



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2017

No. 6

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 10, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER 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.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

HARRY DEITZ: 17 SIMPLE WAYS TO IMPROVE THE WORLD IN 2017

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when we came back from break, starting 2017, I wanted to share some thoughts on how we can all improve ourselves and our country here in 2017, but last week there was such a flurry of activity, I didn't have the opportunity to do so.

I came across an editorial in the Reading Eagle, a newspaper with circulation in my district. Harry Deitz, the editor of the Reading Eagle, had an editorial entitled, "17 Simple Ways to Improve the World in 2017." I thought it was so absolutely excellent that I would like to share it with the American public verbatim:

"Imagine how much better the world could be if all of us resolved to make the world a better place. Imagine how much better it could be if just one of us did that.

"It really isn't difficult. We just need to make up our minds to do positive little things that will add up to positive big things. Often, they are things that don't take much time or energy. They may not cost anything. But the rewards—the paybacks—are immeasurable.

"So, in the spirit of a new year, here are 17 simple things we can do in 2017 to improve the world around us.

"1. There's an old caution sign at railroad crossings: Stop, look and listen. It also should apply to communication and understanding. Think how much better things would be if we stopped or at least slowed down, looked a person in the eye and really listened to what he or she has to say. That certainly would derail some of the anger and misunderstandings in the world.

"2. Say something positive to someone every day. You may never know how much a kind word or a compliment will mean to the person, but you will feel better after you've done it.

"3. Make a donation to charity. Money helps, but donations also come in the form of your time.

"4. Don't make judgments. There are people in the world who judge us before they know us. They judge us before they know all the facts. They disapprove when we have different opinions. Sometimes there isn't right or wrong—there is just different. Don't just talk tolerance—practice it.

"5. Say hello to a stranger. How much effort does it take? What is the real risk? Many of our best relationships began with a simple 'hello.'

"6. Give something anonymously to someone in need. Don't look for recognition or appreciation. Focus on what you can do for 'he' or 'she,' instead of asking, 'what's in it for me?'

"7. Have a conversation with a child. Not a lesson or a lecture. You may be surprised at how much you can learn and how much you can teach when you talk and listen.

"8. Make a call to someone you haven't spoken with in years. Better yet, visit that person.

"9. Don't wish away a single day. How often have we been anxious for a day to be over? We only have so many days, and we don't know how many. So even when things are going really badly, don't give up on that day. Think positive, and make every day special. And consider tomorrow a new opportunity to do what we weren't able to do today.

"10. Say you are sorry. It's never too late, and it's not as painful as it may seem.

"11. Forgiveness isn't only one of the best things you can do for others. It also is one of the greatest gifts you can give to yourself. It removes burdens. It helps you see clearly. It repairs what is broken. Time may reduce our pain but doesn't always remove it. Forgiveness will.

"12. Take a quiet walk. Look at the world around you. How can you help but marvel at God's creation when you push away all of the distractions in your life?

"13. Happiness isn't something we are given. It's something we choose. So choose happiness.

"14. Cherish your memories more than your possessions. They not only are more important, but they will last much longer.

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.

H239

"15. Smile. I can't think of an expression that can have a more positive impact on someone else—and on yourself. It's difficult to be angry or cranky when you're smiling.

"16. Pray for peace. If you believe in prayer, you already understand its power. If you don't, what do you have to lose?"

"17. Tell people you love them. It's something you can't do too often. It's something they will never tire of hearing."

Words well spoken, Harry Dietz.

MATERNAL HEALTH CARE

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 315, the Improving Access to Maternity Care Act.

As we look to strengthen health care, one area where we must continue to show leadership is in the delivery of quality and timely maternal and prenatal care. Certain areas of the country, though, suffer from a shortage of professionals to provide this essential care.

For over 40 years, the National Health Service Corps has helped to place primary, dental, and mental health providers in underserved areas. This bill would use data collected from the National Health Service Corps to designate and place maternal healthcare providers in those areas of the country where they are most needed. This will help to solve the shortage of maternal healthcare professionals and ensure new and expecting mothers have access to the care they need.

Mr. Speaker, the statistics don't lie: mothers without access to prenatal care are more likely to experience serious but avoidable complications during birth, which makes passage of H.R. 315, the Improving Access to Maternity Care Act, which I am proud to support, such an important bill.

CONFRONTING THE REALITY OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the campaign rhetoric and politics of the last 7 years now must confront the reality of health care.

No political party can repeal the basic economics. All of the features that make health insurance policies better today—the elimination of lifetime limits on health insurance payments; preventing denial for pre-existing conditions; charging women the same premium as men, not more; keeping children on their parents' insurance policies until age 26—are wildly popular, but they all increase the cost of insurance.

We cannot allow people to wait until they are sick to get a policy. That undermines the very concept of insurance, hence, the mandate to have health insurance.

The truth is that the impact of the Affordable Care Act has resulted in

healthcare costs rising more slowly than before the act. We have expanded coverage and subsidized care for millions of Americans, while improving the quality of health insurance. All of these reforms are, in fact, working.

A reckless act to repeal something that is now baked into the healthcare system on which millions of Americans rely and benefit from—indeed, the entire system benefits from—would have serious destabilizing effects beyond the loss of coverage for almost 30 million Americans. Republican efforts to weaken Medicaid for the poor and disabled and undermine Medicare for the elderly means that almost 100 million Americans have their health care at risk.

We will begin the battle fighting any effort by the new administration and the suddenly empowered Republican majority to act on their campaign rhetoric abolishing ObamaCare but not providing a replacement. A repeal without a clear alternative replacement at the same time is unacceptable. It is not just unacceptable to Democrats in Congress. It is unacceptable to millions of recently insured Americans—in fact, millions found in red States—unacceptable to healthcare professionals, insurance companies, hospitals, and the vast array of other people involved with the healthcare industry. Most importantly, it is unacceptable to our families.

The most unpopular feature of ObamaCare was the name, suggesting, perhaps, a simple solution. When identified with the President, the Affordable Care Act provisions were 20 percent more unpopular than when the act was described in exactly the same terms but the name was different. So perhaps we just allow the Republicans to abolish "ObamaCare" and then get back down to work doing what we should have been doing for the last 7 years: making the Affordable Care Act better.

By all means, let's look for ways to make the system less burdensome. We can continue to demand accountability, but allow some competition with value-based purchasing and negotiation of prescription drug prices by the largest pharmaceutical customer in the world: the Federal Government. Dealing with skyrocketing prescription drug prices and other outrageous practices by some in the pharmaceutical industry will find broad support in and out of Congress.

When the Republican majority and the new administration get serious about a replacement that keeps all of their campaign promises and protects the industry from chaos and consumers from loss of essential coverage, there will be plenty of bipartisan cooperation. But any effort of breaking that fundamental promise by denying coverage and upsetting the healthcare marketplace will be met with strong opposition, and, ultimately, they will lose.

For the sake of the American families and the people who provide health care, not only should they lose, they

must lose. We must stand strong and united on that proposition.

TRIBUTE TO DEAN BORG

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

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor veteran Iowa journalist Dean Borg and to offer my congratulations on his upcoming retirement from Iowa Public Television's "Iowa Press."

Dean Borg is a leader in Iowa, in our community, and his contributions to over four decades of "Iowa Press" are unparalleled. His presence on Iowa Public Television's respected weekly news program will surely be missed.

A native of Forest City, Borg attended Iowa State University and began his journalism career at WOI Radio while still a student. Earning degrees in journalism and public education from Iowa State University and the University of Iowa, Borg served as a reporter and later as news director for WMT Radio and WMT Television stations in Cedar Rapids. His career path is an example of how Iowa hard work, talent, and dedication can set you on the path to achieving remarkable successes in life.

Dean Borg's first appearance on "Iowa Press" took place on January 16, 1972, during the program's fourth episode, as a panelist, while still working for WMT News. The other panelists who joined him that day were Iowa State Representative Frank Bowers, a Democrat from Orange City, and John McCormally, of the Burlington Hawk Eye newspaper. Borg later went on to host the television program for decades, providing the insightful commentary and leadership of discussions with numerous guests from around the State and country.

Borg's commitment to Iowa Public Television, work moderating nationally broadcast Presidential debates and beyond, has set the bar high for aspiring journalists in Iowa and across the country.

From his contributions to the show's decades of broadcasts to his documentary reporting from around the world, Dean Borg has spent a career dedicated to providing folks with national and statewide news. With this type of commitment, it is not surprising Borg has interviewed every President since Lyndon B. Johnson and many of the Presidential contenders who travel through our first-in-the-Nation State.

I can attest to Dean Borg's dedication to his craft personally, as I have had the honor of getting to know him—I have been on the "Iowa Press" show with him—as a Member of Congress and throughout my career working for the people of Iowa.

He is the longest serving program host in Iowa Public Television history, a significant feat. He is an award-winning journalist, an Iowa State distinguished alumnus, and a trailblazer in

Iowa journalism, defending the craft and defending journalists.

While Dean will officially retire from "Iowa Press" this month, I look forward to his return for special occasions and live broadcasts.

Dean is the epitome of Iowa nice: a humble, but bold Iowan putting the interests of his fellow Iowans over himself, dedicated to truth, to his craft, and dedicated to service, dedicated to his fellow Iowans. Dean is a very good and true man.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Dean Borg on his distinguished career and wishing him the best in his retirement.

Dean, I will miss you. If I don't see you soon, I will see you at the Iowa State Fair.

□ 1015

DANGERS OF REPEALING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to put people before politics. As we speak, the Senate is moving to strip millions of families of their healthcare coverage and replace it with, well, nothing.

Now, I know that some of my colleagues ran on a platform of repealing the Affordable Care Act, and now they feel boxed in by politics. But let's be very clear about this. The political stakes of repealing the Affordable Care Act without a replacement are nothing compared to the terrible human cost.

I would like to share with my colleagues the experience of Suzie Clayton, my constituent from North Canaan, Connecticut. "The ACA had a huge, positive impact on my life," Suzie wrote to me last week. Because Suzie is a breast cancer survivor, a pre-existing condition, it was nearly impossible for her to get decent healthcare coverage before the ACA.

"All that we had put away in retirement funds, nearly \$70,000, had to be tapped in order to cover our health costs," she wrote. If it weren't for the coverage she gained through the Affordable Care Act, she and her husband would have lost everything they had worked for, quite likely, including their home.

Instead, with the ACA, her family is once again saving for retirement, completing some overdue home repairs, and getting their medical needs taken care of at an affordable price. All of that will go away if this House follows through on its political crusade to wipe away the Affordable Care Act without a replacement.

Mr. Speaker, there are millions of Suzie Claytons in this country, millions of people who will lose their homes, lose their savings, and some will even lose their lives if this Congress repeals the Affordable Care Act without a replacement.

In my home State of Connecticut alone, 180,000 people who have gained coverage since the ACA was implemented stand to lose their health care. That includes 43,000 children.

Think about that for a moment. If Congress repeals the ACA and doesn't replace it with anything, 43,000 children just in my State will lose their health coverage. When those children get sick, too many of their parents will be faced with a heart-wrenching choice: bankrupt the family to pay for their child's medical care or go without the health services their child needs to get better. All of us here who are parents know that that isn't really a choice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues who are beating the drum for wholesale elimination of the Affordable Care Act: How can you, in good conscience, take away the health care from 43,000 children in my State just to score a political point? How can you throw our healthcare system into chaos just because you are in a political jam?

Let's work together. Let's work together to improve our healthcare system. Let's forge a sensible, bipartisan approach to lower healthcare costs and ensure access to quality care for everyone.

The politics of ObamaCare, no matter how fraught and divisive, should not, must not take priority over the well-being of the American people that we are here to serve.

WOMEN'S MARCH ON WASHINGTON

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you where I will not be on Inauguration Day. I will not be here or outside at the inauguration ceremony. I will be in Washington late that evening because the event that I am going to is on January 21. It is the Women's March on Washington.

You can get more information on Facebook, which is how I heard about it, or should I say, how my wife, Soraida, heard about it. I said to her a little after the election: You know, honey, I don't think I can go to D.C. and watch Donald Trump get sworn in.

And she said: Oh, you are going to D.C., just not for that. And she told me about the Women's March. She said: You and I are going together.

Now, I can already hear the phones ringing in my office with people calling to say: Oh, you Democrats are sore losers and you just hate Republicans.

No. I went to George Bush's inauguration and I work with Republicans all the time. Just read Breitbart, which seems to write an article anytime I even glance favorably at a Republican colleague.

But this is different. I knew that George W. Bush and I would disagree on many issues from trade to health care, to the war in Iraq, but I never thought that George W. Bush was trying to make my own country hostile to

me personally, to my wife, to my daughters, to my grandson. I never felt he was a threat to the Nation that I love so deeply and have served now for more than a quarter of a century.

The reason that I am not going is that I cannot bring myself to justify morally or intellectually the immense power we are placing in that man's hands.

I could not look at my wife, my daughters, or my grandson in the eye if I sat there and attended as if everything that the candidate said about the women, about the Latinos, the Blacks, the Muslims or any of the other things he said in those speeches and tweets, and that all of that is okay or erased from our collective memory.

We all heard the tape when Donald Trump was bragging—bragging—about grabbing women by their private parts without their consent. It is something I just can't unhear, bragging to that guy on TV that he would grab women below the belt, as if that was hitting on them. Sorry. It is never okay. It is never just locker room talk. It is offensive and, if he ever actually did it, it is a crime.

I hang out with Republicans, with Republican-elected officials in an actual locker room in the Rayburn Building, and if they ever started talking like that, I wouldn't just walk away. I would tell them to their faces that they are wrong, and I wouldn't allow it to go unnoticed or dismissed as normal or excusable. I don't know a Republican colleague of mine in this body who would let that type of comment just slide as if it were just okay.

So that is why I will hold hands with my wife and march with the women on January 21 in D.C. And that is why I am calling on all of my progressive allies to come and march with the women as well. If you care about a living wage, come and join the women. If you care about the environment, come and join the march. We know as a society that when women win, we all win. So I plan to be there.

It is deeply personal and deeply patriotic to march, to make my opinions known by walking with my allies arm in arm. I want to be able to look at my two beautiful Latina daughters and my beautiful half-Puerto Rican, half-Mexican, but 100 percent American grandson, Luis Andres, in the eye with a clear conscience.

When the new President denigrates Latinos or Mexicans or immigrants as drug dealers and criminals, I want to be able to say that I did not condone or allow that type of speech to go mainstream. That was not normalized on my watch.

Because the future President said that the American-born children of immigrants were not capable of being American judges, I cannot sit there as if this inauguration is okay and I forgave him.

I am deeply honored to return to the U.S. Congress, and I want to thank the people of the Fourth Congressional District. My constituents knew that when

they voted for me, I would be a fighter; and I don't intend to let them down.

If the new President comes for the Muslims, I will be a Muslim. If they come for Planned Parenthood, I will stand with Planned Parenthood. When they deny climate science, I will make my voice heard.

I will use whatever peaceful means available to make sure the words and the actions of our new President do not become the new mainstream and normal in America.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why I will not be here for Inauguration Day and why I will be marching with my wife and with a million women from across this country.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT—DO NO HARM

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

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise not as a Member of Congress, but as a doctor. When I graduated medical school and took that oath, there are two core ethics that we take when we take that oath: to do good. And that is exactly what we tried to do when this body passed the Affordable Care Act. It was about doing good. It was about giving people basic access to health care. That is a good thing.

The Affordable Care Act is not perfect, but let's keep doing good. Let's fix it. Let's address the cost of health care. Let's make sure people can afford their medications. That is doing good.

Another core ethic that we take when we enter the profession of medicine as a physician is to do no harm. If this body repeals the Affordable Care Act, we are going to harm 20 million Americans that now have access to health care that didn't have it prior to the Affordable Care Act. We shouldn't do harm.

Let me put it into real context. I am a primary care internist. My wife is also a primary care internist. You can tell we have exciting conversations at our house. I was asking her the other day what the Affordable Care Act meant to her as a physician, and she was sharing a story of a patient that she had cared for for years.

This was a patient that had diabetes and hypertension, high blood pressure. We know these are silent killers. If you don't control your diabetes, if you don't control your blood pressure, it can have devastating consequences leading to heart attacks, leading to strokes. It is one of the leading causes of death in America. But if you control it, you can prevent all of these illnesses and people can live a normal, healthy life.

So my wife—she is a very good doctor—had her patient under good control. The patient stopped coming in to see her—maybe the patient moved away or something happened—for a couple of years. And then about 2 years ago, the patient came back in. Once

she came in, her blood sugars, her diabetes was out of control; her blood pressure was out of control.

My wife looked at this patient and just said: Well, what happened? How come you stopped taking your diabetes medicine? How come you stopped taking your blood pressure medicine?

She said: Well, Doc, in the recession, I lost my job. I lost my health insurance coverage. I couldn't get the medications.

And then she said: But you know what? With the Affordable Care Act with Covered California, I was able to get health insurance again. I was able to come in and see you.

It wasn't too late for this patient. My wife was able to get her back on her medications, get her back on her blood pressure medicine, get her blood pressure and diabetes under control, and, hopefully, there is no permanent damage.

But if we do harm and repeal the Affordable Care Act, we are going to do irreparable damage to 20 million and more Americans who are just like this patient, who need their health care covered, who need their access to medications. That is what this is about.

Mr. Speaker, let's do what we are trained to do as physicians and what this body should do. Let's do good by making sure people have better coverage, affordable coverage, and better access to health care. Let's definitely make sure we do not do any harm by repealing the Affordable Care Act. Let's make sure we fix it and make it better.

STATE SPONSORS OF TERROR REVIEW ENHANCEMENT ACT—115TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, today I will reintroduce my bill, the State Sponsors of Terrorism Review Enhancement Act. This legislation passed the full House last Congress unanimously. I hope this Chamber will once again take up this commonsense legislation and pass it as soon as possible.

The designation of a foreign government as a "State Sponsor of Terrorism" is one of the United States' most powerful statements that we can give on another statement.

Besides imposing sanctions, the stamp of "State Sponsor of Terrorism" labels a state untouchable to the international community.

□ 1030

This pariah status is much deserved as these are states that support the killing of innocent people as a matter of policy.

Under current law, in order for a state to be delisted, the President of the United States only needs to certify that the country being considered for delisting has not engaged in supporting terrorism for a paltry 6 months. We are

talking 6 months to be delisted. Considering the heinous acts of violence these countries have supported in the past, we should not be allowing them to be delisted after only 6 months.

To address this, my legislation will—and, again, it passed last Congress unanimously—quadruple the time a designated country must refrain from sponsoring terrorism, before the President can remove it from the sponsor list, from 6 to 24 months; increase congressional oversight by doubling the time Congress has to review the President's proposed removal from 45 to 90 days; establish a uniform process through which Congress can disapprove of the President's decision to remove a country from that list; and require the administration to notify and brief Congress upon initiating a review of a designated country's potential removal from the list.

This legislation will assert congressional scrutiny and oversight and hopefully bring to an end politically motivated delistings. Successive administrations—both Republican and Democrat alike—delisted countries based on their presidency's legacy rather than the facts. This will stop absurd delistings like that of North Korea in 2008.

North Korea was delisted in exchange for their promises of dismantling their nuclear program. However, 9 years and 5 nuclear tests later, they remain off the list. This rescission from the list has enabled North Korea to engage in supporting terrorism abroad. By increasing the amount of time for a state to not be engaged in terrorism and increasing congressional oversight and scrutiny, my legislation will not allow mistakes such as this delisting of North Korea's to take place.

I want to remind people that this passed unanimously, and we hope that we will get the support again.

SECRETARY OF EDUCATION NOMINEE BETSY DEVOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to join my colleagues from the great State of Ohio. I come here because we have a statement that we want to make to voice to not only the citizens of Ohio but to this great country.

I am honored to join Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR and Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, two women who have been in the battle for our citizens, but, more importantly, for our students, for education, and for our teachers.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I demand that Betsy DeVos, President-elect Trump's nominee for Secretary of Education, repay the \$5.3 million—yes, Mr. Speaker, I am going to say that again—\$5.3 million in fines owed by her political action committee, All Children Matter, to my home State of Ohio.

The PAC's contempt for Ohio campaign finance laws by illegally funneling contributions from a nationwide PAC to an unregistered Ohio affiliate is troublesome. And its refusal to pay these fines to the State of Ohio is disgraceful as the debt is nearly a decade old.

Can you imagine what would happen if a student refused to pay something that they owed to a university or to the State? I don't have to answer that. We all know what would happen.

Mr. Speaker, I ask: How can the public trust Ms. DeVos to ensure borrowers repay their student loans in a timely manner when the group she chaired failed to pay fines that were imposed nearly a decade ago? The fines owed to the State of Ohio—the \$5.3 million—belongs to the taxpayers of Ohio. And every time, Mr. Speaker, I say \$5.3 million, I am going to say it twice because she owes \$5.3 million that belongs to the taxpayers of Ohio. This is money that could be used to pay for more teachers and other initiatives to help educate Ohio's children.

We cannot let her skirt the system and cheat Ohio taxpayers. No, we cannot let her be nominated and confirmed to be over our educational system.

I urge her to repay the \$5.3 million in fines prior to her Senate confirmation hearing next week.

PRESIDENT-ELECT TRUMP'S CABINET

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, in America, we expect no one to be above the law. But, what happens if someone is super rich and breaks the law?

Today, I rise to place on the Record a demand that the President-elect's Cabinet nominee for Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos of Michigan, immediately pay fines she owes to the State of Ohio.

These obligations total \$5.3 million, just as Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY stated in her opening statement, and also Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, who will speak subsequent to my own remarks. This is an enormous amount of money owed to the State of Ohio in unpaid fines and levied late penalties for Ms. DeVos' political organization for campaign finance violations in Ohio. They broke Ohio law. These are the largest fines ever levied in Ohio history, dating back to 2008. Essentially, the political organization Ms. DeVos led violated Ohio's election laws.

Betsy DeVos of Michigan was in charge of the political action committee known as All Children Matter, based in Virginia. During her chairmanship, she broke Ohio's election laws which impose spending donation limits of \$10,000 per candidate. She, in fact, violated those limits by funneling national PAC money, over \$870,000 of it, to Ohio's State can-

didates—incidentally, all Republican candidates.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD these names and the amounts of money they received.

OHIO CANDIDATES WHO RECEIVED DIRECT CONTRIBUTIONS FROM BETSY DEVOS' FEDERAL PAC—ALL CHILDREN MATTER

Blackwell, J. Kenneth & Raga, Thomas, \$10,000; Husted, Jon A., \$10,000; Raussen, Jim, \$7,500; Bacon, Kevin, \$6,000; Harris, Bill, \$5,000; Montgomery, Betty, \$5,000; Taylor, Mary, \$5,000; Bubb, Danny, \$4,000; Coughlin, Kevin, \$4,000; Luther, Brant, \$4,000.

Patton, Thomas F., \$4,000; White, Dan, \$4,000; Adams, John W., \$3,000; Bowling, Marcus U., \$2,500; Buehrer, Stephen, \$2,500; McGregor, Jim, \$2,500; Brinkman, Thomas, \$2,000; Cousineau, Thomas, \$2,000; Fink, Deborah Owens, \$2,000; Mandel, Josh, \$2,000.

McLaurin, Donald K., \$2,000; Farmer, Kyle J., \$1,500; Goodman, David, \$1,500; Peterson, Jon M., \$1,500; Seitz, William J., \$1,500; Setzer, Arlene J., \$1,500; Batchelder III, William G., \$1,000; Dolan, Matthew J., \$1,000; Faber, Keith Lloyd, \$1,000; Hite, Cliff, \$1,000.

Jordan, Kris, \$1,000; Niehaus, Tom, \$1,000; Schindel, Carol-Ann, \$1,000; Wagoner, Mark, \$1,000; Adams, Richard N., \$500; Jones, Shannon, \$500; Ohio House Republican Campaign Cmte, \$500; Rankin, Tim, \$500; Whiston, Tom, \$500; Young, Tom, \$500.

Source: The Columbus Dispatch and FollowtheMoney.org

Ms. KAPTUR. All these candidates pledged to advocate for privatizing public school education through vouchers once elected into office.

The Ohio Election Commission, comprised of an equal number of Republicans and Democrats, swiftly and unanimously levied a record fine against her organization in 2008. Their decision was subsequently vetted and upheld by a Republican judge in a State court.

Yet, now nearly a decade later, neither Betsy DeVos nor All Children Matter has paid their penalty of \$5.3 million to the citizens of Ohio.

Indeed, the State of Ohio prior to her violations had even informed Ms. DeVos by issuing a legal opinion that such contributions from her national PAC would be illegal to State candidates, and she willfully ignored them and that opinion. No one, no matter how wealthy, should be above the law.

