's society, family owned small businesses are an essential player to the future of our nation. It is families like the Burns family that help foster strong local economies by establishing successful business practices that can be carried out for multiple generations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding the Burns Brothers Cleaners for its dedication to serving our community for so many years. I wish Don, Amy, and the rest of the Burns family the best in their future endeavors.

HONORING TIM SCHWERING

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Spokane Police Officer Tim Schwering.

On Friday, January 20, 2017, Officer Schwering was first on the scene to a vehicle fire, with reports of the driver inside. The driver, Kim Novak, was returning home when she encountered a frozen section of roadway,

causing her car to malfunction and eventually catch fire. According to Officer Schwering, when he arrived on scene, the car was engulfed in flames and he noticed a woman trapped in the backseat. Upon learning that she was unable to escape the car, Officer Schwering used his baton to begin breaking a hole in one of the passenger windows. He was successful in creating a hole large enough for Ms. Novak to escape, saving her life.

The next day, Officer Schwering met Ms. Novak, who expressed her thanks for his valiant efforts. According to Ms. Novak, "You just don't hear about that kind of compassion and follow through. And the officers get a lot of bad rap, but here's a guy who's a genuine hero."

Today and every day, we owe a debt of gratitude to our nation's law enforcement officers, who put themselves in harm's way to serve and protect. I'm grateful for the sheriffs and officers in Eastern Washington, such as Officer Schwering, who put on the uniform and do right by their communities each and every day. I want to recognize Officer Schwering for his bravery and quick thinking in a dangerous situation.

HONORING PAUL WARHIT

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the strength of our Westchester community lies with those who are engaged and working to better it day by day. One of those engaged individuals is a constituent of mine, Paul Warhit, who has given his time and talent to a whole host of active civic groups in the region.

Born in Yonkers, Paul is a loyal son of Westchester. He had his bar-mitzvah at Mid-Chester Jewish Center and later graduated from Eastchester High School. He went on to attend Boston University and after completing college returned to New York to oversee the family business.

Paul's active involvement in Jewish communal life began in 1996, when Ilissa joined Temple Israel of New Rochelle. Less than a decade later, he became the synagogue's president. He has also served as president of the Board of American Jewish History Society, the New Rochelle Public Library Foundation, in addition to treasurer of the Jewish Deaf (and Hard-of-Hearing) Resource Center.

Thanks to his prolific involvement across a range of organizations, Paul's work caught the eye of the Westchester Jewish Council (WJC) who asked him to join their board. As is often the case with Paul, once he's on the board it's only a matter of time before he becomes the board's president, and Paul was elected to that post for WJC in 2013.

When not serving his community, Paul enjoys spending his down time reading and traveling the country to visit different Major League Baseball parks. He also serves as an umpire for Westchester High School baseball leagues.

This year, WJC is honoring Paul Warhit at the organization's 41st Anniversary Gala for all he has done to better our community. I want to congratulate Paul on this wonderful honor,

and thank him for all the years of amazing service to Westchester.

CELEBRATING GRACE BROWN ON
RECEIVING A SILVER CONGRES-
SIONAL AWARD MEDAL

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Grace Brown of Granger, Indiana, on receiving a Silver Congressional Award Medal for her dedicated service to our community and her outstanding personal growth.

Grace stands out not only because of her hardworking Hoosier spirit, but also because of her dedication to setting and achieving goals of personal growth and public service. Grace is driven, talented, and compassionate, and at her young age she has already left a positive mark on her community. I look forward to learning of the amazing accomplishments that I am certain lie ahead for Grace.

The Congressional Award recognizes the best of America by honoring individuals who have achieved goals that build character, foster community service, and strengthen personal development and citizenship.

Grace exemplifies these qualities and much more. She has shown great commitment to bettering the lives of others through her dedicated public service. She has built on her talents and developed new skills by teaching and taking part in dance classes. She has shown a genuine interest in learning about different cultures and exploring new environments, organizing and leading a five-day Expedition to Hocking Hills, Ohio. And she has given back to her community, spending more than 200 hours collecting and distributing food for local families in need.

Through all of this, Grace has shown an exceptional understanding of the importance of civic engagement. She has taken on huge responsibilities and demonstrated the power of a dedicated and inspired young mind.

Mr. Speaker, I am inspired by Grace's example and grateful for young Hoosiers like her. I ask my colleagues to join me in extending Grace our congratulations and best wishes.

CLEAR LAKE REGIONAL MEDICAL
CENTER DESIGNATED LEVEL II
TRAUMA CARE

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Clear Lake Regional Medical Center of Houston, TX, for being designated by the State of Texas for Level II Trauma Care.

Clear Lake has a trauma program with round-the-clock staff and in-house trauma surgeons and specialists to treat patients no matter the time or injury. To be considered a Level II Trauma Center, the medical center must have comprehensive trauma care with 24/7 availability with all essential specialties,

personnel and equipment. Clear Lake had to undergo extensive site reviews and evaluations to meet this designation. This will significantly increase the number of lives that can be saved.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Clear Lake Regional Medical Center for being designated as Level II Trauma Care. We all benefit from their commitment to quality healthcare and we thank them for their hard work to keep Houstonians healthy.

IN HONOR OF I CARE I CURE
FOUNDATION

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to recognize the tremendous and meaningful work of the I Care I Cure Childhood Cancer Foundation. The I Care I Cure Foundation was founded by my constituents and friends Beth and Brad Besner in honor of their son, Ian, who was diagnosed with T-Cell Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia in 2006, one week before his eleventh birthday. Just four months after his diagnosis, Ian tragically passed away.

It is so sad to see someone suffer from cancer but it hurts the most when it is a child. The harsh reality of children's cancer treatment is that it lasts longer than treatment for adults. Fighting cancer is devastating for children due to painful treatment, absence from school, and isolation from friends and family.

Childhood cancer research is significantly underfunded and we must rely on organizations such as this one to help put research dollars to work. Over the past 10 years, the I Care I Cure Foundation has helped fund research and projects at the Miami Children's Hospital, the Cincinnati Children's Hospital, and the National Cancer Institute just to name a few.

The good news is that researchers are making advances daily in the field of cancer treatment. And the better news is that there are organizations such as the I Care I Cure Foundation to help lead the way to gentler yet more cutting edge therapies.

The Besners' work has helped ease the suffering that far too many children and families must endure.

I thank Beth, Brad and their I Care I Cure family for the support they give to so many so that more children may celebrate their twelfth birthday, their twentieth birthday, and each and every day healthy and cancer free.

HONORING MRS. BARBARA
WHELTON

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Barbara Whelton of Rutland, Vermont. Barbara is retiring from a distinguished career after nearly a half century of devoted public service.

Mrs. Whelton has worked in various capacities for government agencies across the country. From 1970 to 1975, she worked for both the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Rhode Island and the United States Marshals Service, assisting with the Service's nascent Witness Protection Program. Following a stint in the Audit Agency for the United States Air Force in Great Falls, Montana, Mrs. Whelton went to work for the United States Secret Service as a Contact Representative from 1975 to 1980.

In 1980, Mrs. Whelton and her husband, Master Chief (U.S. Navy, Ret.) Paul Whelton, relocated to Rutland, Vermont where he was posted as a Deputy U.S. Marshal. Upon their arrival, Mrs. Whelton served as a legal assistant in the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Vermont. Except for a brief turn in the private sector, Mrs. Whelton served in our U.S. Attorney's office for twenty-four years before she was asked to become the judicial assistant to Vermont's sole judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, the Honorable Peter W. Hall.

Mrs. Whelton has been Judge Hall's judicial assistant for the past thirteen years. She has worked tirelessly to ensure that chambers ran smoothly and that Judge Hall and his clerks were fully supported in handling their robust caseload. I can say with confidence that without Mrs. Whelton's determined efforts, the administration of justice would not have been as efficient or exacting.

I know Barbara's colleagues will miss her sharp wit, her quiet determination, her devotion to duty, her professionalism, and most of all, her friendly demeanor.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me today in recognizing Mrs. Whelton's many contributions to our country and the states and communities she served during her exceptional career. I wish her many years of health and happiness in her well-earned retirement.

HONORING JEFF KOHN

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an active member of the Westchester community, Mr. Jeff Kohn, who is being honored this year by the Westchester Jewish Council (WJC) at the organization's 41st Annual Anniversary Gala.

Jeff has been an active member in the Westchester Jewish community for a long time. He and Martha are members of Temple Shaaray Tefila Bedford Corners, where he currently serves as President. Prior to that, he was a board member at the Temple for more than a decade, and Martha has also served actively as co-chairperson of the Caring Community committee. Outside of the Temple, Jeff is also quite active. He currently serves as an officer of the Westchester Jewish Council and serves on a whole host of other non-profit boards focused on education. He serves on the advisory board at NYU Law School; Cornell University's School of Industrial & Labor Relations; and the George Washington University Law School, from which he graduated in 1984. Jeff has since been honored by the school with their Distinguished Alumni Award.

A lawyer by trade, Jeff is Managing Partner of O'Melveny & Myers LLP's New York office, where he practices labor and employment law. In 2011, he received his first Warren Christopher Values Award, in recognition of individuals who epitomize the values that guide the firm. Jeff currently Chairs the firm's Values Award Committee and works on the firm's scholarship program, which provides financial support to deserving students from five New York City public high schools.

In both a personal and professional capacity, Jeff Kohn has always worked to improve his community. The WJC couldn't have picked a more deserving honoree for their annual Gala, and I want to congratulate Jeff and thank him for all of his amazing work.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S FIDUCIARY
DUTY RULE

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Donald Trump on Friday released a Presidential Memorandum on the Fiduciary Duty Rule and I am grateful that President Trump has directed the labor secretary to thoroughly study this harmful rule.

Under the Obama Administration, the Department of Labor released a burdensome fiduciary rule that increased the cost of financial planning reducing retirement advice for American families.

Families all over the country are struggling to save for their retirement and I applaud the President's swift action to study the harmful effects of this rule I am confident a study will result in a delay or revision of this ridiculous regulation of 1023 pages to define a profession.

I will continue to advance legislation calling for a delay of two years to give Congress and the Administration time to reassess the regulation. While I will continue to advance legislation, any delay would be a victory for hard-working American families struggling to save for retirement creating jobs.

In conclusion, God Bless Our Troops and may we never forget September 11th in the Global War on Terrorism.

HONORING DONNA SALAMON

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a member of the SAR team who has utilized her time and talents to transform the academy through the arts, Ms. Donna Salamon.

Donna is a uniquely talented artist who has spent countless hours over the last 12 years transforming the Academy's open spaces into gallery walls and museum-worthy displays. She has a passion to elevate Jewish education. With her strong connection to Eretz Israel, she has created projects that incorporate science, literature, history, and most importantly, Jewish values, through art. Her

portfolio includes the design and production of a 720-square-foot mosaic mural, "Do What is Right and Good," depicting the core elements of the SAR experience on the Academy field wall. The mural was a 10-month project featuring 75,000 tiles, 12 iconic images, signatures from every child (804) in the Academy, and the work of more than 1,000 volunteers.

Donna makes SAR celebrations come alive—life-size educational games based on history curricula for Yom Yerushalayim, a year-long "Science is the Story," science, history and art program, including life-size dioramas and culminating in a Riverdale restaurant gallery showing. She also makes props for the Celebrate Israel Parade, banners for 'theme of the year,' stunning alphabet/middot paintings for the graduation ceremony produced by art elective students she leads, backdrops for such milestone events as the Siddur and Chumash plays, and sets for drama productions.

When not working to improve SAR, Donna loves spending time with her family. She and her husband, David, live in Riverdale with their three beautiful children, Yedidya, Yonatan, and Yaakov.

Congratulations to Donna on being this year's SAR Michael Schreck Memorial Community Service Award honoree.

IN HONOR OF LOUDOUN COUNTY
HIGH SCHOOL VOLLEYBALL
STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a school in my District who was recently crowned as state champion in volleyball. The Loudoun County High School Raiders Volleyball team, led by Athletic Director Bruce Sheppard, Head Coach Sherrilyn Hanna, and Assistant Coaches Juliane Hanna, Cayla Hamrick, and Amy Ging, was one of several teams who won state titles in a variety of sports from Virginia's 10th Congressional District. I am proud of their hard work in achieving this goal. They practiced long hours as a team, and this extraordinary achievement shows how far dedication, hard work, and commitment to teamwork can take a group as they played against some of the best competition in the nation.