And who exactly were the State candidates that received a direct campaign contribution from Betsy DeVos' political action committee All Children Matter? You will notice a few candidates still serving in Ohio office, including Lieutenant Governor Mary Taylor, Secretary of State Jon Husted, State Treasurer Josh Mandel, and Ohio Senate President Keith Faber. Former Ohio gubernatorial candidate J. Kenneth Blackwell also received a direct contribution. Mr. Blackwell now leads the President-elect's domestic policy transition team.

In addition, according to the Center for Responsive Politics, Betsy DeVos gave direct contributions to at least 20 current Members of the United States Senate. These are the same Senators who will now confirm her for her Secretary of Education position.

Talk about pay to play and a real need to drain the swamp, the Presi-

dent-elect ought to start in his own backyard.

The \$5.3 million fine that Betsy DeVos' political organization owes to Ohio could pay for better education for Ohio's children. It is outrageous that a candidate for Secretary of Education holds herself above the law and fails to make good on outstanding fines imposed nearly 10 years ago. Public records indicate she personally has a net worth of over \$5.1 billion.

The New York Times today has a front page story by Noam Scheiber that includes a quote from a writer and scholar who observes about the life of Ms. DeVos.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this article as well.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 9, 2017]

BETSY DEVOS, TRUMP'S EDUCATION PICK,
PLAYS HARDBALL WITH HER WEALTH

(By Noam Scheiber)

After Tom Casperson, a Republican state senator from Michigan's Upper Peninsula, began running for Congress in 2016, he assumed the family of Betsy DeVos, President-elect Donald J. Trump's nominee to be education secretary, would not oppose him.

The DeVoses, a dominant force in Michigan politics for decades with a fortune in the billions, had contributed to one of Mr. Casperson's earlier campaigns. But a week before his primary, family members sent \$24,000 to one of his opponents, then poured \$125,000 into a "super PAC," Concerned Taxpayers of America, that ran ads attacking him.

The reason, an intermediary told Mr. Casperson: his support from organized labor. "Deceitful, dishonest and cowardly," was how Mr. Casperson's campaign described the ads, complaining that the groups running them "won't say who they are or where their money is coming from." On Primary Day, Mr. Casperson went down to defeat.

In announcing his intention to nominate Ms. DeVos, Mr. Trump described her as "a brilliant and passionate education advocate." Even critics characterized her as a dedicated, if misguided, activist for school reform. But that description understates both the breadth of Ms. DeVos's political interests and the influence she wields as part of her powerful family. More than anyone else who has joined the incoming Trump administration, she represents the combination of wealth, free-market ideology and political hardball associated with a better-known family of billionaires: Charles and David Koch.

"They have this moralized sense of the free market that leads to this total program to turn back the ideas of the New Deal, the welfare state," Kim Phillips-Fein, a historian who has written extensively about the conservative movement, said, describing the DeVoses.

Ms. DeVos declined to be interviewed for this article.

Like the Kochs, the DeVoses are generous supporters of think tanks that evangelize for unrestrained capitalism, like Michigan's Acton Institute, and that rail against unions and back privatizing public services, like the Mackinac Center.

They have also funded national groups dedicated to cutting back the role of government, including the National Center for Policy Analysis (which has pushed for Social Security privatization and against environmental regulation) and the Institute for Justice (which challenges regulations in court and defends school vouchers). Both organizations have also received money from the Koch family.

Indeed, the DeVoses' education activism, which favors alternatives to traditional public schools, appears to derive from the same free-market views that inform their suspicion of government. And perhaps more than other right-wing billionaires, the DeVoses couple their seeding of ideological causes with an aggressive brand of political spending. Half a dozen or more extended family members frequently coordinate contributions to maximize their impact.

In the 2016 cycle alone, according to the Michigan Campaign Finance Network, the family spent roughly \$14 million on political contributions to state and national candidates, parties, PACs and super PACs.

All of this would make Ms. DeVos—whose confirmation hearing has been delayed until next week amid mounting pressure that her government ethics review be completed beforehand—very different from past education secretaries.

"She is the most emblematic kind of oligarchic figure you can put in a cabinet position," said Jeffrey Winters, a political scientist at Northwestern University who studies economic elites. "What she and the Kochs have in common is the unbridled use of wealth power to achieve whatever political goals they have."

BIRTH OF A POWER COUPLE

Ms. DeVos, 59, grew up in Holland, Mich., the daughter of a conservative auto parts magnate who was an early founder of the Family Research Council, a conservative Christian group. When she married Dick DeVos in 1979, it was akin to a merger between two royal houses of western Michigan.

Her husband's father, Richard Sr., co-founder of the multilevel marketing company Amway, was an active member of the Christian Reformed Church that preached a mix of social conservatism and self-reliance. He once told the church's official magazine that Chicago's poor dwelled in slums because that was "the way they choose to live," according to a Washington Post story from the 1980s.

A fan of Rolls-Royces and pinkie rings, Richard Sr. wrote books with titles like "Ten Powerful Phrases for Positive People."

A similar air hung over his business. Amway sales representatives, which the company calls "independent business owners," make money both by selling the company's products—everything from perfume to toilet bowl cleaner—and by recruiting other sales representatives.

The Federal Trade Commission once investigated the company for running a pyramid scheme before concluding that it had misled potential recruits about how much they could expect to earn.

The flip side of the family's proselytizing for capitalism, according to Professor Phillips-Fein, has been an effort to dismantle much "that would counterbalance the power of economic elites."

Amway funded a nationwide ad campaign in the early 1980s, protesting high taxes and regulations. Not long after, the company pleaded guilty to cheating the Canadian government out of more than \$20 million in revenue.

The family had a more winning public face in Dick DeVos, who combined the practiced empathy of a pitchman with the entitlement of an heir, spending over \$30 million on an unsuccessful run for governor of Michigan in 2006. The Detroit Free Press described him that year as the wealthiest man to seek office in the state's modern history.

Betsy DeVos, who served as chairwoman of the Michigan Republican Party for most of the decade between 1996 and 2005, has often played the role of strategist in the relationship. She was a key adviser in her husband's

run for governor and publicly brooded that he had been too gentlemanly in his first debate against the incumbent.

"He's very good with people, a retail politician who looks you in the eye, shakes your hand, listens to what you say," said Randy Richardville, a former Republican leader of the Michigan Senate, describing the couple's strengths. "I would never underestimate Betsy DeVos in a knife fight."

Ms. DeVos has sometimes lacked her husband's finesse, once famously blaming many of the state's economic woes on "high wages." She has won detractors, by their account, by browbeating legislators into voting her way.

"Betsy DeVos was like my 4-year-old granddaughter at the time," said Mike Pumford, a former Republican state representative who once clashed with her. "They were both sweet ladies as long as they kept hearing the word 'yes.' They turned into spoiled little brats when they were told 'no.'"

But Ms. DeVos has often made up for what she lacks in tact through sheer force of will.

Mr. Richardville said he and Ms. DeVos disagreed over term limits, which she supported as party chairwoman and he opposed: "I said, 'I don't think you should be setting policy. You should be supporting those of us who do make policy.' But she never backed down."

While Dick and Betsy DeVos appear to practice a more tolerant form of Christianity than their parents—Ms. DeVos has spoken out against anti-gay bigotry—as recently as the early 2000s they funded some groups like Focus on the Family, a large ministry that helps set the political agenda for conservative evangelicals. They have also backed groups that promote conservative values to students and Christian education, including one with ties to the Christian Reformed Church.

Their economic views are strikingly similar to the elder Mr. DeVos's.

According to federal disclosures, Amway, which Dick DeVos ran between 1993 and 2002, has lobbied frequently over the last 20 years to reduce or repeal the estate tax. Only the top 0.2 percent wealthiest estates paid the tax in 2015.

The company has also opposed crackdowns on tax shelters.

Ms. DeVos has been an outspoken defender of unlimited contributions known as soft money, which she described in a 1997 editorial as "hard-earned American dollars that Big Brother has yet to find a way to control."

After Congress later passed a major campaign finance reform bill, a nonprofit that Ms. DeVos helped to create and fund masterminded the strategy that produced Citizens United, the 2010 Supreme Court decision laying the groundwork for super PACs funded by corporations, unions and individuals to raise and spend unlimited amounts in elections.

And then there are the family's efforts to rein in the labor movement.

Through their contributions to think tanks like the Mackinac Center, as well as Mr. DeVos's direct prodding of Republican legislators, the family played a key role in helping pass Michigan's so-called right-to-work legislation in 2012. The legislation largely ended the requirement that workers pay fees to unions as a condition of employment.

Unions in the state bled members in 2014, the first full year the measure was in effect.

Allies say the DeVoses fight for their beliefs. "Betsy and Dick see themselves as principled conservatives," said Frederick Hess of the American Enterprise Institute. "It kind of seems healthy and admirable to

give resources to folks who are going to fight for causes you believe in."

But the fights can appear to be as much about consolidating power as ideology. Unions were arguably the family's most formidable political opponent in Michigan, one of labor's traditional strongholds.

CHANGES IN MICHIGAN

The DeVos family's roots as education activists date back at least to when Richard DeVos Sr. was running Amway and an institute based at the company's headquarters trained teachers to inject free-market principles into their curriculum.

According to an interview Ms. DeVos gave to *Philanthropy* magazine, she and her husband became interested in education causes when they began visiting a Christian school that served low-income children in Grand Rapids in the 1980s.

"If we could choose the right school for our kids"—by which she appeared to mean primarily private schools—"it only seemed fair that they could do the same for theirs," she told the magazine.

The family spent millions of dollars on a ballot proposal in 2000 asking if Michigan should legalize vouchers, in which students can use taxpayer money to attend private schools.

Many critics, like the education historian Diane Ravitch, argue that the point of vouchers is to destroy public education and teachers' unions. The group Americans United for Separation of Church and State has documented how conservative Christians have long supported vouchers, which could fund religious schools.

After voters objected by more than a two-to-one ratio, Dick DeVos gave a speech at the Heritage Foundation saying such efforts would have to shift to state legislatures, where groups backed by deep-pocketed donors could offer "a political consequence for opposition, and political reward for support of education reform issues."

It is not unusual for the wealthy—who devote nearly 50 percent of their philanthropic dollars to education, according to the group Wealth-X—to spend aggressively in the political realm to impose their preferred reforms.

Even by these standards, however, the DeVoses stand out for the amount of money they spend trying to advance their goals through politics rather than philanthropy, such as research into reforms or subsidizing schools.

As Sarah Reckhow, an expert on education philanthropy at Michigan State University, put it: "The DeVoses are like: 'No, we know what we want. We don't need to have all this window dressing.'"

Ms. DeVos has led two nonprofits that have spent millions of dollars electing governors and legislators sympathetic to school vouchers around the country.

Matt Frendewey, a spokesman for one of the groups, said the efforts had frequently been bipartisan, and that the amount of money they had spent has been dwarfed by contributions from teachers' unions opposed to reform. Yet in Michigan, at least, the family's political strategy has not been subtle.

After he defied Ms. DeVos on a key charter school vote, Mr. Pumford, the former Republican legislator, survived an effort by the Great Lakes Education Project, a nonprofit the DeVoses bankrolled, to defeat him in his 2002 primary.

But shortly after, the House speaker told him the Education Committee chairmanship he coveted would not be forthcoming. "I said, 'Why?'" Mr. Pumford recalled. "He said: 'You know why. The DeVoses will walk away from us.'" Mr. Pumford added: "She told me that was going to happen."

(Rick Johnson, the House speaker, said he did not recall the conversation but also that he had not promised Mr. Pumford the chairmanship and would not have explained his reasons for withholding it.)

Over time, the Great Lakes Education Project helped elect Republican majorities sympathetic to the DeVoses' agenda. But the DeVoses' lobbyists and operatives also discovered less messy ways to advance legislation.

Late one night of their last workweek in 2015, the Michigan House and Senate were about to approve some uncontroversial changes to campaign finance law, when the bill abruptly grew by more than 40 pages.

After the legislators discovered what they had voted for, many said they were horrified.

Tucked away in the new pages was a provision that would have made it much harder for local bodies like school boards to raise money through property tax increases.

"Michigan schools will likely suffer the brunt of the impact because the vast majority rely on periodic voter approval of local operating levy renewals for property taxes," the ratings agency Moody's wrote of the measure the following month.

"I was fooled into voting for something I opposed," said Dave Pagel, a Republican representative. "I consider it the worst vote I've made."

The chief culprits, according to Mr. Pagel and others at the state Capitol when the bill passed, were lobbyists closely tied to the DeVoses.

Tony Daunt, a spokesman for the Michigan Freedom Fund, a nonprofit headed by the DeVoses' longtime political aide, and whose political spending arm they have funded generously, said the group was "part of the discussion process with people in the legislature" about the proposal and "had consistently expressed support for the policy."

The law was later blocked by a federal judge, but the group has vowed to try again.

RADICAL SUSPICIONS

Ms. DeVos's advocates see in these fights the toughness to take on entrenched opponents of expanding reforms like charter schools and vouchers.

In promoting Ms. DeVos in *The Washington Post*, Mitt Romney, the Republican Party's 2012 presidential nominee, emphasized that her wealth gave her the independence to be "someone who isn't financially biased shaping education." He added, "DeVos doesn't need the job now, nor will she be looking for an education job later."

But critics see someone with an unmistakable agenda. "The signs are there that she will do something radical," said Jack Jennings, a former general counsel for the House education committee. "Trump wouldn't have appointed this woman for this position if he didn't intend something radical."

Ms. KAPTUR. The article states: "She is the most emblematic kind of oligarchic figure you can put in a cabinet position. . . . What she and the Kochs have in common is the unbridled use of wealth power to achieve whatever political goals they have."

If confirmed, Betsy DeVos would be responsible for administering our Nation's student loan portfolio and would have to ensure borrowers repay their loans in a timely manner. Yet, how can we believe she will demonstrate sound judgment in her responsibilities or be a role model when her own political organization has blatantly avoided paying legally obligated fines for her violations of Ohio's election laws?

Mr. Speaker, Betsy DeVos' attempt to subvert the law and buy influence

are diametrically opposed to everything the President-elect advised was wrong with America. He wants to drain the swamp. No one in America should be above the law, and neither should Betsy DeVos be above the law. She ought to pay the \$5.3 million she owes the people of Ohio.

SECRETARY OF EDUCATION NOMINEE BETSY DEVOS

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues, Representatives BEATTY and KAPTUR, to address the Secretary of Education.

Mr. Speaker, Betsy DeVos is an imminent and present danger to all of America's children. She does not support public schools. Public schools are where 93 percent or better of all America's children attend. She opposes increased accountability and transparency in for-profit schools, and has a privatization agenda that can set public education back more than 50 years. Even more alarming, she breaks laws and does not pay her bills. DeVos has owed my home State of Ohio \$5.3 million since 2008 for violating campaign finance laws. Despite repeated attempts to collect the money, she has failed to pay those fines.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, I am deeply concerned about DeVos' nomination for Secretary of Education. As a member of the Ohio delegation, I am appalled by her deliberate refusal to pay millions in fines she owes our State. We cannot give the purse strings of America's education system to someone only concerned with her own bank account. And we cannot entrust the future of our children to a person who breaks the law, cozies up to Wall Street, and calls public schools, which I believe are the bedrock of our education system, a dead end.

I urge my Senate colleagues to vote "no" on DeVos. The future of our country and our children are at stake.

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 42 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, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the early days of the 115th Congress play out, we are mindful and grateful that our Nation has once again experienced something so often lacking in our world's experience: the peaceful transition of government.

Though major change of party control did not take place in this Chamber, it is still the American experience that our streets are peaceful and winners and losers of elections move on with their lives in dignity.

We thank You again for the inspiration of our Nation's Founders and the legacy they left us with. May the Members of this assembly, and all Americans, be worthy of that legacy.

And may all that is done in the people's House 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.

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

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BERGMAN 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.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect please present himself in the well.

Mr. SCHRADER of Oregon appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now a Member of the 115th Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath of office to the Member-elect, the whole number of the House is now 435.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE NATIONAL CHAMPION CLEMSON UNIVERSITY TIGERS

(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, early this morning, the Clemson University Tigers achieved the College Football National Championship in what was one of the most stunning and unforgettable endings to a football game. Trailing behind the formidable University of Alabama for the majority of the game, the Clemson Tigers refused to be defeated, culminating in a come-from-behind win at literally the last second.

Throughout the entire season, the Clemson football team has shown guts, grit, and determination to their team, their school, and the State of South Carolina. This was a well-deserved win for a remarkable school and a remarkable program. I join my two sons, Julian and Hunter, who graduated from Clemson, and Clemson fans from across the Nation in celebrating this historic victory.

Congratulations to Clemson superstars Deshaun Watson and Ben Boulware, who were named most valuable players for the game. Congratulations as well to President Jim Clements and his wife, Beth. They are continuing in the world class tradition of Jim and Marcia Barker.

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

Congratulations, Dabo Swinney and the entire Clemson football family. Go Tigers.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express strong opposition to any attempted repeal of the Affordable Care Act. In North Carolina, more than 552,000 people have gained affordable health care through the Affordable

Care Act. One of those residents is Mrs. Darlene Harris of Charlotte, North Carolina, who was born with a hole in her heart. Each and every breath she has taken has been a miracle.

When her heart was beats away from rupturing, her husband's insurance saved her life. Following his death, Darlene tried to cope without that insurance, gambling with her own life. Thanks to the ACA, she is free from that awful burden.

A repeal of the Affordable Care Act would condemn millions of hard-working Americans and their loved ones to the nightmare of the past when preexisting conditions were not covered. It is imperative that we not ignore the pleas of our fellow Americans. It has and will continue to save the lives of our family, neighbors, and friends. I urge my colleagues to absolutely object to any repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

THE GREATEST SHOW ON EARTH

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, this week kicks off the North American International Auto Show in Detroit. As a car guy all my life, I never missed the world's premier automotive event, the greatest show on Earth. This year there is plenty to celebrate.

Just yesterday, Fiat Chrysler announced it would create 2,000 jobs and invest \$1 billion to modernize manufacturing plants in Michigan and Ohio. Last week, Ford scrapped plans for its facility in Mexico and instead promised to invest \$700 million at the Flat Rock plant. This move will bring 700 new jobs to Michigan. These are exciting developments for our State's economy and good paying jobs for our dedicated and talented workforce.

Mr. Speaker, as everyone will see at this year's auto show, Michigan continues to lead the way in car manufacturing. Working together, we can keep Michigan on the forefront of innovation and mobility and keep making the best cars and trucks in the world right in our backyard, the motor capital of the world.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let's not make America sick again.

I am deeply disappointed my Republican colleagues are moving forward with their plan to undo the historic progress we have made by expanding health coverage under the Affordable Care Act, repealing it and leaving millions of Americans with no coverage.

While repeal and replace was an abstract talking point for years, it is clear that there is no plan for replacement, no plan. The new phrase "repeal

and delay" will, in effect, be repeal and chaos, with no plan in place.

Repeal will have real-life, personal impact on 30 million Americans who will stand to lose their health insurance. The options for the 129 million Americans with preexisting conditions who have newfound health security would disappear. We would be returning to a time of lifetime limits, annual caps for care, and consumers will be sold junk health plans at high costs.

Not only will the newly insured suffer, repeal would destabilize the individual health insurance market and send the healthcare system into disarray. Let's don't make America sick again. Let's have no repeal without a replacement.

THANK YOU TO MICHIGAN'S FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say thank you to the people of Michigan's First Congressional District for giving me the opportunity to represent them in Congress. I would also like to thank my wife, Cindy, and our children and grandchildren for their constant and unwavering support.

It is truly an honor and a privilege to be here, and I am so humbled to be doing the people's work in the House of Representatives. I came to Congress not only to restore common sense and fiscal sanity to the Federal Government but, most importantly, to serve the constituents of Michigan's First District and to be their voice in Washington.

We have a new opportunity ahead of us to bring industry and prosperity back to the American people, but it is up to us here in Congress to do the work and put in the long hours it will take to get there. My promise today is that I will work tirelessly for my district and do everything I can to make sure we are leaving a better country for our children and grandchildren.

Again, thank you to the people of Michigan's First Congressional District for this opportunity.

DON'T TURN YOUR BACK ON MILLIONS OF FAMILIES

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, since the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, millions of Americans have gained access to valuable healthcare services, and every American has seen their health insurance benefits improve.

While there are ways the Affordable Care Act can be improved, we cannot afford to go back to the days when big insurance companies had the power to decide what care Americans could receive, deny coverage to children with diagnosed conditions, cancel coverage

when people got sick, and place limits on the amount of care people can receive.

Last week, Carol Lodi from Harvard, Massachusetts, in my district, called and told her story. She and her husband gained healthcare coverage under the Affordable Care Act. She is 61. Her husband is 63. They are self-employed. She said: "If we lose the insurance, we don't know what we'll do."

Mr. Speaker, please listen to the Lodi family and millions of other families like them. Don't turn your back on them and make America sick again.

HONORING DR. PRISCILLA THOMAS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Priscilla Thomas, a commissioner in Chatham County, Georgia, a champion of our area's local youth and a Savannah native.

In 1990, Dr. Thomas was first elected to serve as a commissioner in Chatham County. During her tenure, she became chairman pro tem and later the first minority and female vice chairman. However, long before she entered government, Dr. Thomas was already dedicated to creating more opportunities and better lives for young people.

She worked as a principal at Haven Elementary School in Savannah after earning her Ph.D. in educational administration from the University of North America. When she was elected to serve as commissioner in 1990, she continued to use her passion for young people to provide entertaining and enlightening activities for them, including the Chatham County Youth Commission and the Summer Bonanza Partnership.

On December 16, 2016, Dr. Thomas attended her final county commission meeting and retired from her 26 years as a Chatham County commissioner. She will always be remembered for being one of the toughest, fairest, and most well-informed members of our local government and for her 60 years serving young people. She certainly will be missed.

OPPOSING THE CONFIRMATION OF JEFF SESSIONS AS ATTORNEY GENERAL

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the confirmation of JEFF SESSIONS as Attorney General.

In a 2006 speech, then-Senator SESSIONS wrongfully misstated: "Fundamentally, almost no one coming from the Dominican Republic to the United States is coming here because they have a provable skill that would benefit us and that would indicate their likely success in our society."

When I was 9 years old, Mr. Speaker, I immigrated to the United States from the Dominican Republic without any papers, and now I am a Member of the U.S. Congress. Mr. SESSIONS, have I not succeeded in America?

On behalf of millions of Dominican Americans and notable Americans such as fashion designer Oscar de la Renta, Pulitzer Prize winner Junot Diaz, Secretary of Labor Thomas Perez, and baseball giant Big Papi, I stand here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives as a proud Dominican American. I say to Mr. SESSIONS: you are wrong, wrong in thinking, and wrong for our country.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the confirmation of JEFF SESSIONS as Attorney General. Hateful speech and racist rhetoric have no place in our American society.

□ 1215

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our Nation's law enforcement men and women.

I respect and appreciate the important work of our police throughout the Nation who are charged with the critical work of protecting the people in our States and our local communities. The heartbreaking violent targeting of our Nation's police officers, recently, demonstrates the dangers these men and women face every day.

Every American is so proud as our many neighbors and fellow citizens get up every morning, put on their local law enforcement uniform and badge, kiss their families good-bye, and go out and serve us, keeping our cities and towns safe, trying to build trust and faith among all of our citizens.

Monday was National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, and our law enforcement men and women in Arkansas and throughout the country deserve our gratitude and respect. I proudly displayed a blue light in my office window to honor our law enforcement men and women, and I thank them for their selfless service.

FORT LAUDERDALE AIRPORT SHOOTING

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, last week, we observed a moment of silence to remember the victims 6 years after the Tucson shooting. Just yesterday, another moment of silence to remember the five people killed and six wounded when they were shot while waiting at the Fort Lauderdale Airport baggage claim.

In those awful moments after the shooting, the airport was thrown into chaos and confusion. Yet, before we knew anything of the circumstances, every American could tell you what would come next because Congress has developed a well-worn routine in response to gun violence: first, shocking news of a deadly shooting, followed by thoughts and prayers, followed by a moment of silence on this floor, followed by a complete failure to take action.

To truly honor the victims, moments of silence must be followed by productive discussions of policy: What will we do to keep our community safer? I ask my Republican colleagues, meet with me. Let's at least start a conversation here on the House floor. We can no longer remain silent during this epidemic of gun violence. Thoughts and prayers are all that we have offered the American people, and that is not enough.

OBAMACARE

(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 talk about the families that are feeling the burden of ObamaCare.

Premiums have skyrocketed an average of 19 percent in our State, and insurers are fleeing the market left and right. In fact, 73 percent of counties in Florida only have one insurance provider, leaving people with higher costs and less choice when it comes to their health care. That is why the President's healthcare law has failed the people of Florida.

Now, Republicans are offering up solid solutions to make our Nation's healthcare system work for everyone, without pulling the rug from anybody's feet. We are focused on a more affordable, more personalized healthcare plan that empowers patients, not Washington.

I am proud to serve on the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee as we begin our first steps this week to bring relief to the people of Florida and our Nation.

OBAMACARE

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as we were home over the Christmas holiday break, so many calls that came into my office dealt with the ObamaCare issue—the rise in premiums, the lack of affordability.

Here is one example. A 64-year-old man, his premiums \$30,000, deductible \$12,000—indeed, too expensive to afford and too expensive to use.

But we do have a plan for repealing and replacing. You will find it at A Better Way. This will help lift the financial burden from many Americans

who are currently facing high costs due to ObamaCare. Our plan allows patients greater access to affordable care and affordable insurance.

Our next step includes my legislation, H.R. 314. It is the Health Care Choice Act of 2017. What it will do is allow greater access, more choice, and more options by allowing across-State-line purchasing of health insurance. You find the plan that is most suited to you and your family at a price that you can afford.

It is time for us to repeal and replace with good patient-centered options.

PRESIDENT-ELECT DONALD TRUMP'S PROMISE TO BUILD A WALL WITH MEXICO AND MAKE THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT PAY FOR IT

(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, you might recall, during the campaign, President-elect Donald Trump promised to build a wall with Mexico and, of course, make the Mexican Government pay for it.

Well, now we are hearing that Republicans intend to come to this body, Congress, to spend your hard-earned money and mine, American taxpayer money, to build a wall with Mexico. They are estimating \$10 billion to \$12 billion.

Well, do you know what? In comprehensive immigration reform, which I was proud to support last session, we had over \$40 billion for border security. So apparently Donald Trump is building one-quarter of the wall, all directly with deficit spending.

In comprehensive immigration reform, we not only paid for that border security, not only paid for that \$40 billion and required people who were here illegally to pay fines and register and get right with the law, it actually would reduce the budget deficit by over \$200 billion over 10 years.

So what we have is one-quarter of the wall and deficit spending with Donald Trump. With Democrats, four times the wall and reduce the deficit by \$200 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the choice is obvious.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Law Enforcement Appreciation Day, a day we set aside to thank those who risk their lives to protect our communities nationwide.

These men and women are the hidden heroes of our country, and they deserve our respect and our gratitude. When they put on their badge and kiss their

family good-bye each day, these officers have no certainty that they will return home safely. They willingly face that risk to keep the rest of us safe.

This past year, 135 law enforcement officers made the ultimate sacrifice. One of those courageous individuals was our own Officer Scot Fitzgerald, who lost his life serving on duty with the South Jacksonville Police Department, located in my district.

Last night, throughout the Capitol, blue lights were lit to honor our heroes in blue. In my office, we lit our blue candle in remembrance of fallen Officer Scot Fitzgerald.

In 2016, more officers lost their lives on duty than in any of the previous 5 years. Let us show our admiration and appreciation to the sworn law enforcement officers across the State of Illinois and the 900,000 who serve and face danger in the United States every day. Not just this week, but throughout the year, we need to honor our law enforcement officials.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO JUDGE BRUCE MOSIER

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I sadly rise today to pay tribute to Judge Bruce Mosier, who lost his life yesterday; to his lovely and beautiful wife, Diane; beautiful daughter; and extended family.

The whole of Harris County in Texas loved and respected Judge Bruce Mosier. Oh, he was a strong and vibrant Democrat, but he was a man that, whenever you called upon him, he would serve. He loved the law, practiced, and continued to represent individuals, many of whom could not help themselves. And, of course, he stood by his wife's side, championing every effort she made to empower people to vote. He was a stalwart in the last Presidential election. He continued to encourage and support all of us to do what is right and to ensure the rights of all people to vote.

Judge Bruce Mosier served his neighborhood, served his county, served his State, and served this Nation. I will miss Judge Mosier. I will miss his friendly smile and his kindness, his willingness to help those who were just starting in their political or legal career, his willingness to lift up this country and to be the kind of American that always had an open mind to anyone, no matter how different they might be.

So today, my dear friend, Judge Bruce Mosier, may you rest in peace.

Diane, we will continue to love you and honor his legacy, work with you to continue his dreams and aspirations, and encourage those in this Nation, our county, and our State to be participatory participants in the wonderment of democracy in this Nation that is, that was, Judge Bruce Mosier.

REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on November 8, the American people gave my party control of the entire Congress and the White House because of the promise-breaking, job-killing law known as ObamaCare—the craziest thing in the whole world, according to President Bill Clinton. The fearmongers on the other side are telling Americans they will lose their health care in a snap. They should talk to Martha.

Martha is a self-employed CPA who developed a nasty leukemia a couple of years ago. She was told to get ready for the end of her life. A miracle happened. Experimental treatment reduced her cancer from grade III to grade I. The drugs to save her life cost \$15,000 per month. On October 20, because of ObamaCare, she was told that she had to pay 50 percent of that cost instead of 30 percent. That is tough for her to afford.

Martha got to hold her fifth grandkid this past summer. House Republicans want her to hold her sixth and seventh grandkid in the future. We have our orders to repeal ObamaCare. It is time to go to work.

ELK COUNTY CATHOLIC STUDENTS PERFORM AT PEARL HARBOR

(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 recognize seven Elk County Catholic High School band students who performed on December 7 at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, for the 75th anniversary of the tragic attacks that brought the United States into World War II. This anniversary marks one of the major milestones, which may be one of the few opportunities for survivors of the attacks to participate.

Elk County Catholic represented the Commonwealth, alongside the survivors of the USS Pennsylvania, one of the eight battleships in Pearl Harbor on that fateful day in 1941.

I am so proud of how the students paid tribute to World War II veterans who served at Pearl Harbor and all of the military men and women that fought for our Nation.

This event was especially close to the heart of baritone saxophone player, Luke Ferragine, whose grandfather is a World War II veteran. Also performing in the honor band was Emily Miller, Kendra Smithbauer, Holly Kim, Andrew Wingard, Simon Glatt, and Nathan Schlosser. Congratulations to each of them.

CELEBRATING 10 YEARS OF GIVING BY FRIENDS OF ST. JUDE—MIAMI

(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 today to recognize the 10th anniversary of the founding of Friends of St. Jude—Miami.

St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, located in Memphis, Tennessee, is a leading institution in the fight against pediatric cancer and other diseases that harm children.

Friends of St. Jude—Miami is made up of young professionals in south Florida, who, like my dear friend Wendy Grant, are dedicated to St. Jude's lifesaving mission and who have continued to help the organization to ensure that no family ever receives a bill for the world-class care their son or daughter requires.

To Wendy and, indeed, all of the members of the Friends of St. Jude in south Florida, thank you for the difference you continue to make in the lives of children across our Nation and across the world.

□ 1230

DESHAUN WATSON, A MAN OF CHARACTER

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last night, as we all watched football, no matter who you rooted for, team sports also still comes down to individuals. Last night, a young man named Deshaun Watson—the favorite son of Gainesville, Georgia, my hometown—showed the character that I have witnessed since he was a young boy, playing with my son in the 7- and 8-year-old little flag football league.

His athletic ability has never been questioned, and last night it was on full display for the world to see. I believe that he is the best college football player in the country. Beyond football playing, he is a better man. He is looking forward to the leadership of his team, to the leadership of his classmates, and the leadership he has shown in his community back in Gainesville is exemplary and will not be forgotten.

Gainesville is proud of its favorite son, Deshaun Watson, and of the national championship that he won last night with his team, Clemson, during the football game. But, as with everything in life, as the game ended, it reminded us that the games are played by men of character. Deshaun Watson is a man of character, and I look forward to watching his career as he goes forward.

CONGRATULATIONS TO UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA'S MACHINE INTELLIGENCE LABORATORY ENGINEERING TEAM

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate the other Gainesville—the University of Florida's Machine Intelligence Laboratory Engineering Team.

On December 12, 2016, the University of Florida's Machine Intelligence Laboratory Engineering Team won a world championship and beat 12 teams from five countries at the Maritime RobotX Challenge in Hawaii. This team, which is comprised of UF students, designed a vessel that completed a number of different obstacles, including navigating through buoys and self-parking—all without human intervention.

As a supporter of scientific research, I am proud of the inspiring work being done in Florida's Third Congressional District. The dedication displayed by these students and professors is an outstanding example of the success that comes from hard work. It is the dreams of the students and scientists, like these of today, that will propel them to go on and create the innovations of tomorrow that will make this country great again. I am honored to announce their accomplishments, and I look forward to witnessing their continued success.

As a UF alumnus, I would be remiss not to say, "Go Gators."

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 36

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Jones, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. LoBiondo, Mr. Bishop of Utah, Mr. Turner, Mr. Rogers of Alabama, Mr. Franks of Arizona, Mr. Shuster, Mr. Conaway, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Wittman, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Coffman, Mrs. Hartzler, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, Mr. Brooks of Alabama, Mr. Cook, Mr. Bridenstine, Mr. Wenstrup, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Graves of Missouri, Ms. Stefanik, Ms. McCally, Mr. Knight, Mr. Russell, Mr. DesJarlais, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Gaetz, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Banks of Indiana, and Ms. Cheney.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Tom Price of Georgia, Mr. Diaz-Balart, Mr. Cole, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Rokita, Mr. Woodall, Mr. Sanford, Mr. Womack, Mr. Brat, Mr. Grothman, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Westerman, Mr. Renacci, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Mr. Lewis of Minnesota, Mr. Bergman, Mr. Faso, Mr.

Smucker, Mr. Gaetz, Mr. Arrington, and Mr. Ferguson.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE ATTENDANCE OF THE HOUSE AT THE INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 37

Resolved, That at 10:30 a.m. on Friday, January 20, 2017, the House shall proceed to the West Front of the Capitol for the purpose of attending the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States; and that upon the conclusion of the ceremonies the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday, January 23, 2017 for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 79, HELPING ANGELS LEAD OUR STARTUPS ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 33 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 33

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, to clarify the nature of judicial review of agency interpretations, to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the

Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 79) to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from 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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Res. 33, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 5, the Regulatory Accountability Act, and H.R. 79, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups, or HALOS, Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate for each bill, equally divided between the majority leader and the minority leader and the chairman and the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee, respectively. The rule also provides for a motion to recommit for both pieces of underlying legislation.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee had the opportunity to hear from Congressman TOM MARINO and Congressman HANK JOHNSON, on behalf of the Judiciary Committee, and from Congressman HUIZENGA, on behalf of the Financial Services Committee. We also heard from several Members on both sides of the aisle who testified on their amendments. The Rules Committee made in order both amendments submitted for the HALOS Act and 16 amendments from Members on both sides of the aisle for the Regulatory Accountability Act.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke from this podium last week about the positive, pro-growth agenda we in the majority are advancing. The bills before us today are additional pieces of that puzzle, and they help us to return to common-sense governance that fosters economic success.

H.R. 79, the HALOS Act, was introduced by my friend from Ohio, the chairman of the Small Business Committee, Mr. STEVE CHABOT. Last Congress, very similar legislation passed the House with my support and by an overwhelming bipartisan majority. The HALOS Act ensures that so-called angel investors, who serve as the largest funding source for startups in the United States, are able to effectively hold educational economic development events, like “demo days.” The bill also helps to ensure that startups can connect with angel investors who can serve as funding sources, mentors, or outside directors.

In plain English, the HALOS Act helps to ensure that small, innovative companies and startups have access to the necessary capital. This, in turn, enables these companies to expand and generate jobs that put Americans back to work while fueling our economy as a global hub of innovation.

Mr. Speaker, in order to keep America’s market competitive, we must relieve American job creators and employees from suffocating regulations. We can move toward this by helping government function as our Founders intended. Our Constitution lays out a system of three coequal branches of government, which is meant to fulfill unique roles and to provide checks and balances for one another.

Over time, we have allowed cracks to form in that system, and we have gradually seen executive agencies usurp power from the elected officials of the legislative branch—to the detriment of hardworking Americans and the separation of powers. We, too often, see unelected bureaucrats handing down regulations that have enormous impacts on small businesses, family farmers, individuals, and families. In

an unfortunate irony, these bureaucrats are isolated from the very entities they are trying to regulate.

Congress must stop ceding authority to the executive and reassert the power of the legislative branch to write law. The Regulatory Accountability Act helps us do just that. It helps us to ensure that burdensome rules that handcuff American business with red tape aren’t crushing our economy, our competitiveness, or our future. It also restores common sense to the rule-making process.

H.R. 5, the Regulatory Accountability Act, combines six bills that have previously passed the House. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation.

I thank Chairman CHABOT, Chairman GOODLATTE, and Chairman MARINO for their thoughtful and diligent work on this legislation. Additionally, Congressman RATCLIFFE and Congressman LUETKEMEYER contributed important provisions to this package.

The bill reforms the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, clarifies the nature of judicial review of agency interpretation, and calls for more complete analysis of the potential impact of rules on small entities.

H.R. 5 includes the text of the Separation of Powers Act, which amends the Administrative Procedures Act to overturn two doctrines that call for judicial deference to agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions: the Chevron and Auer doctrines.

In plain English, the Separation of Powers Restoration Act prevents Federal bureaucrats from interpreting the legality of their own regulations at the expense of hardworking Americans and the constitutional separation of powers.

Title I of the Regulatory Accountability Act requires agencies, when establishing new rules, to consider the lowest cost option that meets statutory requirements. The bill also provides for more public input in the rule-making process. Title IV of the bill, the Providing Accountability through Transparency Act, requires agencies to publish plain-language summaries of new proposed rules online. These proposals are not farfetched. Instead, they provide more information and a voice to the American people while reining in agencies that have gotten drunk on their rulemaking power.

Mr. Speaker, our current administration issued over 600 major regulations with an economic impact of over \$740 billion. These numbers show the staggering number of rules put forth by the executive branch, but nowhere are the true costs of regulations highlighted better than in the stories that I hear from my constituents. I know other Members hear similar stories, and all across the Nation, we are seeing the toll that overregulation has taken on growth and competitiveness.

Back home in northeast Georgia, Elbert County is known as the granite

capital of the world, but a rule put forth by OSHA that is related to silica levels threatens to jeopardize that industry; and, of course, there is the waters of the United States rule, which could negatively impact everyone from farmers to ranchers to Realtors. The menu labeling rule is yet another example of a misguided regulation that the administration has put forth without impunity. That rule would raise costs for businesses, from restaurants to convenience stores, leading to higher costs for consumers—in actuality, hurting the very ones that it proclaims to help.

This is the irony of many of these regulations. Sadly, they are borne out in the costs to the American people.

Last year, the EPA finalized a rule that established Federal standards for residential wood heaters. In rural districts like mine, many individuals may count on wood heaters to keep their families warm. This EPA rule will raise costs for consumers and undermine families' decisions about what type of heater may work the best for them.

Mr. Speaker, is this really where we want to go, having the Federal Government decide things like this, away from the scrutiny of the elected body? I think not.

The examples from this administration are numerous, but, importantly, this problem of overregulation is not unique to this administration. This is not a Republican or a Democratic problem. This is a balance of power problem; this is a problem between branches not doing what they are supposed to be doing and staying within that.

□ 1245

The Regulatory Accountability Act helps ensure that this administration and future administrations do not ignore Congress by writing law through regulation. It returns transparency to the process. It restores Congress' rightful place as the legislative branch and reins in the unelected fourth branch that regulators have become.

Mr. Speaker, many of the bills in this package have previously passed with bipartisan support. I hope my colleagues can continue to agree that Congress should make the laws and that we should do so in such a way that encourages growth, innovation, and American ingenuity.

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

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

We will get to the content of the bills in a moment, but there is a procedural issue here that disenfranchises millions of American citizens in this process.

We are in the 115th Congress since the founding of this country. We were just sworn in last week to begin that. There are 56 new Members who just started serving last week that have never served in this body before, and

there were 56 people that served in the last session who are no longer with us. What we are doing here is we are taking bills that those former Representatives worked on and new Representatives have not worked on and advancing them to the floor without going through committee, without going through the regular order.

So, for example, you have two bills, H.R. 5 and H.R. 79. We will talk about them in a moment. These are Committee on Financial Services bills. They should have gone to that committee, and members of that committee, Democratic and Republican, would have had the chance to amend those bills in that committee and mark it up before it comes to the floor. That is the normal process. Both parties are now constituting those committees; we are putting people on them.

I heard you, Mr. Speaker, read just before we began this debate how a number of Members were officially appointed to those committees. That is what we do in our first week or two.

Fifty-six new Members should have a say on these bills. They will get a vote on the floor on these bills, but they were completely excluded from the committee process that wrote these bills. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker, to not allow 56 new Members of this body to be the lawmakers that the people of their districts elected them to do. In fact, it disenfranchises the tens of millions of people collectively that those 56 Members represent. And I hope that, for future legislation, we can move through regular order and allow the new Members, as well as those who are returning, to be part of the lawmaking process.

With regards to these bills, we have largely seen these bills in prior sessions that people who are no longer in this body worked on.

The HALOS Act, I was proud to support last session and I am proud to support again. It addresses a potentially real problem. There is guidance from the SEC that—in our Rules Committee meeting yesterday I questioned the subcommittee chair—largely also addresses those concerns, but it is better to do it in statute and it is better to do it in the broader language that is included in the bill, which is why many Democrats—I hope a majority—support the HALOS Act.

The United States is the leader in innovation in the global economy, and this is a small piece of that. What we are talking about here are demo days where entrepreneurs can pitch their idea. I, personally, have been able to attend a number of those, and it is a question of who can be in the room when that occurs.

Should it only be millionaires who are allowed in that room? Or can it be the next great generation of entrepreneurs? Can it be students? Can it be aspiring entrepreneurs? Can it be community members who want to learn what it means to pitch and how to do it and how ideas are spread, or maybe they are looking for a job?

It doesn't change who can invest in those startup companies. They still have to be qualified investors. By the way, I hope we have the opportunity to work with Republicans on the definition of "qualified investor" because I think it is unfair to restrict investment opportunities to multimillionaires. We need to allow educated and qualified investors of all levels.

Just because somebody is rich doesn't mean that they are a good investor, and just because somebody has not yet earned a lot of money doesn't mean that they can't be trusted to invest \$10,000 or \$50,000 of their own money.

We made progress in the original JOBS Act with the result of crowd-funded investing, but that is only a small piece—almost an insignificant piece. Private placements are the much larger piece of capital formation for venture-stage startups in our country. If there is a way we can have an alternative to the net worth test that allows individuals to, perhaps, take a qualitative test of their knowledge and, therefore, qualify as an investor, they ought to be able to do that, too.

This bill does not do any of that. That is a controversial area. It is one that it will take Democrats and Republicans working together on to help fund tomorrow's great companies and allow opportunity for all people, not just millionaires and billionaires.

What this bill does is it continues to restrict the actual investors to the millionaires. Okay? But it allows other people in the room at least. That is a start. It allows an MBA student who him- or herself wants to, perhaps, come up with their own company to hear 10 or 20 companies pitch so they can assemble their own deck; somebody who might have a great amount of value to give as a mentor who themselves is a veteran of a number of companies. Maybe they are not quite worth a couple of million dollars. Maybe they are worth only—only, right?—\$500,000. Maybe they were a reasonably successful person worth \$500,000, but they have a lot of knowledge to give.

Without the HALOS Act, it would be unclear whether that person would even be allowed in that room. So we want to make sure that mentors, up and coming, young entrepreneurs, and, frankly, up-and-coming entrepreneurs of all ages have access to the knowledge and the learning that can occur in these pitch events.

Congress has a role in making sure we have laws in place that really help build an environment that promotes innovation. When we passed the JOBS Act in 2012 that allowed for crowd-funding, Congress took a step forward. We have room to go there, room to go with private placements.

The HALOS Act is a small step, but it is a good one and a noncontroversial one. It creates a clear path for startups to participate in demo days, sponsored by government entities, nonprofits, angel investment groups, et cetera, and

a clear safe harbor from the SEC with regard to the definition of general solicitation to make it clear that business experts and others can be in the room, while maintaining that only existing accredited investors can actually participate in offerings under Regulation D for the purchases or sale of securities that are mentioned in those demonstrations.

Currently, sponsors of demo days are relying on the 12-year-old, no-action letter by the SEC to make sure that they don't face the consequences of failing to comply. The guidelines outlined by the SEC's no-action letter are actually incorporated into the HALOS Act. So, in many ways, this clarifies and puts in statute something that has been at the whim of the SEC for too long.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and others will join me in talking about the importance of angel investors for early stage capital to create jobs, to allow tomorrow's great entrepreneur who might not have any resources of their own today to raise the resources they need to hire people and succeed.

The Center for Venture Research estimates that U.S. angel investors invested \$24.6 billion in about 71,000 small businesses in every area, every congressional district of our country. Many of those were startups in the early stages of building a company.

Tomorrow's company that employs 10,000 or even 50,000 people is today's garage startup trying to figure out how to get \$50,000 or raise \$100,000 to make their payroll or buy their inventory.

Angel investors focus their investment on local startups and much more so than, for instance, national venture capital firms that tend to be clustered at the coast. It is an important way we can continue to grow the economy in every ZIP code in this country, across the heartland and the middle of the country, not just the coasts where the venture capital firms themselves are situated.

The Colorado-based digital home design firm, Havenly, started by two sisters, utilized demo days as networking opportunities to perfect their pitch to investors, a very common path. After participating in a 500-startup demo day, the pair received nearly \$13 million in investment capital from qualified investors. Now Havenly is a thriving business, employs hundreds of interior designers across the country, and I am proud to say it has a staff of 40 people in their Colorado headquarters. Havenly is a perfect example of how demo days provide opportunities to startups that create real jobs for real people in our country.

The HALOS Act simply gives the same opportunities to other startups that thousands of others have had when getting off the ground.

I believe the HALOS Act is the appropriate approach to regulatory relief. I appreciate the bipartisan nature of the legislation. It is targeted to pro-

vide clarity around a specific potential problem and certainty around what these events can entail.

Now, there is another bill under this rule as well. It is a bad bill. It is not a strong bipartisan bill. It is called H.R. 79. Since we began the 115th Congress here, the Republicans are promoting a deregulation agenda. Often this agenda results in this body, Congress, potentially being buried in having to do inordinate amounts of work to review the executive branch of government.

Now, we all believe in oversight of the executive branch. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, you are going to hear many Democrats speaking up about how important oversight of the executive branch is, particularly for the incoming administration.

We are not the executive branch. Congress delegates authority to agencies, under the laws we write, to fill in gaps and decide how best to implement the law. If we disagree, we can always change or amend the authorizing statute to make more clear the intent of this body.

However, these bills being brought to the floor by the Republicans would either require Congress to spell out exactly what ways to implement a policy in a changing world or give the authority of how to interpret and implement law to the judicial system, neither of which are wise or expedient choices regardless of who occupies the Presidency.

While I certainly will have more sympathy with this approach with President Trump in the White House than President Obama in the White House, I still believe this is the wrong way to go about the separation of powers under our Constitution.

This bill sets out 60 new analytical requirements that agency actions must meet before they can be implemented. In other words, any attempt by agencies to protect the public from toxic substances, make sure our planes and trains are meeting safety regulations, or make sure our food is toxin free would be subject to 60 new bureaucratic hurdles, effectively creating more and more red tape to tie the bureaucracy up rather than make their work quicker and more efficient, which is what Democrats seek to do.

This bill would bury the agency rule-making process under a blizzard of bureaucratic hurdles and documentation requirements, literally burying the executive and administrative branch of government in red tape and paperwork. This bill would hold the regulatory process hostage to the whims of the very corporations and bureaucrats whose rulemaking it is designed to address.

The process that the bills call for have been roundly discredited by so many experts on regulatory policy from the left and the right and consumer advocates as well. The administrative law and regulatory practices section of the American Bar Association stated that these burdens would

reduce transparency, reduce public input, threaten public safety, and, most importantly, not result in any better rules.

This bill is nothing other than a recycled effort that 56 Members of this body have not had a chance to participate in writing through the committee process to slow down the government and get in the way of agency rulemakings that are critical for protecting public health, safety, and our environment.

We are simply failing our constituents that we are elected to serve by spending time on legislation that would deliberately sabotage our own ability for our government to function efficiently. This is a bill that would make government less efficient. That is not what I hear when I am back home from my constituents—Democrat, Republican, Independent. I don't hear: Go to Washington to make government less efficient. My constituents want government to be more efficient.

Finally, this bill is being considered under a structured rule limiting the amendment process. There were over 30 amendments filed. Yet, we are only considering 16 amendments under this very overly restrictive rule. This is particularly onerous because, again, there was no opportunity for the 56 new Members through the committee process to amend this bill.

There was a new Member that appeared before the Rules Committee yesterday. Unfortunately, he was not even allowed to advance his amendment to the floor under this rule.