The state final brought perhaps the biggest challenge of the season, as the Raiders faced the Jamestown Eagles, a team they had played in the state final three times in the last four years; a team that was returning all starters but their libero from last year's state runner-up squad. After dropping the first set and overcoming a major deficit in the third set, the Raiders turned the tide, dominating the fourth set and taking the match for a record setting 5th consecutive state title, and their ninth state title in the last ten years.

The Loudoun County High School Raiders Volleyball team has made Virginia's 10th Congressional District proud and they have represented us well. Winning a state championship attests to their impressive athletic ability, unselfish mentality, and determination to succeed. I commend them for their tireless dedication to both their school and their team-

mates, without neither of which this could have been possible. It takes a delicate combination of superior skill and many hours of practice to win a state title. Loudoun County High School Volleyball has certainly earned this honor and the lessons learned over the years will valuably serve them as they continue on in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the Loudoun County High School Raiders for winning 9 state volleyball titles in the last 10 years and representing Virginia's 10th Congressional District with such distinction. I wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

COMMENDING THE MEDICAL
STAFF OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL

HON. JOHN H. RUTHERFORD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the medical staff of The George Washington University Hospital who cared for me during my stay in January.

On the evening of January the Eleventh I suffered an allergic reaction and was taken to The George Washington University Hospital for treatment. During my stay, I was cared for by an incredible medical team. I offer my most sincere gratitude to Dr. Mayce Haj-Ali for her insight and swift action to treat the allergic reaction I suffered.

I also wish to commend the incredible nursing staff who cared for me: Andrea Gavurin, Megan Johnson, Alelcunda M'mari, Ophelia Hunter, Mary Synder, Christina Gale, Danielle Sier, Chaquonna Watson, Crystal Nyguyen, Perla Adames-Castillo, Mamta Jazier, and Jaquece Mudd. In particular, I want to acknowledge Andrea, Megan, and Alelcunda for their continued diligence in looking after me to make sure I made a quick and full recovery. I owe this entire group a debt of gratitude. It is because of their care that I was able to recover and return to work representing the people of Florida's Fourth Congressional District.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics states that more than 2.5 million nurses work in the United States. These women and men provide and coordinate patient care, educate individuals about their health conditions, and provide advice and emotional support to patients and their family. I am grateful, not only for the nurses who recently took care of my needs, but for all nurses across the U.S. who work diligently to ensure the health of their patients. I ask my colleagues to take a moment to remember these individuals who work in the nursing profession and the care they provide to the American people.

HONORING THE MILITARY SERVICE
OF WWII VETERAN ROBERT
PITTS

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor WWII Veteran Robert

"Bob" Pitts who proudly served in the 150th Combat Engineer Battalion. Mr. Pitts joined the Army in 1943 and left his boyhood home in Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts for basic training at Fort Devens, Massachusetts. He was among a group of young men from New England who received special training in electrical engineering. Their small unit would distinguish themselves during fierce military campaigns including being in the first assault crossings of the Rhine River. They became one of the few small units to receive a Presidential Unit Citation.

Mr. Pitts, who rose to the rank of Tec 5, served as the battalion electrician, battalion photographer, and reconnaissance scout. It was during his time in Europe that Mr. Pitts began his duties as the battalion photographer. He often developed photographs in a makeshift darkroom which also served as his sleeping quarters.

In addition to taking photographs on and off the battlefield, Mr. Pitts would also go on dangerous reconnaissance missions. He was awarded the Bronze Star while serving on a mission with the battalion captain and two others. They came under small arms fire and then they encountered a German unit with tanks. His bravery that day earned him the Bronze Star. Mr. Pitts would also earn the Good Conduct Medal.

Eventually, this tight-knit unit would be divided up, but that did not keep them from staying in touch. Two years after they returned home from war, these young soldiers formed the 150th Combat Engineer Battalion Association. They held reunions for more than 60 years before their last one in 2005.

Mr. Pitts' son, Rick, says his father's engineering skills would serve him well when he returned to the civilian world. Mr. Pitts was eventually employed by MIT as an electronic engineer assistant. He worked on very early computers and later on "Star Wars" projects for the U.S. Department of Defense in Massachusetts, Hawaii and New Mexico.

Mr. Pitts, who is now 94, is a member of our greatest generation. It is an honor to recognize this great American veteran and citizen who leaves behind a legacy that will be remembered for generations to come. It is an honor to be among those who followed in his footsteps as a member of the 150th Combat Engineer Battalion.

Mr. Pitts was married to Eleanor M. Hathaway for 48 years. She died in 1998. They have three children; Robert (deceased), Nancy and Richard. He has one grandson, Robert.

HONORING DR. MARK SHINAR

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as a former school teacher, I am intimately aware of the amazing impact educators can have on young minds. At SAR High School in my district, one such educator, Dr. Mark Shinar, has been changing the lives of his students in just such a profound way.

Abraham Joshua Heschel said that "It is the personality of the teacher which is the text that pupils read; the text they will never forget." As Director of General Studies at SAR High

School, Dr. Mark Shinar embodies this quote. He has proven to be a mentor and champion to his students both in and out of the classroom. He is deeply invested in their academic and long term personal growth which continues even after they leave SAR. His is the voice in their ear, the text they will not forget as they make key decisions in the future. Mark brings an infectious energy and enthusiasm to the classroom that energizes both students and faculty. He leads by example and listens to concerns of colleagues, peers and students always trying to improve the learning process. This is the true definition of a teacher. "The classroom is air to me and the students are part of my family. It's a joy and remarkable privilege to teach at SAR."

When not changing lives in the classroom, Mark enjoys spending his time just being a husband and dad. He and his wife, Lauren, are parents to four wonderful children, Aiden, Joseph, Samuel, and Ian. The Shinar family are members of YIOZ in Riverdale, and will be making aliya at the end of the current academic year.