Another example is an amendment offered by a new Member, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, who filed an amendment that would ensure that LGBT employees are protected from workplace discrimination. It would allow Federal agencies that are tasked with protecting the civil rights of employees to continue to do their work without being hamstrung with unnecessary requirements.

Civil rights protections do not fit neatly into a corporate monetary analysis, and our government has a responsibility to ensure that all Americans are protected from arbitrary or unjust discrimination based on race, gender, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

Given the breadth and scope of this legislation, an open amendment process would have allowed this amendment to be debated if the majority wanted, perhaps even voted down, although I hope the majority would have approved it. It would have produced a more thoughtful piece of legislation. Yet, we are not even allowed to have that debate on the floor of the House, which is why this rule is wrong and why I stand in strong opposition to it.

We should be considering legislation to create permanent, high-paying jobs, investing in infrastructure to grow our communities, fixing our broken immigration system, and streamlining and improving our tax system through tax reform rather than recycling old bills

that 56 Members have not even had the opportunity to put their imprint on.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule for those very reasons.

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

□ 1300

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is no better way to start this Congress fresh but with some understanding. It is very clear, and it has become obvious to Members here on the floor, that there is a discussion going on. And, Mr. Speaker, if Members would like to see the difference that is being portrayed here on the floor today, it is very obvious. There is one party that is really concerned about tying the hands of bureaucrats; and there is one party, the majority, that is looking to untie the hands of the American people. I think I will side on the side of the American people and job creators and job promoters, and those who go out every day and earn a living.

We worked on this last Congress, and I will talk about it again here. Let's not start the strongman that Republicans are wanting to do away with all regulations. We do not. We want government to operate in the most efficient manner possible and do what it needs to do, but also get out of the way.

The problem with government, many times the government has overstepped where it needs to be, and it needs to be out of the way to start with.

Also, I would like to at least clear the record and make something understood. At the beginning of the year, we are bringing a rule. We had a full Rules Committee hearing yesterday, and Members were able to offer amendments. Not all amendments were made in order. Sixteen amendments were made in order on both sides of the aisle. I would like to remind Members, Mr. Speaker, as we go back in history, we are promoting discussion here in the Rules Committee and bringing to the floor and allowing Members to talk about amendments and give them the opportunity.

I will just remind Members, Mr. Speaker, in the 111th Congress, which was controlled by my friends on the other side of the aisle, in the very first rule bill they brought, the rules for the House, they put two major bills in the rules package that did not even get a rules hearing, that did not get anything except just pushed to the floor. I think we will stand firm that we are pushing to the floor stuff that Americans care about, and also doing it in a way that Members can participate.

Speaking of that, the American people, especially the good folks of Nebraska, have sent to us a new Member, and I have gotten the chance to know him.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ne-

braska (Mr. BACON), and I welcome him to the floor.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill which provides for H.R. 5, the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2017.

I promised my district in eastern Nebraska that I would work my hardest to rein in an out-of-control bureaucracy that is burdening our Nation with over 3,000 new regulations each year. The cumulative cost of all of these regulations passed each year cost approximately \$2 trillion, almost 10 percent of our GDP. That is a tremendous burden, and it largely falls on our small businesses, farmers, and community banks.

I meet often with our local, small business owners. The top concern that I hear, and they are loud and clear, and I hear it over and over, is that regulations and ObamaCare are preventing them from growing, and, in some cases, making it very difficult for them to stay afloat. There is anger that the health of our businesses are not being undermined by competition or new technology, but they are being undermined by their own government, and they are angry about it.

I have promised my district that I will be aware and push back on these regulations and on a bureaucracy that is on steroids. That is what we are doing today by passing H.R. 5 and by passing these rules.

I think one of the Members of the very first Congress and the writer of our Constitution would be proud to see H.R. 5 passed. James Madison thought the separation of powers was vital to the safeguarding of our Republic. In recent years, we have seen that separation of powers undermined by an overzealous bureaucracy that creates laws, then executes those laws, and then acts as their own appeal authority. Madison said the accumulation of powers—legislative, executive, and judiciary—in the same hands is the very definition of tyranny. Today, we move toward the right balance, toward restoring the separation of powers and lifting the burden that has been put on our small businesses and farmers.

I urge support for the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, when we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up a bill that would establish a national commission to investigate foreign interference in the 2016 election.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we have all been very concerned about the reports from our own intelligence agencies

about foreign interference in the 2016 American elections.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) to discuss our proposal, the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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

I rise in strong opposition to this rule so that it can be amended to include consideration of H.R. 356, Protecting Our Democracy Act, which is sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) and yours truly.

Mr. Speaker, we are presently in a struggle for the soul of our democracy. This legislation would create an independent commission to examine Russian attacks on our electoral process. I am pleased that all of my House Democratic colleagues have joined in this bill and that similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate.

I want to be clear about why we are here today. It is not just about the past. It is about the future. The CIA, the FBI, and the NSA have issued a declassified report warning that Russian entities acted under the orders of Vladimir Putin to execute “an influence campaign,” and they say they did this “to undermine public faith in the United States democratic process.” Again, I say: our democracy is under attack.

Our intelligence agencies explain that Moscow's attacks will not end with the attacks they launched in 2016. They warn that Moscow “will apply lessons learned from its campaign aimed at the U.S. Presidential election to future influence efforts in the United States and worldwide. . . .” Democracy under attack.

These Russian attacks on our electoral process were attacks on our Constitution, our people, and they are attacks on our great Nation. Our intelligence agencies are warning that if we do not respond now, the Russians will attack us again.

Mr. Speaker, we must not take our democracy for granted. We must guard this democracy. We must guard the fundamental foundation of that democracy, and that is a vote, and a vote with integrity. We are all Members of the Congress of the United States of America. We have taken an oath to protect and defend our Constitution and our great Nation. That is what this legislation is about. It is not about Donald Trump. It is not about Hillary Clinton. It is not about Republicans, Democrats, or independents. It is not even about 2016. It is about our future, and it is about generations yet unborn. We cannot allow ourselves to be distracted from our solemn duty and our solemn oath. We cannot allow foreign attacks on our electoral process to become normal or inevitable. They are neither.

This legislation attempts to rise above politics. If there was any moment in our history when we should be rising above politics, it is this moment.

This commission is intended to be truly bipartisan, to have an equal number of Democrats and Republicans, to examine how Russia and any other foreign powers interfered with our elections, including hacking Federal and State political parties and disseminating fake news stories intended to warp public opinion.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Most importantly, this bipartisan and independent commission will make recommendations to try to prevent any foreign power from interfering in our elections again. I sincerely hope Republicans, including the President-elect, who, for the first time ever, will swear his own oath to protect and defend our Constitution, will join us in supporting this independent commission.

I urge all Members to vote “no” on the previous question so this rule can be amended to require consideration of the Protecting Our Democracy Act.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado, and I thank my good friend from Georgia. It is important to take note of the value of democracy and the discourse on this floor, and my friendship with the gentleman from Georgia, but absolute disagreement with him on our purposes here.

Yes, regulation should be fair, and it should cede to the administrative process and the administrative laws that dictate how they should be formulated, and that fairness should be their underpinnings. But I think my constituents, in terms of the regulatory scheme, are far more interested in clean water and clean air. They are far more interested in making sure that consumer products that impact toddlers and babies are enforced. They are far more interested in ensuring that there is competition to the FTC, and that there are fair energy laws to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

Having said that, I am disappointed as well that we are moving forward on H.R. 5, which is a bill that went through the Judiciary Committee, and, as my colleague from Colorado said, with 56 new Members, it did not go through regular order. We are recycling the same bad bill again.

I rise today to express concern over the number of amendments that were presented that were good amendments that did not get in. Before I speak to the amendment I am concerned about, first, I want to speak to the previous

question. I support the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) on a very important statement, and that is in the tragedy and the heinousness of 9/11, we formulated the 9/11 Commission.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more heinousness than a foreign nation interfering with the just and fair voting of every American. There are many who lost their life in the name of one vote, one person. For that reason, I would make the argument that it is imperative that this bill be amended to create the commission that will address the question of foreign intrusion, particularly Russian intrusion and hacking in our election.

I believe this election was skewed, in spite of the peaceful democratic transfer of government, which we will all adhere to, but there is no doubt. This does not compete to 2001 with President Bush in Florida. It does not compete to 2004 with Mr. Kerry. It is beyond any kind of comprehension of what happened in this election, a direct intrusion and skewing of this election. But, more importantly, protecting the systems of election and the voting rights, the preciousness of the voting rights, is crucial to democracy.

This commission, independent of any of the committees that should be working—and I agree, Congress should be working. Senator MCCAIN has already begun working—a Republican—but this commission would be a vital asset. So I am certainly disappointed that the amendment I had that was crucial as relates to cybersecurity to deal with the question of cyber intrusion was not made in order. It would have been appropriate for us to have an amendment that would have spoken directly to the idea of identifying new tactics or techniques that a malicious actor might deploy, or detect and disrupt an ongoing intrusion, in addition to protecting the data that enables cybersecurity firms and other network defenders to identify certain malware that the Russian intelligence services use.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

This amendment would have been vital to have not only a vigorous discussion on the floor but also to recognize that cybersecurity has now become a potential weapon. I have worked on this issue for a decade as the former chairwoman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee. It was under my subcommittee that we began to look at electric grids and began to see the enormous power of the cyber world. My amendment should have been included because we are now faced with what the cyber world used as a weapon can do. I am disappointed that that amendment was not made in order. I am disappointed that H.R. 5 is again before us

without regular order, and would hope that we have the opportunity to vote for and support the previous question to find out what happened and who conspired to alter our elections in 2016.

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

I strongly oppose this rule because it makes in order H.R. 5, the Regulatory Accountability Act of 2017, which is a radical measure that could make it impossible to promulgate safety regulations to protect the public.

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

My opposition to H. Res. 33 is amplified by the Rules Committee's decision to decline to make in order the Jackson Lee Amendment, “to provide an exception for regulations that help prevent cyberattacks on election processes or institutions.”

Apparently, House Republicans are still reluctant to debate the subject—undisputed by our Intelligence community—of Russian cyberattacks on American cyber networks and infrastructure.

Key Judgments in the Intelligence Community Assessment's declassified version of a highly classified report entitled, “Assessing Russian Activities and Intentions in Recent U.S. Elections,” have confirmed that 2016 witnessed the first American presidential election that was the subject of cyberattacks.

These and other subversive activities have been confirmed to have been perpetrated by entities allied with the Government of Russia and were undertaken for the express purpose of influencing the presidential contest to secure the election of its preferred candidate, Donald Trump, who made history by becoming the first presidential candidate to invite a hostile foreign power to launch cyberattacks against his political opponent.

All three agencies, CIA, FBI and NSA, agree with this judgment.

The so-called Regulatory Accountability Act (RAA), in addition to this rule, demonstrates the deceptive design of the majority to make it harder to establish regulations to protect the public by tilting the entire regulatory system significantly toward special interests.

The bill allows Federal courts without expertise on technical issues to substitute their judgment for those of the expert federal agencies.

These agencies are staffed with career subject matter experts that are deeply knowledgeable of the background, context, and history of agency actions and policy rationale.

For this reason, courts have long deferred to agency experts who are in the best position to carry out the statutes.

The RAA would end this well-established practice and allow far less experienced judges to second-guess expert opinion—essentially sanctioning judicial activism.

The Jackson Lee Amendment, however, would have attuned this dangerous legislation to provide an exception for regulation upon which Americans so greatly rely on their government to help prevent cyberattacks on our highly coveted and esteemed election processes and institutions.

The bill promoted by the majority, calling for accountability from our Administrative Agencies—fails to answer in accountability to the threat posed by foreign and domestic invaders on our national cyber networks.

As the new Congress commences in the People's House, obstructionist Republicans are circumventing the very procedures by which elected officials answer the cries of outrage and dismay of desperately concerned constituents.

To the obstructionist majority perpetuating this restrictive rule, let me stand firm in the American convictions laid bare by the Jackson Lee amendment—the system of Checks and Balances established by the Separation of Powers clause of the Constitution will not be thwarted.

The spirit of the H.R. 5 is clearly designed to stop all regulation dead in its tracks—no matter the threat to cyber networks, national security, economy, or the very health and safety of the American people.

We know that Russia's cyber activities were intended to influence the election, erode faith in U.S. democratic institutions, sow doubt about the integrity of our electoral process, and undermine confidence in the institutions of the U.S. government. These actions are unacceptable and will not be tolerated.

The mission of the Intelligence Community is to seek to reduce the uncertainty surrounding foreign activities, capabilities, or leaders' intentions.

On these issues of great importance to U.S. national security, the goal of intelligence analysis is to provide assessments to decision makers that are intellectually rigorous, objective, timely, and useful, and that adhere to tradecraft standards.

Applying these standards helps ensure that the Intelligence Community provides U.S. policymakers, warfighters, and operators with the best and most accurate insight, warning, and context, as well as potential opportunities to advance U.S. national security.

This objective is difficult to achieve when seeking to understand complex issues on which foreign actors go to extraordinary lengths to hide or obfuscate their activities.

My amendment would have improved H.R. 5 by exempting only those regulations critical to making cyber networks invulnerable to attack from foreign and domestic agencies and individuals.

Specifically, the amendment that the Rules committee disallowed for presentation on a vote here on the floor today would have provided the American people an exemption to allow for the prevention of tampering, alteration, or misappropriation of information by agents of foreign countries with the purpose or effect of interfering with or undermining election processes or institutions.

In particular, restrictions put forth in H.R. 5 could result in further delay to agencies attempting to take action to help network defenders better identify new tactics or techniques that a malicious actor might deploy or detect and disrupt an ongoing intrusion, in addition to protecting data that enables cybersecurity firms and other network defenders to identify certain malware that the Russian intelligence services use.

The Regulatory Accountability Act provides no accountability to the American public.

Instead, it allows polluting industries and special interests to game the system and escape accountability for any harm they inflict.

It makes it incredibly difficult, if not impossible, to secure new public protections and arms industry with numerous tools to avoid their legal obligations.

The increasing use of cyber-enabled means to undermine democratic processes at home and abroad, as exemplified by Russia's recent activities, has made clear that a tool explicitly targeting attempts to interfere with elections is also warranted.

We cannot afford to let global terroristic threats, in the form of cyber activities, erode faith in U.S. democratic institutions, sow doubt about the integrity of our electoral process, influence elections, or undermine confidence in the institutions of the U.S. government.

My amendment would have offered protections guarding the integrity of our cyber networks, while at the same time allowing the bill to achieve the proponents' major purposes.

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

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

□ 1315

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and allow an amendment to be put forward on H.R. 356, the Protecting Our Democracy Act.

A public report was released on Friday by the FBI, the CIA, and the NSA, and it was chilling. It declared that Russia attacked our democracy in the past Presidential election. It said that the attack came from the Russian services themselves. It was ordered by Vladimir Putin and, most concerning, that Russia had a preferred candidate and that they sought to denigrate Secretary Clinton along the way.

Going forward, this is not about re-litigating the past. Donald Trump will be the next President. This is about preserving the integrity of our democracy and saying that our dialogue, our democracy, these fights between our parties, they belong to us.

The report also said that Russia intends to do this again. We know that Russia has done this before across the globe to our allies. They are doing it right now to other countries as they seek to move forward in their democracies. Now other foreign adversaries of ours will look at what Russia did, if we do nothing, and see an opportunity to strike us again.

So we have an opportunity, as Republicans and Democrats, to come together and say that the victims may have been the Democratic Party in this past election and, if history has its way, in the next election it may be a different party.

The constant will always remain this: both parties will unite to say, We believe that this democracy, which has been fought and sacrificed for, is worth defending. To do that, we should have an independent, bipartisan, appointed commission to look at how this was able to occur, why our democracy was

so vulnerable, and, most importantly, make recommendations to the public to ensure that this never happens again.

We should do this so, first, we can devote ourselves fully—with an independent commission, you have full-time members and full-time staffs—to understanding what happened.

Second, we should do this to depoliticize what has occurred. The incoming President has continuously undermined the findings of our 17 intelligence agencies that Russia was responsible. We should depoliticize this by taking this out of Congress and having an independent commission, once and for all, sign off on who was responsible and, again, make recommendations to protect us going forward.

We should also declassify, to the extent possible, the evidence behind the findings.

Finally, once this commission is formed and once congressional investigations also take place, the American people have to come together. We have to come together because we can never again let an outside meddler influence our elections. So we have every single House Democrat cosponsoring this legislation.

This legislation should not be partisan at all. When you talk to Republicans and you talk to Democrats in our districts and you talk to Independents, they all express a concern about what Russia did. So what we can do in this House is say: We are united. We are united to get to the bottom of what happened.

So I invite my Republican colleagues to join us in the search for what happened. Join us in this responsibility to do everything we can to tell our constituents that, in the next election, we won't let it happen again. Defeat the previous question and support H.R. 356, the Protecting Our Democracy Act.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, are there any more speakers the gentleman from Colorado has?

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close if the gentleman from Georgia is.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I am prepared for the gentleman to close. I reserve the balance of time.

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

Mr. Speaker, so, in summary, when we defeat the previous question, we will then bring forward our bill to establish an independent report on foreign interference in this most recent 2016 election, something that the American people deserve to see, that we need to see. We need to put safeguards in place to prevent our election system from being hijacked by foreign powers.

With regard to the rule, Mr. Speaker, it is a bad, closed rule, particularly given the chance that 56 new Members of Congress have not had the opportunity to add their imprint to the bills that are before us.

The gentleman mentioned, oh, the Democrats did this 10 years ago. Well,

that is hardly an excuse that the American people buy. There were many things about the Democrats' tenure in this body the American people didn't like; and to simply cite some of those less popular elements of Democratic leadership and now say: Well, now we Republicans are going to do earmarks; now we Republicans are going to have a closed process that doesn't allow amendment; now Republicans are going to gut the ethics rule.

In over 200 years, you can always cite some precedence for that from both Democrats and Republicans, but those aren't good things. We want to learn from our mistakes, I hope, and not say, just because some Democrat or some Republican did this in 1952, it is a good thing to do today.

Mr. Speaker, we are 6 days into the next Congress. After we defeat the rule, hopefully, and defeat the previous question, we can bring forward an independent study on foreign interference.

With regard to these two bills, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the HALOS Act and, of course, oppose the ridiculously broad H.R. 5, Regulatory Accountability Act, which would simply add more paperwork to the bureaucracy, further reducing the efficiency of a branch of government that many Americans believe is already too inefficient.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I serve a wonderful part of the world. With all due respect to all the other Members of Congress, I do believe it is one of the fairest in the country.

As I go around and travel, one of the things I have not heard, Mr. Speaker—and I am not sure if you have or other Members sitting here—I have never been hit, when I run into something saying the fact that government is efficient, and I am really wanting it to be efficient in a sense that it is working for me.

It is a very obvious statement here, and what we see time after time after time after time is rules and regulations that most of the American folks are saying: Government, do what you are supposed to be doing. Get us back on a fiscal financial path that is solid, that balances, that gets us back in understanding that we can't spend more than what we make or bring in, and that we have to have a strong national defense. Let's get back to the things that make America the shining light all around the world.

One of the things I do not hear them asking me to do, Mr. Speaker, is make it easier on bureaucrats in Washington. I have not had them beg and bring petitions to my table and say: Please make it easier on bureaucrats to run our lives.

That is not what we do. What we are trying to do is simply say: Let's get up,

go out to work, do the regulations that matter. Make sure that government does what it is supposed to do. Make sure that the balance of power is honored and not looked upon with disgrace. It is looked upon as something that should be taken care of. Let the legislative body be the legislative body. Let the executive be the executive, and let the judicial be the judicial.

I have no problem putting before the American people the choice: Do you want a party that will defend a bureaucracy that stifles them? Or a party of the majority, like we are, that are putting forward regulation reform that says, We want to help you; we are concerned about you?

Obvious choice, Mr. Speaker. Today we have two opportunities to this rule. They both look at our economic engines in the country and reviving it again.

The HALOS Act helps us ensure that small businesses have access to the capital necessary to grow and succeed. Small business is the backbone of our economy, and it makes sense to enact policies that promote the viability and growth.

The Regulatory Accountability Act restores simple checks and balances so that Congress, once again, makes laws so they work better for those who elected us.

It is time we demand the voice of the American people be heard rather than letting the others up here, separated in cubicles, decide what is best. When we look at that, the obvious choice is clear. You pass this rule, you vote "yes" on these bills, and you say to the American people: I agree with the majority.

We are looking after those that get up every day and have the American Dream in front of them and get up and say: I want to be better and I want my government to be out of the way.

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

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 33 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2

(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 356) to establish the National Commission on Foreign Interference in the 2016 Election. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and re-

port the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 356.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on agreeing to the resolution, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 179, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—234

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

Poe (TX)	Rutherford
Poliquin	Sanford
Posey	Scalise
Ratcliffe	Schweikert
Reed	Scott, Austin
Reichert	Sensenbrenner
Renacci	Sessions
Rice (SC)	Shimkus
Roby	Shuster
Roe (TN)	Simpson
Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)
Rokita	Smucker
Rooney, Francis	Stefanik
Rooney, Thomas J.	Stewart
Ros-Lehtinen	Stivers
Roskam	Taylor
Ross	Tenney
Rothfus	Thompson (PA)
Rouzer	Thornberry
Royce (CA)	Tiberi
Russell	Tipton
	Trott

NAYS—179

Adams	Fudge
Aguiar	Gabbard
Barragan	Gallego
Bass	Garamendi
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)
Bera	Gottheimer
Beyer	Green, Al
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Grijalva
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez
Bonamici	Hanabusa
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings
Brady (PA)	Heck
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)
Brownley (CA)	Himes
Bustos	Huffman
Butterfield	Jackson Lee
Capuano	Jayapal
Carbajal	Jeffries
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.
Carson (IN)	Keating
Cartwright	Kennedy
Castor (FL)	Khanna
Castro (TX)	Kihuen
Chu, Judy	Kildee
Cicilline	Kilmer
Clark (MA)	Kind
Clarke (NY)	Krishnamoorthi
Clay	Kuster (NH)
Cleaver	Langevin
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)
Cohen	Larson (CT)
Connolly	Lawrence
Conyers	Lawson (FL)
Cooper	Lee
Correa	Levin
Costa	Lewis (GA)
Courtney	Lieu, Ted
Crist	Lipinski
Cuellar	Loeb sack
Cummings	Lofgren
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal
DeFazio	Lowe
DeGette	Lujan Grisham,
Delaney	M.
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray
DelBene	Lynch
Demings	Maloney,
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.
Deutch	Maloney, Sean
Doggett	Matsui
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum
Ellison	McEACHIN
Engel	McGovern
Eshoo	McNerney
Españolat	Meeke
Esty	Meng
Evans	Moore
Foster	Moulton
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)
	Nadler
	Napolitano

NOT VOTING—21

Becerra	Jones
Crowley	Kelly (IL)
Davis, Danny	Mulvaney
Dingell	Perlmutter
Duncan (SC)	Pompeo
Hoyer	Price, Tom (GA)
Johnson (GA)	Richmond

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

□ 1346

Messrs. McEACHIN, BROWN of Maryland, SCOTT of Virginia, SCHNEIDER, and LAWSON of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HILL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

Stated against:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 26.

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 183, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

AYES—233

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

□ 1357
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.

Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thornberry
Titus
Trott
Tsongas
Vela
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin

THE JOURNAL

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

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 162, answered "present" 3, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]
YEAS—248

Adams
Aguilar
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Blumenthal
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
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
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 y
Lujan Grisham, M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McColumm
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schneider
Schrad er
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suo zzi
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schneider
Schrad er
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suo zzi
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Blumenthal
Bonamici
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Budd
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jeffries
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Levin
Lewis (MN)
Doggett
Donovan
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Portenberry
Poster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Green, Al
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Olson
Palmer
Panetta
Pascarell
Pelosi
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reichert
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Lipinski
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McEachin
McHenry
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palmer
Panetta
Pascarell
Pelosi
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reichert
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford

NAYS—162
Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragan
Bass
Bera
Beutler
Beyer
Blum
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Cardenas
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chaffetz
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crist
Crowley
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Espallat
Esty
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foxy
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallego
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Hill
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Khanna
Kihuen
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger
Knight
Kuster (NH)
LaHood
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Mast
McColumm
McGovern
McKinley
McSally
Meehan
Moolenaar
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Nolan
O'Halleran
Palazzo
Pallone
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosuzer
Sarbanes
Schiff
Schrad er
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Stivers
Suo zzi
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Wilson (FL)
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Payne
Rice (SC)
Tonko
Becerra
Davis, Danny
Dingell
Duncan (SC)
Gohmert
Grijalva
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kelly (IL)
Mulvaney
Perlmutter
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rosen

NOT VOTING—21

NOT VOTING—18
Becerra
Davis, Danny
Dingell
Duncan (SC)
Gutiérrez
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kelly (IL)
McCaul
Mulvaney
Perlmutter
Pompeo
Price, Tom (GA)
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez
Schakowsky
Takano
Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1405

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO 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. 39

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

(1) Committee on House Administration—Ms. Lofgren.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELPING ANGELS LEAD OUR STARTUPS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 79, to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities laws, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 33 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 79.