This year, SAR, is honoring Mark at the organization's 48th Anniversary Dinner with the Audrey Schurgin Memorial Faculty Award. They could not have picked a more deserving honoree. Congratulations again to Mark on receiving this well-deserved recognition, and thank you for all of your amazing work in the community.

RECOGNIZING THE EXPANSION OF CYPRESS BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. MIKE JOHNSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise and recognize the Cypress Baptist Church of Benton, Louisiana. For over thirty years, Cypress Baptist has blessed the lives of many in our region. Most recently, God has blessed Cypress Baptist Church with the means to expand their sanctuary to grow their ministry.

Their mission, "to help people come to know Christ and to grow in Christ," has been modeled by the church's faithful congregation and their commitment to the Lord is unwavering. Because of their continued stewardship, more and more people are answering the call of God by being baptized and carrying out critical mission work.

Over the past two years the communities of Benton and Bossier City and surrounding areas have come together to help Cypress Baptist in its mission. This church has touched the lives of so many, and is growing exponentially, and it is only fitting that God rewards them with the blessing of more space to carry out their service.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Cypress Baptist Church and congratulate this pillar of our community on its continued dedication to the Kingdom. Their new sanctuary will be a true blessing to the people of our community. My wife, Kelly and I pray that the Spirit of the Lord continue to bless the congregation of Cypress Baptist Church.

DR. OGLESBY YOUNG CONCORD MONITOR OP-ED

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an op-ed by Dr. Oglesby Young as published in the Concord Monitor.

MY TURN: PAID FAMILY LEAVE IS THE
INVESTMENT OF A LIFETIME

A pediatric colleague once said, "We can invest in early childhood or we can build more prisons 20 years later at a much greater cost to society."

A bill, presently before the state Legislature (HB 628), is a plan for an Employer Based Insurance Program to provide "paid family leave." I believe this is an opportunity to invest in early childhood in order to create a healthier, more productive and caring society.

Barry Brazelton, now a 95-year-old Boston pediatrician and researcher, established a half-century ago how critical newborn bonding is for the baby and the parents. The development of "attachment" from the start of life, profoundly affects the relationship between the child and his or her new parents.

It follows that the first few years, even the first few months, of life lasts forever. We have a compelling biologic model of why kids who have experienced the toxic stress of neglect—the absence of love, as simple as cuddling—have trouble learning. A Harvard pediatrician, Jack Shonkoff, states simply, "We can modify behavior late, but we can't rewire disrupted brain circuits."

Years ago, I remember seeing the MRI scans of the brains of children who were completely neglected in an Eastern European orphanage. There were large areas of atrophy (no brain tissue), which had resulted from a lack of love and stimulation of these children early in their lives.

As obstetricians, we see new moms routinely for their postpartum visits six weeks after the delivery of their babies. Most are just learning how to be a parent. Their bodies are still healing, while they are torn between the challenges of being a new mom and returning to the demands of an old job.

I realized early in my career that we could devote ourselves to delivering healthy babies, but it would mean nothing if we did not care for the mom and newborn when we sent them home from the hospital. Those of us who have children know that no matter how well-educated or how well-motivated, the experience of having a first child at times can be overwhelming.

Babies are not born with instructions. We all want to be good parents, but not all of us have had good modeling, and not all of us have the resources to be the parents we want to be.

Many new moms are single today with no support. Grandparents work and they often live elsewhere. In my lifetime neighborhoods have changed. There is no longer a woman down the street who has had six kids and welcomes the opportunity to help a new mom as she was once helped. For these reasons, 20 years ago, we established the Healthy Beginnings Endowment at Concord Hospital, raising \$1.3 million to award grants annually to Concord area programs that support and educate new parents.

Physicians have been the most generous donors to this endowment because they understand the wisdom of investing in early childhood to prevent adult problems. The upshot is that children who are undermined

early are much more likely in later years to suffer mental illness, heart disease, obesity, diabetes and other physical ailments.

The bill before us, HB 628, would give time and financial support at very little cost, to permit new parents to establish an attachment to their baby that would pay dividends over the lifetime of their child. We are one of the few developed countries in the world that does not provide this benefit to new parents.

In England, my daughter-in-law was given nine months of paid maternity leave when she had our granddaughter. In France, our former exchange student was awarded six months of paid leave, as was her husband, following the birth of each of their three children. In Germany, a close friend's daughter had one year of paid maternity leave and her husband three months after their first baby. It should not surprise us that the people of those countries are healthier and live longer than us (even though Europeans drink and smoke more than us). And, remarkably their health care costs amount to half of what we spend per person in this country.

The implication is that the most cost-effective window to bring about change in the health and welfare of a country isn't high school or even kindergarten. It is the early childhood years, and it can be done at a relatively low cost, when compared to the later financial burden of adult health care.

Presently, we have a ravaging substance abuse crisis into which we are pouring millions of dollars to treat and rehabilitate those afflicted. It seems, almost every week, we read in the Concord Monitor about another young person whose life has been lost to overdose. Is there a better example today that an "ounce of prevention would save pounds of cure"?

If we are to have healthy, responsible, kind adults—young people who choose not to abuse themselves or others—we must first create kids with a deep sense of self worth, a strong respect for themselves and others. Adults who love well have been children who were well-loved. Adults who care deeply about others and our world were children who were deeply cared for.

The crucial value of "paid family leave" is that it would provide parents to start their child on the path to a successful adulthood.

I recently read the book *Find Me Unafraid: Love, Loss and Hope in an African Slum*. The author, Kennedy Odede, overcame a late childhood fraught with constant hunger, complete poverty and physical abuse. He writes, "As a young child, I knew how much my mother loved me. When I was on the streets, I thought of what my mom had told me, that no matter where I was in the world, if I could see the stars, I should know that she could see them, too, and I felt her love always."

Kennedy Odede is an adult now, who has returned to his impoverished Nairobi slum and created a school for girls and a community organization called *Shining Hope for Communities*. In spite of a cruel childhood, except for his first three years of life, he has become a successful, productive, happy adult who is devoted to improving his old neighborhood, his world. Paid family leave is fundamental to a healthy society because it provides the framework for a precious, priceless early childhood—the foundation on which responsible, loving adults grow. For those of you who believe we cannot afford paid family leave, I would argue that we can't afford not to provide paid family leave. The future of our society surely rests on this wise investment.