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

□ 1408

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 79) to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law, with Mr. BOST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 79, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act, also known as the HALOS Act.

I remind all Members that the House passed this bill just a few months ago with overwhelming support from both Republicans and Democrats by a vote

of 325–89, Mr. Chairman, almost 4 to 1. It is hard to get more bipartisan than that.

It has received overwhelming bipartisan support because then and now the HALOS Act will help create needed jobs and grow our economy. I think we all know, Mr. Chairman, from listening to our constituents, jobs in the economy continue to be the number one issue of concern of the American people.

I commend the bipartisan sponsors of this bill, Mr. CHABOT, the chairman of the Small Business Committee, who we will hear from soon, and Ms. SINEMA, who serves with me on the Financial Services Committee. I also thank the six Republicans and four Democrats who joined them as original cosponsors.

These Members reached across the aisle and produced legislation that is especially important to America's small businesses. Let's remember, Mr. Chairman, that half-half—the people who work in this country earn or work at small businesses, which historically create two-thirds of all the new jobs in America. So small business—small business—is the job engine of America.

Our economy clearly works better for working Americans when small businesses thrive and they can focus on creating jobs rather than navigating bureaucratic red tape, red tape that disproportionately hurts the small businesses and startup companies that we are counting on to create jobs for our constituents.

Burdensome regulations make it harder for entrepreneurs to access startup capital, and they place credit out of reach for many who wish to start up a small business. Many of these harmful regulations arise from complicated laws, like the Dodd-Frank Act. Overall, small business loans are at a 25-year low, in large part due to regulatory burdens on our community banks and credit unions.

Even the former Director of the Small Business Administration, appointed by President Obama, admitted as much when she said: "Small banks have been laden with excessive costs and confusion from overlapping regulations, which are getting in the way of their ability to make small business loans."

We simply must not allow our security laws to inhibit the free flow of investment capital to Main Street. The HALOS Act provides an important regulatory solution to make it easier for small businesses to attract investments and put both the "open for business" and "we are hiring" signs on their front doors.

The bill provides a clear path for startups to connect with angel investors and allows investors to make their own informed decisions. Angel investors, Mr. Chairman, have a huge impact on economic growth. Famous companies like Amazon, Costco, Google, Facebook, and Starbucks were all first funded by angel investors.

That is just how important this matter is. Today, approximately 600,000 employees earn their paychecks from working for these specific companies.

Unfortunately, when Washington bureaucrats get involved, we often see the dreaded "unintended consequences" of red tape. Five years ago, Congress passed the bipartisan JOBS Act to make it easier for business startups to gain access to critical capital. But the Securities and Exchange Commission instead issued regulations on angel investors that have the complete opposite effect. This is a problem Congress can easily fix by passing a bipartisan HALOS Act, which will ensure that funding from angel investors remains available to small business startups.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot have employees, unless you first have employers. You cannot have jobs without job creators. And that is what this bill is all about—jobs. It is about helping small businesses overcome misguided Washington red tape so they can create jobs.

I urge all Members to support this commonsense bipartisan bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 79, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act. This bill, under the guise of helping angel groups attract additional investors for small businesses and startups, would alter the balance between capital formation and investor protection that we sought to achieve in the JOBS Act.

Let me remind my colleagues of what we did in the wake of the financial crisis when bank lending was scarce. Our Nation's startups had trouble getting off the ground and attracting new capital. Previously, they had done so using rule 506, which allows companies to sell private securities to accredited investors who are financially savvy and have the means to bear their heightened risks and lack of SEC oversight. As a condition to using rule 506, however, companies could not solicit purchasers from or advertise to the general public.

□ 1415

This condition was viewed as a barrier to capital formation for startups. Therefore, Democrats worked with Republicans to provide companies in the JOBS Act with an alternative so that they could broadly advertise and solicit new investors.

Recognizing the need to balance investor protection with this expansion, Ranking Member WATERS offered an amendment requiring companies to take reasonable steps to verify that the ultimate purchaser was an accredited investor. This verification requirement is a necessary investor protection designed to prevent unsophisticated investors from purchasing—either accidentally or by fraudulent means—risky, illiquid, and lightly regulated Rule 506 securities.

I would remind my Republican colleagues that this amendment was agreed to unanimously, in part because the amended provision struck the appropriate balance between capital formation and investor protection. Nevertheless, here we are today seeking to alter it in H.R. 79.

This bill would remove the verification requirement and allow companies to broadly solicit and advertise their private stock at any event sponsored by a college, nonprofit, government organization, angel investor group, or other group. That means that America's college students can walk into an event on campus and be talked into buying stock that they don't understand and may not ever be able to sell. Having created this initial relationship, the company can then sell the students stock without ever checking if they are accredited investors.

What is more, the bill would make it much easier for fraudsters to swindle unsophisticated investors by, for example, encouraging the unsophisticated investors to buy stock in a fake or failing company, only to sell off their own stock at artificially inflated prices.

Republicans claim that the bill is merely a clarification; that these demo days are not merely solicitations or advertisements in and of themselves and can be used by companies to generally discuss investment opportunities along with their products and services with the general public. But that is not the case.

Companies can already go to a broadly advertised, widely attended demo day and discuss their businesses and not implicate the securities laws if they don't offer securities for sale or otherwise condition the market for their security, but the bill would allow them to offer securities or condition the market by describing the type and amount of stock they are offering, the intended use of the proceeds, or any of the other information in subsection (a)(4) of the bill.

Therefore, today, a company discussing such information would have two options: one, to ensure that the event is limited to persons with whom they or the event organizer has a pre-existing, substantive relationship or have been contacted through an informal personal network; or two, verify at the time of purchase that their investors are accredited by, for example, looking at bank statements, W-2s, or third-party verification letters.

The bill would allow companies to avoid both options and broadly advertise their stock, solicit purchases from the general public, and never check to make sure they are financially sophisticated, accredited investors. The only limitation—that the stock offerings only be at events sponsored by certain groups—does not provide a meaningful investor protection. Phony private universities or nonprofits that may be guilty of fraud themselves can hardly be held accountable for policing it in stock offerings.

So rather than clarify existing law and preserve the compromise we struck in the JOBS Act, H.R. 79 provides a potential loophole that is overbroad and harmful to investors.

Mr. Chairman, I am even more troubled that Republicans have brought this bill and another Financial Services Committee bill to the floor this week without a hearing or a committee markup. In fact, there are 10 new Republican Members and 4 new Democratic Members on our committee that have never even considered this bill.

Collectively, they represent millions of Americans that are being denied the right to better understand this legislation. It is deeply troubling that Republicans have decided to use their newfound power to rush through changes under cover of night without the benefits of an open, public process.

For these reasons, I oppose H.R. 79.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds just to say that hearings have been held in a markup in the last Congress on this bill and the 10 new Republican Members are anxious to vote on this. I am unaware of any new Democrat Members having been appointed to our committee as of yet.

I am now very happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), coauthor of the HALOS Act, a champion for small business because he is, indeed, the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue. I rise in strong support of H.R. 79, the bipartisan HALOS Act.

As the chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I have the honor and pleasure of hearing and speaking with many of America's small-business owners and their employees almost every day. I hear case after case of small-business owners working days and nights and weekends. I hear stories of sacrifice. I hear inspiring stories of success.

But all too often, I hear about how the government continues to make it difficult for small businesses to prosper and grow and create more jobs, which is, obviously, very important to our Nation and its economy.

Perhaps one of the most common and most alarming concerns is just how difficult it is for entrepreneurs who are starting out to access the capital they need in order to grow. We must provide entrepreneurs a better way to build their businesses. The HALOS Act does just that.

The Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act expands access to capital by ensuring small businesses are able to continue to connect and interact with angel investors. One popular way in which small businesses connect with angel investors is through demo days. These exciting events are sponsored by universities, nonprofits, local governments, and many other groups that

allow entrepreneurs to showcase their products and informally meet investors and customers. However, SEC regulations are threatening to force these events out of business by imposing unwieldy regulations that dictate who is and who is not allowed to simply attend.

These ill-considered regulations would force everybody who merely walks through the door to go through what is essentially a full financial examination—handing over tax documents, bank statements, paycheck information, and on and on. This just doesn't make sense. We should be encouraging participation in demo days, not creating obstacles. We should be allowing the largest group of attendees to gather in the room, not be limiting who can walk through the door. After all, not only are these events places to connect people with our communities' small businesses, but they also provide a great opportunity for our next generation of entrepreneurs to ask questions and learn what it takes for a business to open its doors and be successful.

I thank Chairman HENSARLING for his leadership as well as Representatives SINEMA and SCHNEIDER for working in a cooperative and bipartisan manner.

An identical bill, as the chairman mentioned, passed this House in the last session of Congress in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion. We must continue to work together to create an environment in which our small businesses—the engines of our economy—grow and flourish. This bill is one more step in that direction.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 79.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the distinguished chairman of the Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. I thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, we all know that small businesses and entrepreneurs are what drive the American economy. We meet them in our districts and we see firsthand the benefits that their dreams and hard work provide to our constituents and to our communities.

These innovators, entrepreneurs, and risk-takers are really small-business people who are critical for our country's economic prosperity. Small businesses helped to create more than 60 percent of the Nation's net new jobs over the past two decades. So if our Nation is going to have an economy that provides opportunities for every American, then we must promote and encourage the success and growth of our small businesses and our startups.

In order to succeed, these companies need capital and credit—the lifeblood for growth, expansion, and job creation. Yet, the government continues

to construct arbitrary walls that cut them off from essential financing as smaller companies are caught up in red tape that was created, frankly, for the largest public companies, but those public companies have the financial means to hire lawyers and accountants and management consultants and all of those things that would then guide them through the sheer weight, volume, and complexity of the Federal securities laws.

Congress has made strides in tailoring the regulatory environment for smaller companies, most notably when we passed with strong bipartisan support the Jumpstart Our Business Startups, or JOBS Act, in 2012. The JOBS Act's benefits are notable as more and more companies use its provisions to raise investment capital in both the public and private markets.

One essential form of capital for many startups comes from angel investors—sophisticated, high net-worth individuals who invest their own money into startups and other early stage companies. Not many college students of whom I am aware would fit that definition of a sophisticated, high net-worth individual. In 2015, angel investors deployed over \$24 billion to about 71,000 startups—many of these investments going to companies in their own communities and States. Beyond capital, angels provide advice and guidance to help these companies succeed and create jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is important to note that companies such as Amazon, Costco, Facebook, Google, and Starbucks, among a myriad of others that we have not necessarily heard of as public names, were all initially funded by angel investors. Without angel investors, these very successful companies would have never gotten off the ground.

Yet, the Securities and Exchange Commission, whose neglect of its statutory mission to facilitate capital formation necessitated that Congress pass the JOBS Act in the first place, has further restricted startups from interacting with angel investors at demo days and similar pitch events. Startups rely on demo days and similar events to build relationships with angels and other investors and generate interest in their companies and their ideas. These events existed prior to the JOBS Act, but the SEC's rules jeopardize their future.

H.R. 79, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups, or HALOS Act, is a common-sense, bipartisan bill that is aimed at removing a significant regulatory hurdle for innovative companies and startups that seek early stage equity investments. Specifically, the HALOS Act would clarify that these demo days, which are sponsored by angel investor groups, universities, municipalities, and nonprofits, are not considered to be general solicitations and would, instead, ensure that angel funding remains available to those businesses that seek investment capital. These are really educational opportunities.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will claim that the HALOS Act guts critical investor protections and will subject honest, hardworking Americans to rampant fraud. We just had an example of college students being brought up. That is simply not true.

A company that offers securities to investors under these rules may only sell their securities to sophisticated or accredited investors. If these individuals do not meet the standards of an accredited investor, they are not then eligible or even allowed to invest in these types of startups that would participate in a demo day.

Instead, the HALOS Act is a simple, bipartisan, bicameral, and, I might add, short bill that will provide small innovative companies and startups the ability to interact with angels and other investors who can provide the capital that they need to succeed, grow, and create jobs.

Indeed, Senator CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut said it best when he introduced the HALOS Act last Congress: "I have heard from local entrepreneurs and interested backers alike that the most important thing we can do to help these businesses is to make it easier for angel investors to put capital behind them—and that is exactly what our bipartisan HALOS Act will do."

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, that was Senator CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut.

I commend the efforts of Representatives CHABOT and SINEMA for working together across the aisle on a bipartisan, positive solution.

Last Congress, the HALOS Act passed this very body with an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 325–89. I have high hopes that H.R. 79 will enjoy another strong, bipartisan vote.

I encourage all my colleagues to support its adoption.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from the Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises for yielding to me and, also, thank Chairman HENSARLING for his work.

Today, I am proud to speak in support of the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups, or HALOS Act. I would also thank Chairman CHABOT and Congressman SINEMA for putting forth this important bipartisan legislation, and I am a proud cosponsor.

I am fortunate enough to regularly hear from innovators across Illinois and through my work on the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee. These are the people who harness technology to accomplish the im-

possible, whether that is making life-changing medical breakthroughs or just finding a better way to do everyday tasks.

As we all know, startups are the job creators that drive our economy by creating new jobs that can get our constituents back to work.

Angel investors play a key role in the earliest stages of these startups. They provide the initial rounds of funding to help these life-changing ideas get off the ground. We shouldn't have unnecessary barriers in place for our innovators to have access to the capital they need to grow.

The situation we currently find ourselves facing is frustrating for startups and potential investors. There is some regulatory uncertainty from implementation of the JOBS Act. In short, Regulation D may imply a demo day is a general solicitation, which would require companies to identify if investors meet the definition of accredited.

If demo days are treated as general solicitations, startups and investors are required to comply with burdensome, third-party verification rules. However, the purpose of these demo days is not to seek investors. It simply is to promote good ideas. No solicitations or sales of securities take place. This confusion may prevent any conversation—even a very informal one—between angel investors and startups from happening. This can be easily clarified by the legislation under consideration today.

As I mentioned, startup companies frequently participate in demo days to increase the visibility of their company, explain their ideas, and hope to informally attract investors. These demo days are sponsored by a variety of organizations interested in promoting innovation and job creation. For example, the University of Illinois' Research Park told me that this bill would make things like the Cozad New Venture Competition, Urbana-Champaign Angel Network or UCAN angel presentations, the Share the Vision technology showcase, pitch practice at EnterpriseWorks, and other public forums for startups in Illinois problematic. They want to encourage showcases of startups without fear of these programs constituting a formal fundraising solicitation to report to the SEC.

The bill simply clarifies SEC regulations to ensure startups may participate in educational demo days without having to verify that attendees are accredited investors. That is a common-sense, technical fix, and it is no surprise that we had such a strong bipartisan vote of approval in the House last Congress.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this job-creating legislation.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chair, I rise today not only in strong support of the

HALOS Act but for the entrepreneurs everywhere in this country.

The facts are simple. Angel investors provide vital, often necessary capital for startup companies. Unfortunately, after the passage of the JOBS Act, the SEC made this more difficult, placing unnecessary burdens on companies who are just starting out.

Mr. Speaker, the positive impact these startups often have on a community are staggering. In the City of Austin, which I am proud to represent, startup companies provide more than just new technologies. They provide jobs, they generate taxes, and they give back to their local community. In 2015 alone, tech companies in Austin were able to raise almost a billion dollars in new capital. With our economy still on the mend from the financial collapse in 2007, it is time to give businesses, both large and small, the resources they need to compete in an often competitive environment.

H.R. 79 rightly amends the SEC Act of 1933 to formally define an angel investor group and exempts them from having to comply with burdensome, third-party verification rules. The HALOS Act provides essential protection for trade associations that often facilitate such meetings between investors and fund managers, continuing to cultivate small business capital formation relationships. This change may be small, but the impact will be great.

Mr. Speaker, I will end my remarks by saying this: If the 115th Congress is serious about jobs, serious about turning our economy around, and serious about real change, passing bills like the HALOS Act will be paramount to our success.

I urge all Members to support Chairman CHABOT's bill.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF), a new member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 79, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act. This important legislation has the ability to produce real results that Congress continually promises their constituents.

When I decided to seek office, a major driving force was the governmental overreach that I saw at home in west Tennessee. The financial crisis of 2008 crushed the middle class and lower classes across America.

West Tennesseans were hit hard. Far too many faced unemployment, struggled to pay their bills, and lost their homes and businesses that meant everything to their livelihoods. There has been no doubt that it has been a slow recovery under these last 8 years. Thankfully, many areas of the country have begun to bounce back.

West Tennessee, my home, still needs strong workforce development so we, too, can bounce back. As I traveled

throughout the Eighth District of Tennessee last year, I met amazing people, great Americans who were ready to work hard to provide for their families and for their communities. Too often, I heard stories of burdensome mandates and regulations that are preventing these hardworking Tennesseans from moving forward.

With this legislation, we can keep our promise to help alleviate the burden of Federal regulations on small businesses. There is no doubt that angel investors are the backbone of startups; and unless we find a solution to unreasonable restrictions, small businesses could continue to suffer as they struggle to compete with large, established companies.

We need to keep our promise to the American people. We need to focus on creating good-paying jobs. And I believe that this bipartisan legislation is a step in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important legislation.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for 2 minutes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 79, the Helping Angels Lead Our Startups or the HALOS Act.

I was proud to have introduced this bill with Representative CHABOT during the 113th Congress and have been pleased to see this commonsense legislation continue to gain bipartisan support. I want to thank Representatives CHABOT and SINEMA for continuing to advocate for this important legislation.

Small businesses and startup companies are tremendous assets and sources of economic growth for our country. Economists have shown that when the economy is healthy, startups and young, fast-growing firms are the fundamental drivers of job creation. But to succeed, innovative entrepreneurs with ideas need access to capital. These investments give new companies the resources to take their idea from concept to startup to success.

Congress should support this process and pass legislation that makes it easier for accredited investors to find creative, aspiring entrepreneurs. Unfortunately, certain legislation has had the unintended consequence of often making it more difficult for entrepreneurs and inventors to meet investors and access critical investment capital.

The JOBS Act of 2012 has placed additional restrictions on individuals who want to invest in startups. This has adversely affected programs where young companies demonstrate their products and meet potential investors and mentors, and the legislation has curtailed startups' access to individual or angel investors and angel groups.

During my more than two decades of business experience, I saw firsthand how angel investors often provide more than just funding for young companies. They offer wisdom, advice, and guid-

ance as small businesses seek to grow. The HALOS Act would reopen the path for innovative individuals and young companies to more easily connect with angel investors, while still maintaining important investor protections.

This bill will help small businesses better access the resources they need to thrive and ultimately create jobs, ensuring the United States remains the best place in the world to start and grow a new business.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the balance of time remaining on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the coauthor of this bill.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for working with me, yet again, on this bipartisan bill to help entrepreneurs and startup companies create jobs and grow our economy.

American startup businesses are growing both in number and diversity. Entrepreneurs are finding new and better ways to bring together talent, innovation, and investment capital in an increasingly competitive small business environment.

The HALOS Act clarifies SEC regulations to ensure small businesses may participate in educational demo days without the burden of having to verify that attendees are accredited investors. Demo days provide invaluable opportunities for entrepreneurs to meet and exchange ideas with students, professors, business professionals, and potential future investors.

The HALOS Act creates a clear path for startups to participate in demo days sponsored by a government entity, nonprofit, angel investor group, venture association, or other entity permitted by the SEC. Specifically, the act clarifies the definition of general solicitation to exempt communications and presentations at these events where advertising for the event does not make specific investment offerings and where no specific securities offering information is communicated at the event.

This permits startups to connect with business experts, potential future investors, and other entrepreneurs, all while maintaining existing accredited investor verification requirements and exemptions under Regulation D for the actual purchase or sale of securities. It does not, in any way, permit the sale of securities to unaccredited investors at demo days.

Companies such as Amazon, Costco, Facebook, Google, and Starbucks were all initially funded by angel investors. As we work to make America more

competitive in the new global economy, we need to encourage the growth of innovative startups and job-creating small businesses.

Again, I thank Representative CHABOT for working with me on this commonsense, bipartisan bill. I am committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that Arizona startups have the support they need to grow their businesses and create jobs.

□ 1445

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) and welcome her as a new Member.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan HALOS Act because it will help startup companies with angel investors without compromising important investor protections.

When working in the private sector, I participated in numerous so-called demo days where early-stage entrepreneurs make presentations. I have counseled multiple startups and small firms through this process, particularly women and minority-owned businesses. I have seen firsthand as they struggled to overcome regulatory hurdles and to obtain access to much-needed capital when traditional financing sources, such as banks, may not be feasible.

It is important for the government at all levels—Federal, State, and local—to promote economic growth and encourage innovation by connecting people with good ideas to people with the capital and courage to bankroll those ideas. Robust entrepreneurial ecosystems is how great products come to market and how well-paying jobs are created. This is particularly important for my district in central Florida, which has a growing innovative and entrepreneurial startup community.

Based on personal experiences and on the experiences conveyed to me by Floridians with expertise in this area, the current Federal regulations governing demo days can be made more clear and less burdensome so that they better promote the flow of capital through our economy while continuing to protect nonaccredited investors.

Because I believe the HALOS Act achieves these dual objectives, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” on H.R. 79.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, both Democrats and Republicans want to help facilitate capital formation, particularly for groups such as angel investors, who have substantial experience in the private securities market, and for small companies like startups who are seeking funding to innovate and grow. But as Members of Congress, we also have the responsibility to protect investors

and ensure that the rules of the road are reasonable and appropriate. This is especially important for retail investors, those of us who are looking to save for retirement or to buy a house or to support our children’s education.

That is what concerns me about the bill we have before us today. We cannot create loopholes in the securities laws that could have a serious negative impact on Americans’ nest eggs, so we must strike the right balance between capital formation in our securities markets and investor protection.

It is with these goals in mind that Democrats supported the current rules in place. Companies can raise money to grow and support their businesses in our securities markets under the purview of the SEC and State regulators. The regulatory framework we have set up allows for different activities and oversight depending on the nature of the security offering.

For example, public offerings provide robust information to investors about the risks and rewards of a particular securities purchase. They require the SEC or State securities regulator to preapprove and review an offering, and they provide legal recourse to investors that may be deceived. This is a strong regulatory framework that ensures our markets are safe and sound. In exchange for complying with these rules, companies can advertise and sell their stock to anyone in the general public.

On the other hand, private offerings do not come with the same regulatory requirements and protections, which can make it easier and less costly for firms to raise money. This means less information for investors, less legal recourse, and little to no scrutiny by regulators. So we put in place procedures to ensure these private offerings, which are inherently riskier, are only sold to accredited investors.

Private offerings now play a significant role in the market. Unregistered securities have surpassed registered securities in terms of capital formation. They have accounted for more than \$2 trillion in new capital. Moreover, \$71 billion has been raised since 2012 through the general solicitation and advertising exemption that we put in place in the JOBS Act. This is clearly an important and growing segment of our market, and, as such, I believe we need to be even more cautious about who is participating in it.

In fact, the SEC’s Investor Advisory Committee said we should do more, not less, to protect investors in the general solicitation and advertising market for private offerings. They think we don’t have enough guardrails in place. And yet this bill would do the opposite, by expanding the exemptions on general solicitation without similarly protecting the investor.

The bill also undercuts an important amendment Ranking Member WATERS offered to the JOBS Act, which was approved unanimously. It required companies to verify that the purchaser is an accredited investor and is finan-

cially sophisticated enough to bear the risks involved in private offerings. By effectively allowing purchasers to “self-certify” at or after demo days sponsored by certain groups, the bill could open the door to financial ruin for a retail investor who may not have understood the consequences of his or her investment. So I oppose this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I have actually had the pleasure and the honor of sitting through a number of these demo days and seeing these pitches being made. People are coming in, and they are literally laying out their dreams, their hopes, and, frankly, their hard work because they wouldn’t be there that day if it wasn’t for their hard work. They are looking for a couple of things. As small businesses and entrepreneurs, they are looking for capital and credit. We use the word “capital” a lot around here, but think of it as cash and credit. They really are looking for someone who will buy into their dream, who will look at their hard work, and who will understand that their dreams can become a reality with hope. This bill is trying to do that.

Members are hearing a lot of doom and gloom on the other side. In fact, I think the phrase was just thrown out, financial doom for the retail investor. Let’s talk about these retail investors.

For you to become an accredited investor, someone who would qualify to be able to invest in these startup companies, according to SEC rule 501, you need to be married, jointly; \$300,000 in income; and \$1 million of net worth, excluding your home. So you cannot include a million-dollar home. You have to have \$1 million net worth outside of your home and have an income of \$300,000. Earlier, college students were brought up. Not a whole lot of college students that I am aware of have \$300,000 annual income or \$1 million net worth.

These are people who are sophisticated, typically. They are high net worth, by definition. Interestingly enough, as Members of Congress, if we allowed some of these amendments to go through and these restrictions to go through, as Members of Congress, we would be excluded from the room. We would be excluded. We couldn’t even go in there to educate ourselves about how this process works. That, ultimately, is what this is about.

Those pitch days are not just for those people who are going to invest. Those pitch days are not just for the people who are going to do the investing. Those pitch days are for others to learn, to have an understanding.

If you are a college student sitting in the back row, to understand what it looks like to become an entrepreneur, to really become a part of that engine of the American economy, you should be in the room. If you are someone who might be making a pitch later on and want to see how this happens and

works, you ought to be in the room. Let's not exclude those people.

Why would we have a government closed off, closed room, a government-sanctioned closed room that would keep people from understanding and achieving their hopes and dreams and success?

I am pleased to be up here and to talk about this issue because we know that for our standing in the world, we need to have a dynamic economy. Our dynamic economy starts with our entrepreneurs and the risk-takers who are willing to invest in those ideas.

I just want to commend the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for working in a bipartisan manner. I expect we are going to see a massively bipartisan vote for this bill, and I eagerly await that. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 79.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 79

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act" or the "HALOS Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF ANGEL INVESTOR GROUP.

As used in this Act, the term "angel investor group" means any group that—

(1) is composed of accredited investors interested in investing personal capital in early-stage companies;

(2) holds regular meetings and has defined processes and procedures for making investment decisions, either individually or among the membership of the group as a whole; and

(3) is neither associated nor affiliated with brokers, dealers, or investment advisers.

SEC. 3. CLARIFICATION OF GENERAL SOLICITATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise Regulation D of its rules (17 CFR 230.500 et seq.) to require that in carrying out the prohibition against general solicitation or general advertising contained in section 230.502(c) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, the prohibition shall not apply to a presentation or other communication made by or on behalf of an issuer which is made at an event—

(1) sponsored by—

(A) the United States or any territory thereof, by the District of Columbia, by any State, by a political subdivision of any State or territory, or by any agency or public instrumentality of any of the foregoing;

(B) a college, university, or other institution of higher education;

(C) a nonprofit organization;

(D) an angel investor group;

(E) a venture forum, venture capital association, or trade association; or

(F) any other group, person or entity as the Securities and Exchange Commission may determine by rule;

(2) where any advertising for the event does not reference any specific offering of securities by the issuer;

(3) the sponsor of which—

(A) does not make investment recommendations or provide investment advice to event attendees;

(B) does not engage in an active role in any investment negotiations between the issuer and investors attending the event;

(C) does not charge event attendees any fees other than administrative fees; and

(D) does not receive any compensation with respect to such event that would require registration of the sponsor as a broker or a dealer under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or as an investment advisor under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940; and

(4) where no specific information regarding an offering of securities by the issuer is communicated or distributed by or on behalf of the issuer, other than—

(A) that the issuer is in the process of offering securities or planning to offer securities;

(B) the type and amount of securities being offered;

(C) the amount of securities being offered that have already been subscribed for; and

(D) the intended use of proceeds of the offering.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subsection (a) may only be construed as requiring the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend the requirements of Regulation D with respect to presentations and communications, and not with respect to purchases or sales.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 115-2. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-2.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 18, strike "and".

Page 3, after line 24, insert the following:

(E) provides attendees with a disclosure, as prescribed by the Securities and Exchange Commission by rule, describing the nature of the event and the risks of investing in the securities being advertised; and

Add at the end the following:

(c) NO PRE-EXISTING RELATIONSHIP BY REASON OF EVENT.—Attendance at an event described under subsection (a) shall not qualify, by itself, as establishing a pre-existing relationship between an issuer and a purchaser, for purposes of Rule 506(b).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 33, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

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

When we think of a startup business, the early days of Apple or Google usu-

ally come to mind. Their stories are familiar—hardworking entrepreneurs who beat the odds. Like these companies, most successful startups have several common ingredients: a new product or service, a willingness to take risks, and leadership that can navigate the complexities of today's economy. And successful firms also have a way of securing capital to both get off the ground and to grow.

This last ingredient can present serious obstacles as startups face unique financing challenges. Many do not have positive cash flow, putting traditional bank loans out of reach. While some of these firms participate in incubator or accelerator programs that provide a small amount of seed capital, they must find new sources of funding when their initial capital runs out.

One avenue for securing additional capital is by participating in demo days or pitch days. At these events, entrepreneurs have an opportunity to showcase their companies and innovations to potential investors.

Today's bill will alter SEC rules to exempt the use of general solicitation for presentations made at demo days. In other words, demo day organizers will not have to comply with the usual procedures verifying that the investors they are attracting to the event are accredited.

Despite the well-intended goal of expanding the use of demo days to better meet startups' capital needs, it is easy to see how unscrupulous actors could exploit this exemption to deceive ordinary people that were drawn to the event by a public advertisement. My amendment makes improvements to ensure attendees at demo days have an opportunity to be informed about the nature of these presentations and the risks of investing in startups.

□ 1500

Typically, demo days are limited to select groups of potential investors. Let's be clear, these are not science fairs, but they are sophisticated business presentations designed to raise capital for the entrepreneurs and their startups.

However, the underlying bill allows colleges and universities and nonprofits to host these events and advertise them to the public. It is easy to see how some attendees might not know the true nature of the presentation.

My amendment will address this by requiring event sponsors to provide an SEC-created disclosure outlining the nature of the event and investment risks. By creating a uniform disclosure, the SEC can take the burden off the sponsors and issuers on what to disclose.

This amendment would also clarify that attendance at a demo day alone does not constitute a preexisting relationship and does not allow a stock issuer to sidestep their obligation to verify that an investor is accredited. Without this clarification, it is possible that issuers could defraud less-sophisticated retail investors.

Demo days are a great way for our Nation's entrepreneurs to raise capital, but they should be making presentations to the right investors, those that understand the risks of investing in risky startup businesses, not just anyone who saw an advertisement.

My amendment would both expand the ability of small businesses to raise capital by tapping into demo days while ensuring that the right kind of investors, those accredited and fully informed, are participating in the small business capital markets.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, so here is the alternate reality you are expected to believe in this scenario that has been created. You are going to have somebody wander off the street with their checkbook in their pocket, listen to a 3- to 5-minute pitch on an idea that is going to change the world, and then they are going to sign away their financial future and life savings. That is the scenario that is being painted for you out there today by the opponents of this commonsense legislation.

Again, to be an investor, you must be an accredited investor, according to the SEC rules, Rule 501, that says you have \$300,000 of income annually and a net worth of \$1 million outside of your home. Owning your house doesn't count towards that.

I have been to these pitch days. You know what you are walking into. You don't just stumble on it and go: Wow, what's going on here?

I have never thought about this. Tell you what, I am going to write a five- or six- or seven-figure check today and put myself into financial ruin. That is not how these things work.

Mr. Chairman, at the end of the day, I think it is important to just review a little bit of the history here.

First of all, this amendment isn't necessary. It would create yet another SEC-required disclosure and further burden the ability for startups to present their ideas to demo days.

I would note that this amendment could have been offered last March, either in committee or while we here in the House had consideration last April 2016. However, in both cases that didn't occur.

Let's remember why we are here today, Mr. Chairman. When the SEC promulgated the rules to implement Title II of the JOBS Act, the agency made something that was legal prior to April 5 of 2012 suddenly illegal. The SEC decided that demo days that bring together those entrepreneurs and those companies suddenly became a general solicitation.

That isn't the case, and this amendment would require the SEC to pre-

scribe a disclosure that "describes the nature of the event and the risks of investing in securities being advertised."

There is no sale that day, Mr. Chairman. No sale at all is going to happen. There is no exchange that happens at that event.

This amendment is unnecessary, overly broad, and would delay the return to the certainty that the pre-JOBS Act had brought.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how many other speakers the gentleman has?

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers on this amendment.

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

First of all, I am the author of the amendment, and in the amendment, there is no place in which it requires anyone to sign anything. This is a reasonable, straightforward, simple amendment that provides transparency and protection to the investors.

The gentleman says that this is not an offering. While some presentations may not explicitly be offering securities for sale, these demo days are not a simple science fair. They are sophisticated business presentations designed to generate hype and investor interest.

If a sponsor wants to advertise such events to the public, it is reasonable that they also provide information regarding the risk of investing in startups.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, you just heard the author of the amendment make the case that this is a complicated process in general that an unaccredited person is not going to be allowed to invest in. So it requires the event sponsor to provide attendees with a written disclosure outlining the nature of the event and the risks of investing in the securities for sale. It is not an offering that is happening at those demo days. I would ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CLAY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-2.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee for Ms. WATERS' amendment to improve H.R. 79.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 18, strike "and".

Page 3, after line 18, insert the following:

(D) does not receive any compensation for making introductions between investors attending the event and issuers, or for investment negotiations between such parties; and

Page 3, line 19, strike "(D)" and insert "(E)".

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

(c) DEFINITION OF ISSUER.—For purposes of this section and the revision of rules required under this section, the term "issuer" means an issuer that is in day-to-day operations as a business, is not in bankruptcy or receivership, is not an investment company, and is not a blank check, blind pool, or shell company.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 33, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chair, I move for the adoption of the amendment. This amendment, combined with Velazquez amendment, if adopted, would ensure that the bill strikes the appropriate balance between capital formation and investor protection.

First, the Waters amendment would prohibit event sponsors from collecting finders' fees for connecting potential investors to companies. This prohibition helps ensure that event sponsors, including colleges, nonprofits, and trade associations, don't have perverse incentives to drum up sales of stock.

Second, the Waters amendment would require the company selling securities to be a company operating in the real economy, not a hedge fund, shell company, or company going through bankruptcy. Not only does this provision protect investors from purchasing shares of an opaque or speculative firm, but it also ensures that the bill is targeted to provide relief to our Nation's startups and small businesses.

These two provisions are commonsense changes that I hope will receive bipartisan support. I move for the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, once again, we are seeing an unnecessary, duplicative amendment here. The amendment, as it is laid out, creates a new definition of an issuer. The Securities Exchange Act already defines an issuer, and Ms. WATERS' definition is vague, confusing and, frankly, unnecessary.

Demo days are opportunities for startup companies to present their ideas to potential investors that are accredited. Again, accredited. At this point, all of America is shouting back at C-SPAN, saying, \$300,000 in income

per year with \$1 million net worth, excluding their home. We get this out there. This is not a solicitation or offering a security.

So what I am, quite honestly, concerned about and maybe a little confused about is the point of the HALOS Act trying to fix a problem. It is trying to fix a problem.

Remember, we want to expose entrepreneurs and their ideas to the broadest pool of potential investors that includes angel investment community, again, of accredited investors. This requirement raises serious compliance concerns for angel investors. It would require entrepreneurs and startups to perform a compliance function that they may not have the physical or financial means to do so. Again, it is just an additional burden and barrier to entry for entrepreneurs.

Again, these are—the entrepreneurs typically aren't the ones that have \$300,000 of annual income or \$1 million net worth because, frankly, then they wouldn't have to be at the pitch. They could fund it themselves.

The idea is to make sure that those ideas, those people who are looking for an opportunity are given the broadest opportunity possible. And I think what we are seeing here is a reaction to the notion that, you know what? Maybe people can handle this on their own instead of the government needing to step in and be so overly prescriptive and control every decision that they are making.

You are seeing a reaction on the other side to that, to that notion of freedom, that idea of an entrepreneurial spirit; this idea that we all need to be wrapped in bubble wrap as we go out into the world. That is not government's role or job.

Outside of those prescriptions that are already in place, again, we are talking about a narrow group of investors with \$300,000 of net income annually, and \$1 million net worth who would even qualify to invest in those.

Why we would wall this off from others seeking to learn and to see an opportunity, I just simply don't understand.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chair, just in closing, let me say that, again, this amendment will bring some balance to the legislature and ensure that the bill is targeted to provide relief to our Nation's startup and small businesses, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I cannot support an amendment that makes it more difficult for startups to receive the crucial funding that they need to grow and create new jobs. Again, these are people pursuing their dreams, their hopes. They need capital and credit. They need cash and credit to go fulfill those.

Mr. Chairman, I actually believe in the SEC. I believe that the rules that

they operate under are sufficient. I believe in the JOBS Act. I believe in the HALO Act that will provide the proper protections to investors, again, qualified investors with a \$300,000 income and a \$1 million net worth.

There are proper protections in place. This amendment does nothing but add additional burden to those seeking the investment and those seeking to invest. I request opposition from my colleagues.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri will be postponed.

□ 1515

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OLSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOST, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 79) to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

ENERGY EFFICIENT GOVERNMENT TECHNOLOGY ACT

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 306) to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information and computing technologies, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 306

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Energy Efficient Government Technology Act".

SEC. 2. ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title V of the Energy Independence and Security Act of

2007 (Public Law 110-140; 121 Stat. 1661) is amended by adding at the end the following: "**SEC. 530. ENERGY-EFFICIENT AND ENERGY-SAVING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ‘Director’ means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

“(2) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The term ‘information technology’ has the meaning given that term in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code.

“(b) DEVELOPMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, each Federal agency shall coordinate with the Director, the Secretary, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to develop an implementation strategy (that includes best practices and measurement and verification techniques) for the maintenance, purchase, and use by the Federal agency of energy-efficient and energy-saving information technologies, taking into consideration the performance goals established under subsection (d).

“(c) ADMINISTRATION.—In developing an implementation strategy under subsection (b), each Federal agency shall consider—

“(1) advanced metering infrastructure;

“(2) energy-efficient data center strategies and methods of increasing asset and infrastructure utilization;

“(3) advanced power management tools;

“(4) building information modeling, including building energy management;

“(5) secure telework and travel substitution tools; and

“(6) mechanisms to ensure that the agency realizes the energy cost savings brought about through increased efficiency and utilization.

“(d) PERFORMANCE GOALS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish performance goals for evaluating the efforts of Federal agencies in improving the maintenance, purchase, and use of energy-efficient and energy-saving information technology.

“(2) BEST PRACTICES.—The Chief Information Officers Council established under section 3603 of title 44, United States Code, shall recommend best practices for the attainment of the performance goals, which shall include Federal agency consideration of, to the extent applicable by law, the use of—

“(A) energy savings performance contracting; and

“(B) utility energy services contracting.

“(e) REPORTS.—

“(1) AGENCY REPORTS.—Each Federal agency shall include in the report of the agency under section 527 a description of the efforts and results of the agency under this section.

“(2) OMB GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY REPORTS AND SCORECARDS.—Effective beginning not later than October 1, 2017, the Director shall include in the annual report and scorecard of the Director required under section 528 a description of the efforts and results of Federal agencies under this section.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by adding after the item relating to section 529 the following:

“Sec. 530. Energy-efficient and energy-saving information technologies.”.

SEC. 3. ENERGY EFFICIENT DATA CENTERS.

Section 453 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17112) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(D)(iv), by striking “determined by the organization” and inserting “proposed by the stakeholders”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(2) by striking subsections (c) through (g) and inserting the following:

“(C) **STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT.**—The Secretary and the Administrator shall carry out subsection (b) in collaboration with information technology industry and other key stakeholders, with the goal of producing results that accurately reflect the most relevant and useful information. In such collaboration, the Secretary and the Administrator shall pay particular attention to organizations that—

“(1) have members with expertise in energy efficiency and in the development, operation, and functionality of data centers, information technology equipment, and software, such as representatives of hardware manufacturers, data center operators, and facility managers;

“(2) obtain and address input from Department of Energy National Laboratories or any college, university, research institution, industry association, company, or public interest group with applicable expertise;

“(3) follow—

“(A) commonly accepted procedures for the development of specifications; and

“(B) accredited standards development processes; and

“(4) have a mission to promote energy efficiency for data centers and information technology.

“(d) **MEASUREMENTS AND SPECIFICATIONS.**—The Secretary and the Administrator shall consider and assess the adequacy of the specifications, measurements, best practices, and benchmarks described in subsection (b) for use by the Federal Energy Management Program, the Energy Star Program, and other efficiency programs of the Department of Energy or the Environmental Protection Agency.

“(e) **STUDY.**—The Secretary, in collaboration with the Administrator, shall, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the Energy Efficient Government Technology Act, make available to the public an update to the Report to Congress on Server and Data Center Energy Efficiency published on August 2, 2007, under section 1 of Public Law 109–431 (120 Stat. 2920), that provides—

“(1) a comparison and gap analysis of the estimates and projections contained in the original report with new data regarding the period from 2008 through 2015;

“(2) an analysis considering the impact of information technologies, including virtualization and cloud computing, in the public and private sectors;

“(3) an evaluation of the impact of the combination of cloud platforms, mobile devices, social media, and big data on data center energy usage;

“(4) an evaluation of water usage in data centers and recommendations for reductions in such water usage; and

“(5) updated projections and recommendations for best practices through fiscal year 2020.

“(f) **DATA CENTER ENERGY PRACTITIONER PROGRAM.**—The Secretary, in collaboration with key stakeholders and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall maintain a data center energy practitioner program that leads to the certification of energy practitioners qualified to evaluate the energy usage and efficiency opportunities in Federal data centers. Each Federal agency shall consider having the data centers of the agency evaluated every 4 years, in accordance with section 543(f) of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act, by energy practitioners certified pursuant to such program.

“(g) **OPEN DATA INITIATIVE.**—The Secretary, in collaboration with key stakeholders and the Office of Management and

Budget, shall establish an open data initiative for Federal data center energy usage data, with the purpose of making such data available and accessible in a manner that encourages further data center innovation, optimization, and consolidation. In establishing the initiative, the Secretary shall consider the use of the online Data Center Maturity Model.

“(h) **INTERNATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS AND METRICS.**—The Secretary, in collaboration with key stakeholders, shall actively participate in efforts to harmonize global specifications and metrics for data center energy and water efficiency.

“(i) **DATA CENTER UTILIZATION METRIC.**—The Secretary, in collaboration with key stakeholders, shall facilitate in the development of an efficiency metric that measures the energy efficiency of a data center (including equipment and facilities).

“(j) **PROTECTION OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.**—The Secretary and the Administrator shall not disclose any proprietary information or trade secrets provided by any individual or company for the purposes of carrying out this section or the programs and initiatives established under this section.”

The **SPEAKER pro tempore** (Mr. BOST). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the **RECORD** on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is a major consumer of electricity, and its information technologies account for a large and growing percentage of that major use. That is why we need H.R. 306, the Energy Efficient Government Technology Act, introduced by my good friend from California (Ms. ESHOO).

This bill creates a process by which Federal agencies can incorporate the latest efficiency improvements in their information technologies, including data centers. It also sets out yardsticks to measure progress.

The result of this bill would be lower Federal energy bills and taxpayer savings. In addition, the Federal Government can set an example for energy efficiency that the private sector IT systems would be able to copy.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased to rise today in support of this legislation, the Energy Efficient Government Technology Act.

I want to thank my colleague and friend, Mr. OLSON, for his wonderful description of the bill and his important support of it. I want to thank the new

chairman of the full committee, Mr. WALDEN, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. PALLONE, for their support, and my legislative partner, ADAM KINZINGER, for his partnership on this bill.

I hope that this, the 115th Congress, is going to be the magic charm. I have introduced this bill now in three Congresses, and it passed in each Congress, but it didn't make it to the President's desk. I hope this time it will.

The bill is really a very simple one. It is about bringing the Federal Government's IT and data centers into the 21st century. The Federal Government is the Nation's largest energy user. I want to say that again. The Federal Government is our Nation's largest energy user, and we should lead by example in this area.

By requiring Federal agencies to utilize the best technologies and energy management strategies, this bill will reduce the government's energy use. Very importantly, it is going to save taxpayer dollars, and it is going to also set an example for the private sector.

Today, the world generates more data in 12 hours than was generated in all of human history prior to 2003.

I can tell by the look on your face, Mr. Speaker, that that takes your breath away.

This data must be stored and processed at data centers, which are the backbone of the 21st century economy, but can be highly energy inefficient. While we now routinely hear about data centers, this was not the case when I began examining this issue over a decade ago. In those days, I had to explain to my colleagues what a data center was.

In 2005, I offered language in the Energy Policy Act which mandated an EPA study on the energy use and energy costs of data centers. This report was then transmitted to Congress in 2007, and today most Americans understand that data centers are a critical part of our national infrastructure and are found in nearly every sector of our economy.

According to the GSA, the Federal Government, alone, has more than 2,000 data centers which store everything from Social Security and tax records to e-books at the Library of Congress.

Several Silicon Valley companies have taken the lead in developing efficient, sustainable data centers, but we can do much, much more across the private sector and the government.

The Department of Energy estimates that the 70 billion kilowatt hours of electricity that are used by U.S. data centers annually could be slashed in half simply through implementation of best practices and existing technologies.

This bill, H.R. 306, will drive energy efficiency improvements across the government's IT and data centers by requiring Federal agencies to, number one, utilize the best technologies and energy management strategies; two, formulate specific goals and periodically review their energy efficiency—it

is very important to track the efficiencies—and, three, make government center data energy usage statistics public in a way that empowers further innovation.

Importantly, the bill requires government agencies to formulate specific performance goals and a means to calculate overall cost savings from implementation.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I first introduced the legislation in 2013. It has passed the House by wide margins in each of the last two Congresses. It is noncontroversial. It is bipartisan. It makes sense. I want to urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

I thank my colleagues on a bipartisan basis at the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague in trying to spice things up, so I reserve the balance of my allotted time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY), my valued colleague on the committee.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 306, the Energy Efficient Government Technology Act, sponsored by the committee. It is also bipartisan, as my colleague from California mentioned, sponsored by Ms. ESHOO and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 306 promotes the use of energy efficiency and energy savings information technologies and practices across the Federal Government, especially in data centers.

The bill amends the Energy Independence Act of 2007 to require Federal agencies to coordinate with the OMB, DOE, and EPA in developing an implementation strategy for the maintenance, purchase, and use of energy efficiency and energy savings information technology.

Ten percent of Federal electricity is consumed by Federal energy centers. H.R. 306 aims to keep that at 10 percent or even to reduce it.

The legislation also sets out specific items for consideration in developing an implementation strategy that requires the establishment of performance goals for evaluating agencies' efforts. In addition, the bill would amend the 2007 act to require the DOE and EPA to collaborate with stakeholders in the implementation of data centers, efficiency programs, and other measures to improve data center energy efficiency.

Again, the legislation was passed by the House without dissent last year as stand-alone legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I commend my colleagues Ms. ESHOO and Mr. KINZINGER.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have been a naval aviator, a Senate staffer, and a Member of Congress. In those 20 years, the best

leaders I have seen are ones who lead by example. H.R. 306 makes sure D.C. leads by example. If we lead, the whole country will follow.

I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" on H.R. 306.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 306.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 288) to ensure that small business providers of broadband Internet access service can devote resources to broadband deployment rather than compliance with cumbersome regulatory requirements.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 288

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Broadband Deployment Act".

SEC. 2. EXCEPTION TO ENHANCEMENT TO TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The enhancements to the transparency rule of the Federal Communications Commission under section 8.3 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, as described in paragraphs 162 through 184 of the Report and Order on Remand, Declaratory Ruling, and Order of the Federal Communications Commission with regard to protecting and promoting the open Internet (adopted February 26, 2015) (FCC 15–24), shall not apply to any small business.

(b) SUNSET.—Subsection (a) shall not have any force or effect after the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORT BY FCC.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that contains the recommendations of the Commission (and data supporting such recommendations) regarding—

(1) whether the exception provided by subsection (a) should be made permanent; and

(2) whether the definition of the term "small business" for purposes of such exception should be modified from the definition in subsection (d)(2).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE.—The term "broadband Internet access service" has the meaning given such term in section 8.2 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) SMALL BUSINESS.—The term "small business" means any provider of broadband

Internet access service that has not more than 250,000 subscribers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1530

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 288, the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act. I am glad that the House is taking swift action on this bill, which would protect small Internet service providers from the enhanced disclosure requirements laid out in the 2015 Open Internet Order.

After adopting the Open Internet Order, the FCC recognized the importance of exempting small ISPs from these enhanced transparency rules and subsequently granted a temporary exemption to broadband providers with fewer than 100,000 subscribers. However, the Commission failed to reach an agreement to grant another exemption before the deadline last December and, as a result, has left hundreds of our Nation's small providers vulnerable to cumbersome rules.

FCC Commissioners Pai and O'Rielly have taken action, since the exemption expired, to reassure our small broadband providers that the rules will not be enforced until the situation has been addressed by the Commission, but Congress should go a step further and provide certainty to our Nation's small businesses and pass this bill.