(Dr. Oglesby H. Young lives in Concord.)

IN HONOR OF WESTFIELD HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL STATE CHAMPIONSHIP TEAM

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a school in my District who was recently crowned as state champion in football. The Westfield High School Bulldogs Football team, led by Athletic Director Terri Towle, Head Coach Kyle Simmons and Assistant Coaches Dan Keating, Jon Shields, Mike Giancola, Pete Bendorf, Jose Ardon, Alex Callas, Mike King, Chris Coyer, and Curtis Knight, was one of several teams who won state titles in a variety of sports from Virginia's 10th Congressional District. I am proud of their hard work in achieving this goal. They practiced long hours as a team, and this extraordinary achievement shows how far dedication, hard work, and commitment to teamwork can take a group as they played against some of the best competition in the nation.

This year's state championship was a rematch of the 2015 state championship, where Westfield defeated Oscar Smith High School in quadruple overtime. Oscar Smith jumped out to a 7-0 lead in the first quarter; but Westfield took the lead in second with touchdowns by Nolan Cockrill and Sean Eckert. They extended their lead to 21-7 in the third after Nathaniel Chung punched in a third touchdown. However, Oscar Smith stormed back in the fourth quarter, scoring two touchdowns and executing a two point conversion with seven seconds left on the clock to send the game to overtime. Oscar Smith struck first with a touchdown pass on the first play. With the game on the line, Westfield answered with a touchdown pass of its own, tying the game at 28 and forcing a second overtime. Westfield had capitalized on having the first possession, with Rehman Johnson throwing his fourth touchdown of the night to Ivory Frimpong. Westfield's defense then rose up, and stopped Oscar Smith's high powered offense on the three yard line and in doing so, secured the Bulldogs' second state championship in as many years.

Westfield High School's Football team has made Virginia's 10th Congressional District proud and they have represented us well. Winning a state championship attests to their impressive athletic ability, unselfish mentality, and determination to succeed. I commend them for their tireless dedication to both their school and their teammates, without neither of which this could have been possible. It takes a delicate combination of superior skill and many hours of practice to win a state title. Westfield Football has certainly earned this honor and the lessons learned over the years will valuably serve them as they continue on in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the Westfield Bulldogs for winning the Virginia 6A Football State Championship and representing Virginia's 10th Congressional District with such distinction. I wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING JACKSON COUNTY'S 221ST ANNIVERSARY

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 221st Anniversary of Jackson County, which was formed on February 11, 1796. To celebrate this important day in northeast Georgia's history, the committees of the Jackson County Courthouse are creating an exhibit that will cover their two centuries of history.

The Historic Courthouse Restoration Committee will be giving presentations to each school system in Jackson County, including the great schools of East Jackson, Commerce, Jefferson, and West Jackson.

The presentations titled, "Finding a Sense of Place in Jackson County, Georgia", will invite approximately 1,100 eighth grade students into the dynamic history of their county.

The Jackson County Historical Society has already published a transcription of the first Jackson County Superior Court docket book, which contains the complete histories of each case brought between 1796 and 1802. These cases in Jackson County will serve to show the rich history of the judicial system that has guided Jackson County since its inception.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize the deep history and notable leadership that comes from Jackson County on its 221st Anniversary.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MISSISSIPPI ARMY NATIONAL GUARD SERGEANT (SGT) ROBERT A. MCNAIL

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Army Sergeant Robert A. McNail who died while defending our great nation on February 11, 2005, when his Humvee struck another military vehicle in Iskandariyah, Iraq. SGT McNail was the sixth Mississippi National Guard soldier to give his life in Iraq and the second to die that year.

SGT McNail was a member of Detachment 1, Company B, 150th Engineer Battalion, out of Quitman, Mississippi. His unit was attached to the 155th Brigade Combat Team. In 2005, I was deployed as a Major to Iraq with the 155th Brigade as the Operations Officer of the 150th Engineer Battalion. It was an honor and a privilege to serve with SGT McNail.

SGT McNail was studying to be a nurse and was a civilian employee at the Naval Air Station in Meridian before he was deployed. His mother, Linda McNail, said her son was engaged to be married at the time of his death. She says he enjoyed fishing and camping.

SGT McNail's father, Marvin McNail, said his son followed in the footsteps of 16 family members who served in the military. He was the only member of his family to die in military service. At his funeral, family and friends remembered him for his faith in our Heavenly Father and his willingness to give his life to keep America safe.

SGT McNail, a Meridian resident, was awarded the Bronze Star and the Mississippi Medal of Valor by Major General Harold A. Cross, the state's Adjutant General.

SGT McNail is survived by his parents Robert and Linda McNail and son Edward.

RECOGNIZING THE POLISH LEGION
MOTORCYCLE RIDING CLUB

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Polish Legion Motorcycle Riding Club. Since 2011 this organization has brought together members of our community of all ages who share a passion for riding motorcycles. I would like to give special recognition to the group's President, Szymon Moskal. Millions of citizens in the United States own and ride motorcycles, making ridership as much a part of our identity as baseball or apple pie. The Polish Legion Motorcycle Riding Club continues the proud tradition of motorcycle ridership and enthusiasm found in my district, and across our great nation. It is my privilege to assist them during their trip to our nation's capital.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MR. ECKERD
FINDLEY

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Eckerd Findley, an outstanding South Carolinian, who is retiring from Piedmont Airlines this month after 40 years of service.

Mr. Findley was born on May 4, 1953 to the late Reverend Alex and Ms. Ethel Findley. He graduated from Columbia, South Carolina's Booker T. Washington High School in 1972.

After graduation, Mr. Findley went to work for Mount Vernon Mills, a textile company which was housed in the building that is now the South Carolina State Museum. It was at Mount Vernon Mills that he met his wife Ann. They were married in 1973 and in 1975 they were blessed with a son, Edward. Their daughter, Antonette, was born in 1984. The Findleys currently have four grandchildren.

Mr. Findley's father, the Reverend Alex Findley, worked for Delta Airlines from 1944 until his retirement in 1986. Eckerd decided to follow in his father's footsteps and in 1976 he landed a position at Piedmont Airlines. He has been with the company ever since, helping it to grow into US Airways, which recently merged with American Airlines.

Eckerd was taught and—in turn—has taught his family Matthew 22:39, "love thy neighbor as thyself," and that lesson shows in the way he works and lives. He is a member of Pleasant Springs AME Church and is a pillar of the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and the Members of this House join me in recognizing the outstanding service and example of citizenship that have been shown by this fine gentleman,

Eckerd Findley. I wish him a long, productive and rewarding retirement.

HONORING THE LIFE AND WORK
OF DAVID CULP

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the life and work of David Culp who passed away over the weekend.

This is a monumental loss to supporters of peace everywhere. David's tireless efforts in promoting sane nuclear policies and fighting for a safer world spanned decades.

David was a "go-to" advocate in the arms control community. Many, including myself, relied on his advice, knack for technical details on policy proposals, political insights, and collaborative focus. He played an instrumental role in the campaign to secure Senate ratification of the New START treaty and in the defeat of legislative proposals to proliferate new nuclear weapons.

Not only was David a wise, steadfast, effective voice for disarmament, but he was kind and genuine—a true pleasure to be around. His good nature came through in his personal life, where he spent time working to preserve the environment and enjoying the outdoors. His involvement in the cleanup of the Anacostia River is but one example.

My deepest condolences go out to those near and dear to him. He will be missed, and I hope his family, friends and colleagues take some measure of solace in the knowledge that he has made a tremendous difference.

JOHN BRESLER UNION LEADER
OP-ED

HON. ANN M. KUSTER

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an op-ed by John Bresler as published in the New Hampshire Union Leader.

ANOTHER VIEW—JON BRESLER: REACHING OUT
CAN SAVE A LIFE

[Editor's Note: Throughout the year, in partnership with Change Direction NH, the Union Leader is publishing a monthly series of mental health stories written by Granite Staters.]

The phone was ringing off the hook. It stopped before I could get it, then started again. It was 4:15 a.m., and I stumbled in the dark to pick it up. It was the local police dispatcher saying "an officer was outside." She would not tell me why. With my heart beating fast, I grabbed a coat and went out in the icy driveway. The young officers had to tell us that our 20-year-old Nat had laid down in front of an Amtrak and been killed. Shock set in that reverberates still. It hit to the core of being. I could not breathe right and started panting.

Nathaniel was a super kid, the last you'd suspect was in trouble. He got good grades, had many friends. He was handsome and competitive. He loved music, and had 11,000 songs on his Mac. A senior walk-on, he won

a game ball in the state semis, and the state lacrosse title in 2009. He worked in the admissions department at George Mason University and had recently attended the "Academic Impact" conference at the U.N., meeting the Secretary General in New York. At GMLJ, he was co-founder of Habitat for Humanity. He transferred to the University of New Hampshire as a second-semester sophomore, with more than enough credits to be a junior.

What happened? His life was racing through my mind, but nothing made sense.

I had to tell my wife, call his brother, my siblings and his grandmothers. Numbly then my wife and I drove to Durham. We met the chief, who gave us Nat's driver's license and keys. That was it. No body. No goodbyes, no nothing. Emptiness. How could this be happening?

They kept his phone. It took a few days to identify him. He was definitely listening to music at the end. He left notes for us and some friends. He paid a friend back a loan of \$10 from the night before. He indicated what was deeply troubling him. He lost faith in the world, and his ability to function in it.

He was clinically depressed, but undiagnosed. He expressed what most suicides have in common, a feeling of hopelessness. We believe if he could have confided in a friend, girlfriend, a counselor or therapist, and unburdened himself, he might have controlled the impulse in the moment. Maybe that he could have kept going. Was there no warning—nothing in his life—that anyone noticed? You may well wonder. I hoped someone would come forward, but no one ever did. It was a mystery to us all.

Death is traumatic. The death of a child is very traumatic. The unexpected suicide of one's child, off the charts. It felt like he had been murdered violently, but he was also the perpetrator.

Survivors of child suicide have marked increases in drug and alcohol abuse, depression and divorce, and significantly, increased risks of suicide. We have learned the value of professional help. At first you want to die, rather than accept the reality. Hearing that our son had committed suicide was the hardest thing I ever experienced and living every day since has been a struggle.

Whether it is opioid addiction, PTSD, undiagnosed depression, all can lead to overdoses, suicide, and unnecessary death. Increasing access to care, and removing stigma from the culture surrounding mental illness should be the goal.

A common theme in suicide is "to not want to become a burden." Let's learn to reach out, and not walk away when we know. Talk about it, offer hope. It can save a life. Commit to the goals of Change Direction NH.

Learn the signs, learn to reach out, and know better how to help when someone is in trouble. Let them know that you know what it's like to be suffering from depression.

I cannot underscore for survivors like us, the importance of a good counselor. A professional who treats numerous people can offer new methods and ways of thinking about problems.

The analogy to me is mountain climbing. That mountain will be there every day, and I have to climb it. Therapy offers better tools.

In my experience, we place too much emphasis on our student's scores and grades, but nowhere near enough on them as people, with human needs. We can help them relate to their problems better by creating a space where it is encouraged for them to talk openly about things that bother them.

Let us do a better job recognizing how hard it is to be young today.

Thank you for reading and letting me tell our story. I hope someone reads this, and gets help.

Let's change direction on mental health. That would be a great thing!
—Jon Bresler is a small business owner who lives in Concord.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF MISSISSIPPI NATIONAL GUARDSMAN SERGEANT FIRST CLASS (SFC) BILLY A. SUTTON

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of Army Sergeant First Class (SFC) Billy A. Sutton who died as a result of non-combat causes on February 7, 2012, while supporting Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan.

SFC Sutton was assigned to the Mississippi Army National Guard's 223rd Engineer Battalion, 168th Engineer Brigade, headquartered in West Point, Mississippi. In November, 2011, SFC Sutton was deployed for his third tour in the Middle East to Afghanistan with the Army National Guard's 288th Sapper Company out of Houston. He served as the Platoon Sergeant for Route Clearance Patrol (RCP) 2, 2nd Platoon. He nicknamed his platoon the Honey Badgers.