Rather than a 1-year exemption to the enhanced disclosure requirements, this bill would exempt for 5 years broadband providers with fewer than 250,000 subscribers from the enhanced reporting obligations, providing them with the regulatory certainty to invest in their business.

At our hearing last January, we heard from multiple witnesses just how cumbersome and burdensome these rules are. One witness described the difference to be as significant as the need to hire regulatory counsel versus the ability to build another tower to provide service. For a small business in a capital-intensive industry, that could be the difference between getting more people connected to the Internet and going out of business.

We cannot let our small businesses and hardworking taxpayers be saddled

with more onerous rules and the costs that they bring. In addition to regulatory relief for small ISPs, the bill adds certainty for our Nation's small ISPs by extending the exemption for 5 years.

It was disappointing to see the Commission fail to reach an agreement at the end of last year to extend the exemption, and it is why we are here today. Despite overwhelming bipartisan support from Congress and President Obama's Small Business Administration, negotiations fell short, and our Nation's smallest and most competitive Internet service providers were left to bear the burden.

In today's 21st century economy, we need to do more to encourage connectivity, and this bill embodies that spirit. Congress is poised to provide the regulatory certainty small businesses are seeking in order to invest in stronger networks and foster a better consumer experience.

I want to thank Chairman WALDEN and Mr. LOEBSACK for acting quickly to reintroduce this legislation, and I urge all of my colleagues to support the commonsense measure.

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

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

First of all, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Oregon on his new chairmanship. I look forward to working across the aisle on most of the issues. It is a good bipartisan subcommittee. I think we have a lot to accomplish.

The Small Business Broadband Deployment Act, H.R. 288, unanimously passed the House last Congress on a bipartisan vote, unanimous. H.R. 288 provides a 5-year exemption from the FCC's enhanced transparency rules for small Internet service providers that serve 250,000 or fewer subscribers.

This exemption comes with the understanding that there is a 5-year sunset on the exemption and that the FCC report to Congress with sufficient information to help us better understand the impacts on the consumers of a permanent exemption, of a possible permanent exemption. This data will also better inform us whether a longer term exemption is necessary and whether we got the definition of what a small business is right in this case.

It is also worth noting that H.R. 288 would leave intact the FCC's 2010 transparency rules that consumers have come to rely on, such as what they are paying for, Internet speeds they rely on, data quality, and so on. At the same time, these modifications provide certainty for small ISPs while the FCC collects and reports relevant information to Congress.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the author of this legislation.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the new subcommittee chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology. I know our country is in good hands and our committee is as well with Mrs. BLACKBURN chairing that important subcommittee. I want to thank my colleague from California for his kind comments and his work over the years on these issues. I concur with him that we have a wonderful opportunity to continue our bipartisan work as the committee has been known for, for a long time. Clearly, from time to time, we will have our differences, and we know that as well. It is part of democracy. There is so much of this work, like this bill, that is so very important.

As we begin the 115th Congress, I am pleased to be here to support this bipartisan bill because I think it reflects the best of what government can do for those who sent us here. Small Business Broadband Deployment Act seeks to alleviate, as you have heard, Mr. Speaker, these unnecessary regulatory burdens on small Internet service providers—these are the small ones, oftentimes in our rural communities but not always—while still ensuring that consumers are protected. We found the right balance here.

By extending an exemption to the Federal Communications Commission's enhanced reporting rules, this bill allows these small businesses to focus on their core mission, and that is to provide broadband Internet access to customers throughout America. Over the past year, we spent a great deal of time focused on this issue. We first raised concerns with the Federal Communications Commission in a letter, Mr. Speaker, from the committee, as well as from the Committee on Small Business. We urged the chairman, Tom Wheeler, to not only make the exemption permanent but also to raise the threshold by defining a small business to bring it in line with the definitions previously blessed by the Obama administration's Small Business Administration. We were trying to find some consistency, some workability, and some common sense here.

Well, unfortunately, the FCC only extended the exemption for 1 year, despite the overwhelming support to do this permanent extension. It was clear Congress needed to act. That is what we are doing here. I introduced a discussion draft last year that would have permanently extended the exemption and increased the threshold by defining a small business.

At our January 2016 legislative hearing on the bill, we heard from a small Internet service provider who shared the dilemma that many small ISPs face in these circumstances: Should they put up new equipment, or should they hire a lawyer to help with compliance? Should they improve service for customers, or should they devote those financial resources to sifting through regulatory language and drafting extensive reports on packet loss?

So often these small ISPs provide service to areas of the country that are rural, like in my district throughout eastern Oregon or Representative LOEBSACK's district in Iowa—we heard from him—or may not be as easy to serve and, in some cases, provide a vital competitive edge to larger Internet service providers. We should be making all efforts to promote the viability of these businesses, not saddle them with additional requirements that make it more difficult to do what they are in business to do.

Representative LOEBSACK and I were able to come to a compromise through extensive negotiation. In the bill we have before us today, we extend this exemption for 5 years. Now, it gives greater regulatory certainty to these small Internet service providers looking for predictability when making investment decisions. In addition, we increased the threshold for defining a small business and required the FCC to report back to Congress on the exemption along with data around small ISPs that is currently lacking.

In the end, this bill presents a good compromise that will relieve burdens for small businesses while leaving in place protections for consumers. So it is important to note this bill doesn't affect the transparency rules, as my colleagues have mentioned, adopted in the FCC's 2010 rules. Consumers will continue to have access to those disclosures they have come to expect, with the information needed to make informed decisions about their Internet service.

Again, this bill passed the House unanimously last year, 411-0. Unfortunately, while it made it through the Senate Commerce Committee, it never quite came up for a vote in the Senate. In addition, the exemption granted by the FCC expired on December 15, 2016, and has not yet been renewed. Now, that leaves these many small businesses exposed to the serious reporting burden that we have heard about throughout this process, as well as a great deal of uncertainty around what the future may hold for them. It is now more important than ever that we act to quickly fill this gap and protect these businesses and the consumers they serve.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, especially Representative LOEBSACK, for working with us on this bill. This bipartisan process has resulted in a strong piece of legislation that I am confident will protect many and promote continued network investment and build-out by small businesses. This legislation represents a commonsense approach to a problem that directly impacts so many of our constituents. This solution will enable our country to continue its leadership in broadband deployment. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank the chairman for his work on this and for his willingness to

compromise. As he pointed out, it was a process. It took both sides. I think he wanted permanent exemption, we wanted a less exemption, and it worked out. I think it is the right compromise. Five years gives businesses the predictability they need. It is a good place to be. In 5 years, we will see the report and whether it makes sense to continue the exemption or not.

I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague from Tennessee on assuming the chairmanship of the subcommittee. I look forward to our working together.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a new member of our committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support of H.R. 288, the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act. In 2015, the FCC adopted burdensome transparency requirements for Internet service providers. The FCC immediately recognized that these new transparency requirements would be particularly burdensome for small Internet service providers, so they provided a temporary exemption for providers with 100,000 or fewer subscribers. Despite overwhelming support to make the exemption permanent, the Commission extended the current exemption for just an additional year.

The bill eases the burdens created by the FCC rule by extending the exemption to Internet service providers who have 250,000 subscribers or less and extends the exemption for 5 years.

This is commonsense legislation. This bill provides relief and certainty to Internet service providers so they can continue to build networks, deploy broadband, improve connectivity for rural consumers, and create jobs.

I commend Chairman WALDEN for championing this legislation so that we can continue to grow our infrastructure and improve connectivity for rural Americans.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 288, the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act. This commonsense, bipartisan legislation does two important things. First, it extends the temporary exemption granted to small businesses by the Federal Communications Commission, the FCC, from the burdensome disclosure requirements for Internet service providers and the FCC's own Open Internet Order by 5 years. Second, it increases the number of small businesses that can utilize the exemption by raising the threshold from 100,000 subscribers to the much more realistic 250,000 subscribers.

Small businesses frequently feel that the Federal Government exercises its

most creativity in looking for new ways to get in their way. Oftentimes, small Internet providers are the only ones willing to take the risk and deploy broadband to particularly hard-to-reach areas of rural America. The last thing they have time for is the FCC imposing a greater regulatory burden on them, diverting precious resources to make Washington bureaucrats busy instead of doing what they do best, providing high quality broadband services to millions of Americans in every corner of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and help reduce a portion of the tedious regulatory burden on small businesses.

□ 1545

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to say that the bill passed unanimously in the last Congress. It is bipartisan. It gives small ISP providers a certain amount of time and it allows the FCC to decide if it is overburdensome or not, to require them to disclose information to their customers. This allows us to give customers the amount of protection that is due them as well.

So it is a good compromise. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

I thank my colleagues for their hard work.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I will just encourage my colleagues to join us in passing H.R. 288.

As my colleague from California said, this is one of those commonsense measures. When you talk about removing the burden of regulatory overreach from our Nation's small business, and in this case, our small Internet service providers, this is something that will help get that job done. It is also something that will help extend Internet service to more Americans, and that is a goal that we all share.

So at this time, in closing, I encourage passage of H.R. 288.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 288.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSPIRING THE NEXT SPACE PIONEERS, INNOVATORS, RESEARCHERS, AND EXPLORERS (INSPIRE) WOMEN ACT

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 321) to inspire women to enter the aerospace field, including science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, through mentorship and outreach.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 321

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Inspiring the Next Space Pioneers, Innovators, Researchers, and Explorers (INSPIRE) Women Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) NASA GIRLS and NASA BOYS are virtual mentoring programs using commercially available video chat programs to pair National Aeronautics and Space Administration mentors with young students anywhere in the country. NASA GIRLS and NASA BOYS give young students the opportunity to interact and learn from real engineers, scientists, and technologists.

(2) The Aspire to Inspire (A2I) program engages young girls to present science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) career opportunities through the real lives and jobs of early career women at NASA.

(3) The Summer Institute in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Research (SISTER) program at the Goddard Space Flight Center is designed to increase awareness of, and provide an opportunity for, female middle school students to be exposed to and explore nontraditional career fields with Goddard Space Flight Center women engineers, mathematicians, scientists, technicians, and researchers.

SEC. 3. SUPPORTING WOMEN'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE FIELDS OF AEROSPACE AND SPACE EXPLORATION.

The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall encourage women and girls to study science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, pursue careers in aerospace, and further advance the Nation's space science and exploration efforts through support of the following initiatives:

(1) NASA GIRLS and NASA BOYS.

(2) Aspire to Inspire.

(3) Summer Institute in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Research.

SEC. 4. PLAN.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a plan for how NASA can best facilitate and support both current and retired astronauts, scientists, engineers, and innovators, including early career female astronauts, scientists, engineers, and innovators, to engage with K-12 female STEM students and inspire the next generation of women to consider participating in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and to pursue careers in aerospace. This plan shall—

(1) report on existing activities with current and retired NASA astronauts, scientists, engineers, and innovators;

(2) identify how NASA could best leverage existing authorities to facilitate and support current and retired astronaut, scientist, engineer, and innovator participation in NASA outreach efforts;

(3) propose and describe a program specific to retired astronauts, scientists, engineers, and innovators; and

(4) identify any additional authorities necessary to institute such a program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 321, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise to offer H.R. 321, the INSPIRE Act. I am pleased to lead this effort along with the chairman and ranking member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, LAMAR SMITH and EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, as well as Congresswoman ESTY.

We did pass this bill last year and now we are revisiting it since it didn't get through the Senate.

Recently, the movie, "Hidden Figures," was released detailing a few of the unsung heroes of NASA. This movie highlights the moving story of a group of African American women who worked at NASA at a historic time in the 1960s as mathematicians during the space race.

Katherine Johnson, Dorothy Vaughan, and Mary Jackson were featured in the movie for their work that launched America into space.

In a recent interview with the LA Times, Ms. Johnson, who is still living, was asked: "At the time, did you know that John Glenn asked for 'the girl' (which would be you) to check the numbers before he took his landmark flight into space? Did it heighten the stakes for you?"

Ms. Johnson's response: "I knew they asked me to check the numbers. That was what I did. They knew my record for accuracy. I knew and had confidence in my math, so I did it. I always did my best."

Mr. Speaker, I didn't know the story of these women growing up, even though they were doing these things at a time when we were all watching these things happen. But now today's young women well know that story. It is an inspiring story. It is one of those movies Ms. ESTY and I were speaking about yesterday that were on our list of must-sees.

These women were critical to the success of our astronauts and our space program that would eventually put a man on the Moon. Now is the time to pass this legislation that will afford opportunities to a future generation of women leaders who will have a similar impact on our Nation's history, and maybe, one day, put a woman on Mars.

The INSPIRE Act authorizes the NASA administrator to encourage young women to study mathematics, known as the STEM fields, and to pur-

sue careers that will further advance America's space science and exploration efforts through support of NASA initiatives such as NASA GIRLS, Aspire 2 Inspire, and the Summer Institute in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Research—SISTER.

The goal of NASA GIRLS is to create a virtual mentoring project that offers a one-of-a-kind experience to middle school students using online capabilities.

NASA's vision for Aspire 2 Inspire was to reach out to young girls and present some of the STEM career opportunities through the real lives and jobs of early career women at NASA.

The SISTER program is designed to increase awareness of and provide an opportunity for female middle school students to be exposed to and explore nontraditional career fields with Goddard Space Flight Center women engineers, mathematicians, scientists, technicians, and researchers. According to NASA, 58 women have traveled in space. Forty-nine of those have flown with NASA.

Of course, there are so many other careers available for women in NASA, and we want to make sure all of those are available for them. We know the stories of women like Sally Ride and Mae Jemison, but, ironically, we didn't know these hidden figures that are behind the scene. So now, as we move forward under this program, we hope everyone will know about the many women and the many careers open to both men and women in this NASA program.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 321, the INSPIRE Women Act.

This bill calls on the NASA administrator to support initiatives that encourage girls and young women to study STEM fields and pursue careers in aerospace. Unfortunately, women are woefully underrepresented in many STEM fields, including aeronautics and aerospace. One of the key barriers to women entering technical fields is self-selection out of STEM degrees due to a lack of role models.

In the words of longtime children's advocate and activist, Marian Wright Edelman: "You can't be what you can't see."

Too many girls and young women decide not to pursue studies in technical fields such as science, engineering, and aerospace because they look at their teachers and their role models and they see no one who looks like them.

When students are able to visualize themselves working in technical fields, they gain the confidence they need to take the first step in pursuit of a challenging and rewarding STEM career, to their benefit and to the benefit of society as a whole.

NASA, with its extraordinary STEM workforce, is in a unique position to help close this gap. The agency has ac-

cess to a diverse group of current and retired women astronauts, scientists, engineers, mathematicians, and innovators whose accomplishments and career paths are just the sort of inspiration that girls and young women need.

Astronaut Kate Rubins broke barriers and boundaries when she became the first person to ever sequence DNA in space during her spaceflight last year.

Just last Friday, Peggy Whitson, the first female commander of the International Space Station, completed her seventh space walk.

Vera Rubin's recent passing reminded us of her trailblazing career in astronomy in which she made the groundbreaking discovery of dark matter.

As has already been mentioned by my friend and colleague, BARBARA COMSTOCK, the newly released movie, "Hidden Figures," highlights through the pioneering story of early NASA mathematicians and engineers Katherine Johnson, Dorothy Vaughan, and Mary Jackson that women have been instrumental to our aerospace enterprise since its inception.

NASA has developed a number of programs aimed at leveraging its inspirational workforce to encourage girls and young women to pursue STEM degrees and STEM careers. This includes the NASA GIRLS program, the Aspire 2 Inspire program, and the Summer Institute in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Research, or SISTER program.

H.R. 321 instructs the NASA administrator to continue supporting these and other programs that encourage women and girls to study science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, as well as to pursue careers in aerospace.

Additionally, the bill calls on NASA to develop a plan for how it can best facilitate and support current and retired astronauts, scientists, engineers, and innovators to engage with K-12 female STEM students.

Although retired engineers, astronauts, scientists, and engineers are invaluable to inspiring the next generation of NASA scientists, I am especially glad and thankful to my colleague for including early career female astronauts, scientists, engineers, and innovators in this plan. It is very important for America's young girls to have experiences interacting with young women who look like them in the STEM fields.

I thank my Science, Space, and Technology Committee colleague, Representative COMSTOCK, for her leadership on the bill, as well as our esteemed chairman, LAMAR SMITH, and our wonderful ranking member, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 321, the INSPIRE Women Act, and commend the leadership of Congresswoman COMSTOCK and Congresswoman ESTY on this bill, which I am pleased to also co-sponsor.

We should be doing all we can to encourage young women who wish to study or follow a STEM career path, and Congresswoman COMSTOCK has introduced this commonsense bill to achieve that goal.

H.R. 321 would require NASA to support astronauts, scientists, and engineers who have retired in their efforts to encourage young women who are interested in studying or working in a STEM field.

Mr. Speaker, innovative thinkers are critical to our country's success in the modern global workforce. But we have heard the statistics. Women make up half of the U.S. workforce and half of the college educated workforce. Yet, only 25 percent of women who attain degrees in the STEM field actually end up working in STEM jobs.

That is why I support this bill and that is why I think the aims of this bill are very laudable and could go a long way toward closing that gap. It is an important effort to improve retention of women studying and working in STEM fields.

I thank again Congresswomen COMSTOCK and ESTY for their leadership.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), my ranking member.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 321, the Inspiring the Next Space Pioneers, Innovators, Researchers, and Explorers Women Act.

I want to express my appreciation for the leadership of Congresswoman ESTY and Congresswoman COMSTOCK.

This bill would help ensure that the incoming administration continues to promote and strengthen important programs at NASA to inspire and mentor girls and young women to pursue studies and careers in STEM areas.

Despite progress in the right direction, women remain largely underrepresented in STEM fields because they continue to face cultural and institutional barriers throughout their studies and career progression.

H.R. 321 would support existing programs at NASA that encourage young girls and women to study STEM fields and pursue careers in aerospace.

□ 1600

These programs include NASA GIRLS, a virtual mentoring program; Inspire to Inspire, a program connecting young girls with women in STEM careers at NASA; and a summer institute program that increases awareness and exposes young, middle school girls to the STEM careers at NASA.

H.R. 321 also calls on NASA to develop a plan for how best to use its cur-

rent and retired workforce to mentor female K-12 students. What comes to mind are the inspirational women who are featured in the new movie "Hidden Figures." Those brilliant and brave women opened the door for so many who followed. We must continue to support our great women in STEM who dedicate their time to mentor the girls and young women who will be our next scientists, engineers, and innovators.

I thank my colleagues again—Representative COMSTOCK for her leadership on this bill and Representative ESTY. I strongly support this bill and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass it.

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank my esteemed colleagues for their leadership on this, in particular, Representative COMSTOCK from Virginia and the ranking member.

This is a very laudable bill that plays an important role in inspiring the next generation of STEM engineers and scientists, and I am pleased that we are able to offer this again. This did pass in the last Congress. Unfortunately, it did not make it through the Senate. I am delighted that we are moving early in this session and would urge all of my colleagues to swiftly pass this, to send it to the Senate, and to get it on the President's desk and make sure these important programs are supported long into the future.

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

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, we have had over 65 cosponsors this year on the bill, as was mentioned by my colleague. It had strong bipartisan support last year and it has also been introduced now in the Senate, so we certainly hope it will move through quickly.

Eileen Collins, who became the first female to command and pilot a spacecraft, was asked to give advice to future astronauts. She stated:

My advice to young people is to go into the field you are most interested in. If you love your job, you will do well in your job.

I think what we have all discussed here today is, when you can see that job and when you can see people who look like you—see women and people from all walks of life in those positions—and the Internet allows us to do that now, then you can really have that kind of exposure, which is quite exciting.

I appreciate the opportunity to, once again, present this bill, and I ask my colleagues to join me in support.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, science, technology, engineering and math are critical to America's future prosperity.

Women are unfortunately underrepresented in STEM careers. Despite representing nearly half of the college-educated and total U.S. workforce, women account for less than 25 percent of America's STEM workforce.

Supporting women's involvement in the fields of aerospace and space exploration

should be an important part of NASA's mission.

Current NASA programs such as NASA GIRLS and NASA BOYS are important and give young students the opportunity to interact and learn from real NASA engineers, scientists, and technologists.

They provide virtual mentoring that use commercially available video chat programs to pair NASA innovators with young students across the country.

H.R. 321 builds upon this success. It leverages NASA's talent pool of current and retired astronauts, and early career female scientists, engineers, and innovators to inform and inspire young women to pursue their dreams in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. One day, these young people will push the boundaries of space.

Space can be a catalyst for inspiring young girls to enter the STEM fields. By doing our part to support their engagement in space with this legislation, we are investing in the futures of our daughters, nieces, and grandchildren.

I again want to thank the bill sponsor, Research and Technology Subcommittee Chairwoman COMSTOCK for her leadership on this topic. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 321, the INSPIRE Women, Act.

I support this legislation because Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution states our duty "To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries . . ."

This includes the education of our next generation of women considering participation in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and to pursue careers in aerospace.

Statistics show that women remain underrepresented in the science and engineering workforce, although to a lesser degree than in the past, with the greatest disparities occurring in engineering, computer science, and the physical sciences (NSF, Science & Engineering Indicators, 2014).

1. Female scientists and engineers are concentrated in different occupations than are men, with relatively high shares of women in the social sciences (58 percent)

2. biological and medical sciences (48 percent)

3. relatively low shares in engineering (13 percent)

4. computer and mathematical sciences (25 percent) (NSF, Science & Engineering Indicators, 2014).

Women make up 47 percent of the total U.S. workforce, but are much less represented in particular science and engineering occupations (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Women in the Labor Force: A Databook, 2014):

1. 39 percent of chemists and material scientists are women;

2. 27.9 percent of environmental scientists and geoscientists are women;

3. 15.6 percent of chemical engineers are women;

4. 12.1 percent of civil engineers are women;

5. 8.3 percent of electrical and electronics engineers are women;

6. 17.2 percent of industrial engineers are women; and

7. 7.2 percent of mechanical engineers are women.

These statistics show that measures need to be taken in order to promote women participation in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and to pursue careers in aerospace.

H.R. 321 will support NASA GIRLS and NASA BOYS, virtual mentoring programs using commercially available video chat programs, to pair National Aeronautics and Space Administration mentors with young students anywhere in the country.

NASA GIRLS and NASA BOYS give young students the opportunity to interact and learn from real engineers, scientists, and technologists.

H.R. 321 will also support the “Aspire to Inspire” Program (A21), which engages young girls to present science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) career opportunities through the real lives and jobs of early career women at NASA.

H.R. 321 also promotes the Summer Institute in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Research (SISTER) program at the Goddard Space Flight Center designed to increase awareness of, and provide an opportunity for, female middle school students to be exposed to and explore nontraditional career fields with Goddard Space Flight Center women engineers, mathematicians, scientists, technicians, and researchers.

Let me close by urging all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 321.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 321.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING WOMEN IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP ACT

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 255) to authorize the National Science Foundation to support entrepreneurial programs for women.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 255

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Promoting Women in Entrepreneurship Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) women make up almost 50 percent of the workforce, but less than 25 percent of the workforce in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) professions;

(2) women are less likely to focus on the STEM disciplines in undergraduate and graduate study;

(3) only 26 percent of women who do attain degrees in STEM fields work in STEM jobs;

(4) there is an increasing demand for individuals with STEM degrees to extend their

focus beyond the laboratory so they can be leaders in discovery commercialization;

(5) studies have shown that technology and commercialization ventures are successful when women are in top management positions; and

(6) the National Science Foundation’s mission includes supporting women in STEM disciplines.

SEC. 3. SUPPORTING WOMEN’S ENTREPRENEURIAL PROGRAMS.

Section 33 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885a) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (10);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(12) encourage its entrepreneurial programs to recruit and support women to extend their focus beyond the laboratory and into the commercial world.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 255, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I offer another bipartisan bill that Ms. ESTY and I have introduced, H.R. 255, her bill called Promoting Women in Entrepreneurship Act. We are joined again on this measure by the chairman and the ranking member, who are original cosponsors of this bill.

Our bill, H.R. 255, amends the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act to authorize the National Science Foundation to use its entrepreneurial programs to recruit women and to extend their focus beyond the laboratory and into the commercial world. The bill also includes a number of findings regarding women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, also known as the STEM fields.

One finding in this bill notes that women make up almost 50 percent of the workforce but less than 25 percent of the workforce in STEM professions. We want to make sure we can do everything to improve these statistics, and we believe this bill, along with our earlier bill that we voted on, is a step in the right direction.

Again, I have been happy to collaborate with my colleague, Congresswoman ESTY, on this important legislation for our young women so that they may look to the stars and realize their dreams in this important field that will really be important in the 21st century. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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

I rise in support of H.R. 255, the Promoting Women in Entrepreneurship Act.