"SFC Sutton was gifted," Captain Brenton Montgomery, Commander of the 288th Sapper Company said in a quote released by the Department of the Army. "Anyone who can take their hands and make a difference is truly gifted. He had that gift and he used it to make a difference in all our lives."

The 42-year-old Mooreville, Mississippi native was described as an outstanding soldier and Platoon Sergeant. It is an honor to recognize the life of a soldier who devoted his life to keeping America safe.

H.J. RES. 57 AND H.J. RES. 58

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, today, I voted against H.J. Res. 57 and H.J. Res. 58, two pieces of legislation which threaten students' right to a high-quality education.

In 2015, I was proud to vote for the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which reauthorized federal regulations for K-12 education. It is shocking that scarcely one year after ESSA was signed into law, Congress is trying to pass these resolutions which will devastate public education, particularly for minority and vulnerable children.

H.J. Res. 57 prevents the federal government from uncovering discrimination and civil rights abuses in our schools. Under this resolution, the U.S. Department of Education cannot require states to provide data about vulnerable student groups. This prevents the department from holding schools accountable for academic performance and disciplinary practices.

H.J. Res. 58 makes it more difficult for prospective teachers to find programs that will prepare them for success in the classroom. It also removes incentives to make our teaching workforce more diverse. This is especially troubling at a time when California is suffering from a teacher shortage.

Sadly, these resolutions arrive on the same day that the United States Senate voted to confirm Betsy DeVos as Secretary of Education. Unfortunately, Senate Republicans ignored grave concerns from parents, teachers, and students nationwide about her lack of familiarity with basic public education issues, federal laws, and her refusal to protect public education and civil rights.

As the Congresswoman for California's 40th District, I will fight against any policy that jeopardizes the ability of students to receive an excellent education. That is why I oppose H.J. Res. 57 and H.J. Res. 58.

Tuesday, February 7, 2017

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Senate continued in the session that began on Monday, February 6, 2017. See next volume of the Congressional Record.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

RECENT YEMEN OPERATION

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on the recent Yemen operation from Theresa Whelan, performing the duties of Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, and J-3 Lieutenant General John L. Dolan, USAF, Joint Staff Director for Operations, both of the Department of Defense.

CYBER THREATS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on cyber threats from Admiral Michael S. Rogers, USN, Commander, Cyber Command, Director, National Security Agency, Chief, Central Security Services, Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution (S. Res. 53) authorizing expenditures by the Committee for the 115th Congress.

THE PLAN TO DEFEAT ISIS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the plan to defeat ISIS, focusing on key decisions and considerations, after receiving testimony from James F. Jeffrey, Washington Institute for Near East Policy, and Jeremy Bash, Beacon Global Strategies, both of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of David J. Shulkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 87 public bills, H.R. 898–984; and 21 resolutions, H.J. Res. 65–69; H. Con. Res. 22; and H. Res. 95–98m 100–110 were introduced. **Pages H1079–84**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H1087**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 99, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 428) to survey the gradient boundary along the Red River in the States of Oklahoma and Texas, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 42) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of

Labor relating to drug testing of unemployment compensation applicants (H. Rept. 115–10).

Page H1079

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Palazzo to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1015**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:41 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Pages H1019–20**

Committee Resignations: Read a letter from Representative Judy Chu (CA) wherein she resigned from the Committees on Ways and Means and Small Business. **Page H1031**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 95, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H1031**

Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior relating to Bureau of Land Management regulations that establish the procedures used to prepare, revise, or amend land use plans pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976: The House passed H.J. Res. 44, disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior relating to Bureau of Land Management regulations that establish the procedures used to prepare, revise, or amend land use plans pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 83.

Pages H1032–41, H1055–56

H. Res. 91, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolutions (H.J. Res. 44), (H.J. Res. 57) and (H.J. Res. 58) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 233 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 82, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 187 nays, Roll No. 81. **Pages H1023–31**

Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: The House passed H.J. Res. 57, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to accountability and State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 190 nays, Roll No. 84. **Pages H1046–55, H1056**

H. Res. 91, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolutions (H.J. Res. 44), (H.J. Res. 57) and (H.J. Res. 58) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 233 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 82, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 187 nays, Roll No. 81. **Pages H1023–31**

Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues: The House passed H.J. Res. 58, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to teacher preparation issues, by a yea-and-nay vote of 240 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 85. **Pages H1041–46, H1056–57**

H. Res. 91, the rule providing for consideration of the joint resolutions (H.J. Res. 44), (H.J. Res. 57) and (H.J. Res. 58) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 233 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 82, after the pre-

vious question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 187 nays, Roll No. 81. **Pages H1023–31**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2:30 p.m. on Thursday, February 9th and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, February 13th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H1057**

Committee Ranking: The House agreed to H. Res. 98, ranking a certain Member of a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives. **Page H1057**

Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission—Reappointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Minority Leader, in which she reappointed the following Member to serve as Co-Chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission: Representative McGovern. **Page H1057**

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate by the Clerk and subsequently presented to the House today appears on page H1022.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1030, H1031, H1055–56, H1056, and H1056–57. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:24 p.m.

Committee Meetings

THE STATE OF THE MILITARY

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The State of the Military”. Testimony was heard from General Daniel B. Allyn, USA, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army; General Stephen W. Wilson, USAF, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force; Admiral William F. Moran, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations; and General Glenn M. Walters, USMC, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Challenges and Opportunities in Higher Education”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy And Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a markup on H.R. 829, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify the treatment of lottery winnings and other lump sum income for purposes of income eligibility under the

Medicaid program, and for other purposes; and H.R. 181, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to count portions of income from annuities of a community spouse as income available to institutionalized spouses for purposes of eligibility for medical assistance, and for other purposes. H.R. 829 was forwarded to the full committee, as amended. H.R. 181 was forwarded to the full committee, without amendment.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a business meeting to consider the committee's authorization and oversight plan for the 115th Congress. The committee adopted its authorization and oversight plan for the 115th Congress.

COUNTERING THE NORTH KOREAN THREAT: NEW STEPS IN U.S. POLICY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Countering the North Korean Threat: New Steps in U.S. Policy". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ENDING THE CRISIS: AMERICA'S BORDERS AND THE PATH TO SECURITY

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Ending the Crisis: America's Borders and the Path to Security". Testimony was heard from John F. Kelly, Secretary, Department of Homeland Security; Steve C. McCraw, Director, Texas Department of Homeland Security; Joe Frank Martinez, Sheriff, Val Verde County, Texas; Leon N. Wilmot, Sheriff, Yuma County, Arizona; and Eddie Trevino, Jr., County Judge, Cameron County, Texas.

PRIORITIES OF THE HOUSE OFFICERS AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCH ENTITIES FOR FY 2018 AND BEYOND

Committee on House Administration: Full Committee concluded a hearing entitled "Priorities of the House Officers and Legislative Branch Entities for FY 2018 and Beyond". Testimony was heard from Karen Haas, Clerk, House of Representatives; Paul Irving, Sergeant-at-Arms, House of Representatives; and Philip Kiko, Chief Administrative Officer, House of Representatives.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on House Administration: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 634, the "Election Assistance Commission Termination Act"; H.R. 133, to reduce Federal spending and the deficit by terminating taxpayer financing of Presidential election campaigns; and a committee resolution regarding views and estimates for FY2018. H.R. 634 and H.R. 133 were ordered reported, without amendment. The

committee resolution regarding views and estimates for FY2018 was agreed to.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 732, the "Stop Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2017". H.R. 732 was ordered reported, as amended.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 115th Congress. The committee adopted its rules and authorization and oversight plan for the 115th Congress and appointed committee staff.

ACCOMPLISHING POSTAL REFORM IN THE 115TH CONGRESS—H.R. 756, THE POSTAL SERVICE REFORM ACT OF 2017

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Accomplishing Postal Reform in the 115th Congress—H.R. 756, the Postal Service Reform Act of 2017". Testimony was heard from Megan J. Brennan, Postmaster General, U.S. Postal Service; Robert G. Taub, Chairman, Postal Regulatory Commission; Lori Rectanus, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, Government Accountability Office; and public witnesses.

RED RIVER GRADIENT BOUNDARY SURVEY ACT; HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RELATING TO DRUG TESTING OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION APPLICANTS

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 428, the "Red River Gradient Boundary Survey Act"; H.J. Res. 42, disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to drug testing of unemployment compensation applicants. The committee granted, by voice vote, a closed rule for H.R. 428. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Additionally, the rule grants a closed rule for H.J. Res. 42. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as

read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the joint resolution. The rule provides one motion to recommit. Testimony was heard from Chairman Thornberry, and Representatives Smith of Nebraska, Danny K. Davis of Illinois, McClintock, and Hanabusa.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 115th Congress. The committee adopted its rules and authorization and oversight plan for the 115th Congress.

MAKING EPA GREAT AGAIN

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Making EPA Great Again”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

REIMAGINING THE HEALTH CARE MARKETPLACE FOR AMERICA’S SMALL BUSINESSES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Reimagining the Health Care Marketplace for America’s Small Businesses”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ASSESSING THE VA IT LANDSCAPE: PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Assessing the VA IT Landscape: Progress and Challenges”. Testimony was heard from David A. Powner, Director, IT Management Issues, Government Accountability Office; and Rob C. Thomas, II, Acting Assistant Secretary for Information and Technology and Chief Information Officer, Office of Information and Technology, Department of Veterans Affairs.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held an organizational meeting for the 115th Congress. The subcommittee successfully organized.

EXAMINING THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION’S REPRESENTATIVE PAYEE PROGRAM: DETERMINING WHO NEEDS HELP

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security; and Subcommittee on Oversight, held a joint hearing entitled “Examining the Social Security Administration’s Representative Payee Program: Determining Who Needs Help”. Testimony was

heard from Marianna LaCanfora, Acting Deputy Commissioner, Office of Retirement and Disability Policy, Social Security Administration; Gale Stallworth Stone, Acting Inspector General, Social Security Administration; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings to examine the current readiness of United States forces, 2:30 p.m., SR–232A.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine Inspector General recommendations for improving Federal agencies, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold an oversight hearing to examine modernizing our nation’s infrastructure, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 39, to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, S. 63, to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act, S. 91, to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, S. 140, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund, S. 245, to amend the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self Determination Act of 2005, S. 249, to provide that the pueblo of Santa Clara may lease for 99 years certain restricted land, S. 254, to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages, S. 269, to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, and to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska, and S. 302, to enhance tribal road safety; to be immediately followed by an oversight hearing to examine emergency management in Indian Country, focusing on improving the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Federal-tribal relationship with Indian tribes, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

Wednesday, February 8

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate program is uncertain.
See next volume of the Congressional Record.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2:30 p.m., Thursday, February 9

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 2:30 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E164
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E164
Collins, Doug, Ga., E154, E163
Comstock, Barbara, Va., E159, E161, E163
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E154
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E157
Ellison, Keith, Minn., E159
Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E156, E159, E159, E160, E161, E162
Fitzpatrick, Brian K., Pa., E164
Garamendi, John, Calif., E155

Goodlatte, Bob, Va., E158
Graves, Sam, Mo., E154, E154, E155, E156, E157
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E155
Harper, Gregg, Miss., E156
JOHNSON, MIKE, La., E162
Johnson, Bill, Ohio, E153
Kelly, Trent, Miss., E161, E163, E165
Kilmer, Derek, Wash., E158
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E157
Kuster, Ann M., N.H., E162, E164
McClintock, Tom, Calif., E158
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E154
McMorris Rodgers, Cathy, Wash., E156, E159

Norcross, Donald, N.J., E155
Olson, Pete, Tex., E156, E157, E159, E160
Panetta, Jimmy, Calif., E153
Roybal-Allard, Lucille, Calif., E165
Rush, Bobby L., Ill., E157
Rutherford, John H., Fla., E161
Sánchez, Linda T., Calif., E155
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E160
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E160
Welch, Peter, Vt., E160
Williams, Roger, Tex., E157
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E158, E161



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.