Our bill encourages the National Science Foundation to use its successful entrepreneurial education and training programs, such as the Innovation Corps, known as I-Corps, and Partnerships for Innovation, to inspire, recruit, and support women scientists and engineers who are interested in turning their laboratory discoveries into commercial technologies.

Mr. Speaker, you may ask: Why is it that we need a bill like this? We have these programs. Doesn’t everyone know that we need more women in the STEM fields?

The answer is twofold:

Number one, we have a workforce shortage. If you take the field of advanced manufacturing by itself, in New England, there are 16,000 positions that are open currently. We have people who are looking for work—many of them women. They don’t have the skill sets to meet that open job need right now, and that is a need for America to fill those jobs; so, number one, we need our qualified workforce with appropriate skills to meet the jobs of today.

We also need to think about the jobs of tomorrow. We are a wonderfully diverse country. Over half of our workforce is made up of women and people of color—historically, chronically, still—underrepresented in the STEM fields. There are problems we aren’t even addressing and solutions we haven’t thought of if we don’t have more women with these power tools of the STEM skills to address the challenges and opportunities that this country is facing; so it is both a moral and an economic imperative that we equip more young women, and that is what our bill aims to do here today.

I have heard time and time again in my district, in which we have a lot of small startup companies and major universities, about this challenge that we face of bridging that gap between the laboratory and what happens in the commercial workforce. Through my work, I have formed a STEM advisory council and have met with them for the last 2 years. Among these are the problems they identified: limited access to capital, a lack of women mentors in the STEM fields, unmanageable expectations for work-life balance, and unconscious biases against women in the sciences. These are among the sorts of issues for which the I-Corps and the Partnerships for Innovation have been designed—in order to help close that gap to deal with these issues.

I want to give you examples of two of the women in my district with whom I have met who are benefiting from these programs and why we need to have more of them and the kind of difference that they will make.

The first is Zengmin Xia. She is a student at the University of Connecticut, and she helped the Wei Laboratory secure a National Science Foundation I-Corps grant to commercialize her work on tissue engineer scaffolds, innovative work which is going to help with bone repair and regeneration. She attributes her success to her female adviser and mentor, Professor Mei Wei, who encouraged her as a young woman to carry out her path forward in the biotech world. She helped her make that transition from the lab and the classroom out into the commercial world. She was lucky that she had a mentor with the experience to help close this gap.

Claire Leonardi is the CEO of Health Esense, which is a digital health startup firm in Avon, Connecticut. She received seed grant funding and gained access to hands-on training workshops to learn how to market her technology to consumers. She is now equipped with the tools to take her discovery and bring it into market.

Both of these women scientists are examples of the kind of innovation, the kind of economic engine, and the problem solving we need all Americans to participate in. That is what is at stake. That is why we are proposing this. This is not simply about having a poster with a diverse group of scientists to hang on the wall at the Air and Space Museum and inspire young people. That is important, but it is also important to build on the good work we have already done with the National Science Foundation—to really provide that equipment, those tools, those mentors, the training, and to take those lab discoveries, the basic R&D, and commercialize it.

I am very excited that we are reintroducing this bill. It passed with overwhelming support in the last Congress. Once again, sadly, it did not pass in the Senate, but we will start early in this Congress. I am delighted to be working again with my colleague, Mrs. COMSTOCK; with the ranking member, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, who is here today; and with Chairman SMITH, who is detained with other committee work.

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

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 255, the Promoting Women in Entrepreneurship Act.

The bill helps to build on STEM education and mentorship programs, such as those highlighted in the INSPIRE Women Act.

More women are pursuing STEM degrees and careers overall, but they continue to be underrepresented in many STEM fields. This is especially true in STEM fields with high entrepreneurship rates, such as engineering and

computer science. Women who successfully complete degrees in these fields and want to turn their research and their talents into building new companies and creating new jobs then disproportionately face new hurdles, such as obtaining access to credit.

Unfortunately, because of these barriers, it remains as important as ever for our Federal science agencies to support programs and provide grants with the goal of encouraging, inspiring, and supporting women in STEM at all levels of their education and training, including entrepreneurship education and training.

H.R. 255 ensures that longstanding entrepreneurship education and training programs at the National Science Foundation continue to encourage and recruit women who are looking to move beyond the laboratory and commercialize the results of their research. If we are serious about growing our economy, it is just common sense that we would encourage all of our best and brightest—male and female—to commercialize their best ideas and create new companies and new jobs.

I thank my colleagues Representative ESTY for her leadership and Representative COMSTOCK for her leadership on this bill. I strongly support the bill and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

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

□ 1615

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, once again, I thank Congressman COMSTOCK, Ranking Member EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and our Chairman LAMAR SMITH, and I would urge my colleagues to support this worthwhile piece of legislation. It is wonderful to be able to start out the legislative session with important legislation that will help make a difference. Not only the lives of the individuals who receive these grants and this training but the entire country benefits when we have more women and more young women trained in these fields and able to operationalize and commercialize their discoveries to the benefit of all Americans and, in many cases, the entire world.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this and vote in favor of this important resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman ESTY and Congressman JOHNSON and appreciate their passion on both of these bills and their leadership and, once again, being able to join with them on inspiring the next generation of women leaders in the STEM fields.

As was noted by my colleagues, there is such a shortage of people to fill these jobs in general. Now this will equip more women to be able to be prepared in these important fields that will allow us to be leaders in the 21st century economy.

I would like to thank our staff—particularly we have our female staff here

who have been very active on our bill, as well as a male. We are fortunate to have female leadership on our staff, also, and we thank them.

I know, in working on a program that I have had over the past 4 years, a young woman's leadership program, NASA, space, and astronauts have been some of the most popular people that our women in junior high and high school have liked to meet, hear from, and really be able to see themselves in those roles and to talk to women who have actually been leaders in those fields.

So I appreciate the opportunity to join with my colleagues now in giving that opportunity to the next generation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 255, the Promoting Women in Entrepreneurship Act. I thank my Science Committee colleagues Ms. ESTY, who authored the bill, and Research and Technology Subcommittee Chairwoman COMSTOCK for their initiative on this issue.

H.R. 255 authorizes the National Science Foundation (NSF) to use its existing entrepreneurial programs to recruit and support women and help them develop their research and technology ideas for the marketplace.

STEM education is critical to our country's economy and global competitiveness. A well-educated and trained STEM workforce promotes our future economic prosperity.

These STEM workers have the potential to develop technologies that could save thousands of lives, jump-start new industries, or even discover new worlds.

That's why I authored with Ms. ESTY the STEM Education Act, a new law that strengthens science, technology, engineering and mathematics education efforts at federal science agencies. It also, for the first time, expands the definition of STEM to include computer science. The bill was signed by the President in October 2015.

Unfortunately, studies show that only 26 percent of women who attain degrees in STEM fields work in STEM jobs.

H.R. 255 encourages NSF to tackle this problem. It enhances women's ability to translate their enthusiasm, scientific expertise and research ideas into tangible products and businesses.

Inspiring American students to seek science and math careers is a goal shared by Republicans and Democrats alike. Some of the most energizing and exciting moments of my Science Committee chairmanship have been interactions with young people who want to pursue STEM studies and careers.

At various Committee hearings and robotics competitions in my district, I have encountered motivated, talented young people who want nothing more than an opportunity to pursue their dreams. And, in some cases, change the world with their ideas.

Their passion for learning and science reminds me of why I enjoy serving in Congress and on the Science Committee.

I again thank Ms. ESTY and Chairwoman COMSTOCK for their work on this bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 255.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 255 the "Promoting Women in Entrepreneurship Act."

As a Senior Member on the House Committee on Homeland Security who sits on the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, I know well of the need to encourage and train women to thrive in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields.

Promoting diversity in the STEM professions is more than just an idea; it requires an understanding that there is a need to have a process that will ensure the inclusion of all minorities and women in all areas of American life.

Studies have found that women make up almost 50 percent of the workforce.

Studies note that 23 percent of STEM workers are women; however, women make up 48 percent of workers in all occupations.

Only 26 percent of women who do attain degrees in STEM fields work in STEM jobs.

According to the most recent available data women are less likely to focus on the STEM disciplines in undergraduate and graduate studies.

In 1991, women received 29.6 percent of computer science B.A.'s, compared to just 18.2 percent in 2010.

Jobs in computer systems design and related services, a field dependent upon high-level math and problem-solving skills, are projected to grow 45 percent between 2008 and 2018.

There are approximately 6 million women and minority owned businesses in the United States, representing a significant aspect of our economy.

My home city of Houston, Texas, the energy capital of the world, knows the importance of professionals in the STEM industries.

It has been reported that the highest-paying STEM occupations are petroleum engineers with an annual salary of \$147,520, architectural and engineering managers with an annual salary of \$138,720, natural sciences managers with an annual salary of \$136,450, computer and information systems managers with an annual salary of \$136,280, and physicists with a reported annual salary of \$117,300.

There is an increasing demand for individuals with STEM degrees to extend their focus beyond the laboratory so they can be leaders in discovery and commercialization.

Women deserve a fair shot in the STEM programs in this nation.

In addition, I believe that work needs to be done to modernize key contracting developmental programs designed to increase opportunities for women, minorities and low-income individuals who pursue STEM degrees and STEM job training.

I support programs at the National Science Foundation that have worked to reduce the current barriers and ensure women have the support they need in the STEM fields.

Mr. Speaker, we should encourage women to pursue degrees and careers in the STEM fields so we can continue to compete in the global economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 255.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT FOR RAPID INNOVATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 239) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 239

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

(a) CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 321. CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall support the research, development, testing, evaluation, and transition of cybersecurity technologies, including fundamental research to improve the sharing of information, analytics, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents, consistent with current law.

"(b) ACTIVITIES.—The research and development supported under subsection (a) shall serve the components of the Department and shall—

"(1) advance the development and accelerate the deployment of more secure information systems;

"(2) improve and create technologies for detecting attacks or intrusions, including real-time continuous diagnostics and real-time analytic technologies;

"(3) improve and create mitigation and recovery methodologies, including techniques and policies for real-time containment of attacks, and development of resilient networks and information systems;

"(4) support, in coordination with non-Federal entities, the review of source code that underpins critical infrastructure information systems;

"(5) develop and support infrastructure and tools to support cybersecurity research and development efforts, including modeling, testbeds, and data sets for assessment of new cybersecurity technologies;

"(6) assist the development and support of technologies to reduce vulnerabilities in industrial control systems; and

"(7) develop and support cyber forensics and attack attribution capabilities.

"(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall coordinate activities with—

"(1) the Under Secretary appointed pursuant to section 103(a)(1)(H);

"(2) the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate; and

"(3) industry and academia.

"(d) TRANSITION TO PRACTICE.—The Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall support projects carried out under this title through the full life cycle of such projects, including research, development, testing, evaluation, pilots, and transitions. The Under Secretary shall identify mature tech-

nologies that address existing or imminent cybersecurity gaps in public or private information systems and networks of information systems, identify and support necessary improvements identified during pilot programs and testing and evaluation activities, and introduce new cybersecurity technologies throughout the homeland security enterprise through partnerships and commercialization. The Under Secretary shall target federally funded cybersecurity research that demonstrates a high probability of successful transition to the commercial market within two years and that is expected to have a notable impact on the public or private information systems and networks of information systems.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) CYBERSECURITY RISK.—The term 'cybersecurity risk' has the meaning given such term in section 227.

"(2) HOMELAND SECURITY ENTERPRISE.—The term 'homeland security enterprise' means relevant governmental and nongovernmental entities involved in homeland security, including Federal, State, local, and tribal government officials, private sector representatives, academics, and other policy experts.

"(3) INCIDENT.—The term 'incident' has the meaning given such term in section 227.

"(4) INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The term 'information system' has the meaning given such term in section 3502(8) of title 44, United States Code."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to the second section 319 the following new item:

"Sec. 321. Cybersecurity research and development."

(b) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "2016" and inserting "2021";

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking the last sentence; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) PRIOR APPROVAL.—In any case in which the head of a component or office of the Department seeks to utilize the authority under this section, such head shall first receive prior approval from the Secretary by providing to the Secretary a proposal that includes the rationale for the utilization of such authority, the funds to be spent on the use of such authority, and the expected outcome for each project that is the subject of the use of such authority. In such a case, the authority for evaluating the proposal may not be delegated by the Secretary to anyone other than the Under Secretary for Management."

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "2016" and inserting "2021"; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall annually submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report detailing the projects for which the authority granted by subsection (a) was utilized, the rationale for such utilizations, the funds spent utilizing such authority, the extent of cost-sharing for such projects among Federal and non-Federal sources, the extent to which utilization of such authority has addressed a homeland security capability gap or threat to the homeland identified by the Department, the total

amount of payments, if any, that were received by the Federal Government as a result of the utilization of such authority during the period covered by each such report, the outcome of each project for which such authority was utilized, and the results of any audits of such projects.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall develop a training program for acquisitions staff on the utilization of the authority provided under subsection (a).”.

(c) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to bring two important bills to the floor today that strengthen the government's ability to effectively leverage cutting-edge cyber technologies. Last year, the House passed both of these provisions as part of Majority Leader MCCARTHY's Innovation Initiative, and I am excited that we are able to bring them to the floor here so early in the 115th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 years, my colleagues and I have been working diligently with technology innovators and tech startups to find solutions that will spur innovation and break down the bureaucratic barriers that prevent the government from effectively leveraging the private sector's emerging technologies.

H.R. 239, the Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2017, addresses this problem by requiring the science and technology directorate, or S&T, to more effectively coordinate with industry and academia to support the research and development of cybersecurity technologies.

H.R. 239 does so because it requires S&T to support the full life cycle of cyber research and development projects and identify mature technologies to address cybersecurity gaps. In doing so, S&T will be required to target federally funded cybersecurity research that demonstrates a high probability of successful transition to the commercial market within 2 years.

This bill will also extend the use of other transactional authority, or OTA,

until the year 2021, a move that will improve DHS's ability to engage with tech startups that are developing these cutting-edge technologies. H.R. 239 also includes additional accountability requirements to ensure that there is proper oversight of the authority.

Mr. Speaker, our digital borders are constantly being barraged by cybercriminals, by nation-states, and by terrorists seeking to exploit and harm innocent Americans. Almost daily, we read news stories on how these hackers are intruding into our networks and doing so with increased sophistication. One thing is for certain, we have seen that cyber intrusions and their impact on victims quickly morph and increase both in frequency and in their severity.

In 2017, these hackers will unfortunately continue to pose a great threat to the U.S. homeland and to our critical infrastructure. The Federal Government, therefore, needs to keep pace with these evolving threats by more actively working with the private sector to find effective solutions.

DHS's Directorate of Science and Technology is the primary research and development arm of the Department. The directorate manages basic and applied research and development, including cybersecurity R&D, for the Department's operational components and for our first responders.

Ensuring there are mechanisms in place, like S&T's cybersecurity R&D programs and the OTA, to support the dynamic nature of cybersecurity research and development is essential for addressing homeland security capability gaps.

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, for calling up this important bill today. I believe it will have an incredibly positive impact on encouraging technology innovation across the Nation to address our vital homeland security needs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in supporting this very important bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,

Washington, DC, January 9, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,

Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 239, the “Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2017,” which was introduced on January 4, 2017.

H.R. 239 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. In order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and

would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, January 10, 2017.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 239, the “Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2017.” I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will not seek a sequential referral on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral of this bill at this time, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support a request by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of H.R. 239, the Support for Rapid Innovation Act.

Mr. Speaker, this timely legislation authorizes the Department of Homeland Security to support cybersecurity research and development and to help innovators with promising cybersecurity technologies to help commercialize their products.

Government and private sector networks are under constant attack by increasingly sophisticated cyber hackers. The cyber hacking campaign carried out by the Russian Government against U.S. political and business institutions, during the 2016 election, is a recent, high-profile example.

Concern has also been growing about the threat of cybercriminals carrying out attacks by exploiting unprotected Internet-enabled consumer products. This threat was brought into sharp focus last October with the denial of service attack against Dyn. During that attack, malware was used to direct tens of thousands of Internet-connected cameras, DVRs, and other consumer products to carry out successive, highly sophisticated attacks.

Our adversaries are constantly innovating. It is imperative that the Federal Government—and specifically DHS—innovate, too. To that end, H.R. 239 directs DHS to invest in innovative cybersecurity technologies and provide DHS with flexibility to overcome bureaucratic obstacles that sometimes

discourage smaller companies, like tech startups, from working with the Federal Government.

H.R. 239 directs DHS to pursue cybersecurity projects that will improve detection, mitigation, and recovery from attacks and bolster the security and resilience of our networks, particularly for critical infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation to ensure that DHS does its part to advance cybersecurity research and development.

Cybersecurity threats to our Nation are growing in diversity and sophistication. We cannot afford to let promising technologies languish.

The Department of Homeland Security should work with the private sector in support of innovative cybersecurity research, development, testing, and evaluation. We have seen that public-private collaboration can give these technologies the boost they need to enter the market. Just last month, DHS announced the commercialization of an eight cybersecurity product launched with the help of the Department's Transition to Practice program.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 239.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member THOMPSON for his leadership on the committee, and I want to thank the Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies Subcommittee staff for their hard work.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 239.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 239, the "Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2017," which amends the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for improved innovative research and development.

I support this bill because it would extend the Department of Homeland Security secretary's pilot program for research and development projects and prototype projects through 2020.

This bill would require the secretary to report annually to the House Homeland Security and Science committees and the Senate Homeland Security Committee on the dynamism of the projects undertaken.

Specifically, H.R. 239 would amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to include fundamental improvements to facilitate information, analytics, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents, consistent with the current law.

In particular, it adds a new section to the Homeland Security Act, directing the Department of Homeland Security to support—whether within itself, other agencies, or in academia and private industry—the research and development of cybersecurity-related technologies.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee and Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I support this bill as it directs the Under Secretary for Science and Technology to bolster research and development, along

with the testing and evaluation of cybersecurity technology to improve the sharing of information, analysis, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents.

The Rapid Innovation Act is a smart bill that will enable the Department of Homeland Security to establish and improve technologies for detecting attacks or intrusions.

The "Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2017" will equip the Department of Homeland Security with vital tools and resources to prevent and remove attacks and threats implemented by those who target our nation.

Mr. Speaker, we face growing cybersecurity threats, which demands that we increase research and development, along with the testing and evaluation of cybersecurity technology to expand the sharing of information, analysis, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents.

This is a comprehensive bill that will help protect all Americans in every corner of this nation.

I urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 239.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 239, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEVERAGING EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES ACT OF 2017

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 240) to encourage engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 240

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. INNOVATION ENGAGEMENT.

(a) INNOVATION ENGAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security—

(A) shall engage with innovative and emerging technology developers and firms, including technology-based small businesses and startup ventures, to address homeland security needs; and

(B) may identify geographic areas in the United States with high concentrations of such innovative and emerging technology developers and firms, and may establish personnel and office space in such areas, as appropriate.

(2) ENGAGEMENT.—Engagement under paragraph (1) may include innovative and emerging technology developers or firms with proven technologies, supported with outside investment, with potential applications for the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) CO-LOCATION.—If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that it is appropriate to establish personnel and office space in a specific geographic area in the United States pursuant to paragraph (1)(B), the Sec-

retary shall co-locate such personnel and office space with other existing assets of—

(A) the Department of Homeland Security, where possible; or

(B) Federal facilities, where appropriate.

(4) OVERSIGHT.—Not later than 30 days after establishing personnel and office space in a specific geographic area in the United States pursuant to paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall inform Congress about the rationale for such establishment, the anticipated costs associated with such establishment, and the specific goals for such establishment.

(b) STRATEGIC PLAN.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall develop, implement, and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a Department of Homeland Security-wide strategy to proactively engage with innovative and emerging technology developers and firms, including technology-based small businesses and startup ventures, in accordance with subsection (a). Such strategy shall—

(1) focus on sustainable methods and guidance to build relationships, including with such innovative and emerging technology developers and firms in geographic areas in the United States with high concentrations of such innovative and emerging technology developers and firms, and in geographic areas outside such areas, to establish, develop, and enhance departmental capabilities to address homeland security needs;

(2) include efforts to—

(A) ensure proven innovative and emerging technologies can be included in existing and future acquisition contracts;

(B) coordinate with organizations that provide venture capital to businesses, particularly small businesses and startup ventures, as appropriate, to assist the commercialization of innovative and emerging technologies that are expected to be ready for commercialization in the near term and within 36 months; and

(C) address barriers to the utilization of innovative and emerging technologies and the engagement of small businesses and startup ventures in the acquisition process;

(3) include a description of how the Department plans to leverage proven innovative and emerging technologies to address homeland security needs; and

(4) include the criteria the Secretary plans to use to determine an innovation or technology is proven.

(c) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, I am pleased that the House is today considering H.R. 240, the Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2017.

H.R. 240 encourages engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators, including startups. This bill requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to proactively engage with innovative and emerging technology developers and firms to address our vital Homeland Security needs.

Additionally, H.R. 240 provides the Secretary with the authority to identify geographic areas in the United States where high concentrations of these innovative and emerging technology developers and firms exist and to establish personnel and office space in these areas to more effectively collaborate with these technology hubs. The Federal Government certainly needs to do a better job working with the private sector, and H.R. 240 will help to address that.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also requires the Secretary to develop and to implement a targeted strategy to proactively engage innovative and emerging technology developers and firms.

□ 1630

Under this bill, the Secretary must use the strategic plan to address existing barriers to leveraging innovative and emerging technologies, and the small businesses and startup ventures that create those technologies, and to incorporate them into the Department's acquisition process.

For example, in order to keep pace, the Department of Homeland Security has established an office in Silicon Valley to encourage engagement and communication with the innovative technology developers in that area. Although it is a vital technology hub, Silicon Valley certainly is not the only technology hub in the United States. The Department should not be limited to a single geographic area from which to identify these emerging and innovative technologies.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans are learning that cybersecurity is national security. The impacts of cyber intrusions are being felt everywhere, from boardroom tables to kitchen tables. We have seen them undermine consumer confidence and damage a company's hard-earned reputation in just a couple of seconds. Cybersecurity is a complex and serious issue that our Nation will have to address for decades to come. So it only makes sense for us to require the Department to consider strategically just how it will engage these technology developers to strengthen the Department's ability to access innovative and emerging technologies to better combat evolving cyber threats.

I am happy to support this measure today because I believe it will move us

forward, further addressing our homeland security needs by supporting technology innovation. I urge Members to join me in supporting this important bill.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 240, the Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2017, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor of this measure, as I was for its predecessor last Congress. Last June, the House approved this measure by a 347-8 vote. This bipartisan bill directs the Department of Homeland Security to engage small businesses, startup companies, and other developers of innovative and emerging technologies to tackle some of our most vexing, persistent homeland security challenges.

It is no secret that navigating the Federal procurement process is difficult, especially for small startups. Meanwhile, small companies continue to develop some of the most innovative technological solutions in use today. They are a huge source of untapped potential, capable of bringing forward-thinking, groundbreaking ideas to the homeland security enterprise.

To build these relationships, H.R. 240 allows DHS to establish personnel and office space in areas around the U.S. where technology innovators are concentrated. Having a physical presence in these tech hubs will make it easier for DHS to grow and maintain connections with local startups, innovators, and incubators. The Department has already taken action in this regard.

In 2015, the DHS Science and Technology Directorate established a Silicon Valley office and announced its first-ever procurement focused on working with nontraditional contractors and tech startups. The DHS innovation "other transaction" solution sought technologies to address security challenges in aviation, border, and cybersecurity.

To date, under this program, DHS has funded awards to 13 small businesses in California, Texas, Georgia, Massachusetts, and Washington State. Additionally, DHS has reached out to technology innovators at regional events in Boston, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, New Orleans, Chicago, Louisville and Austin, raising awareness with more than 1,500 startups, accelerators, and venture capitalists through industry days, panels, conferences, and startup meetups. The feedback has been very positive, but it has also validated the need to educate the community about who DHS is and what the challenges are.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

H.R. 240 recognizes that DHS depends on technology to carry out its missions, and must nurture and maintain robust and direct relationships with talented technology developers, even

those that do not fit the mold of the typical Federal contractor.

DHS could improve the productivity and sustainability of these outreach efforts by developing a strategy to proactively engage with innovators in a way that supports long-term relationships. H.R. 240 calls for such a strategy to be delivered to Congress and implemented within 6 months.

Two features of that strategy required under this bill that I would like to highlight are provisions that I sponsored. One requires the strategy to give attention to fostering engagement with developers that may be located outside a recognized regional technology hub. The other directs the strategy to include coordination with venture capital organizations, like the In-Q-Tel nonprofit, to help emerging technology developers, including small businesses and startup ventures, commercialize technologies that address a rapidly growing list of homeland security needs.

Mr. Speaker, for all of the reasons discussed, I urge support of H.R. 240.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) for his support of this bill and for his leadership in keeping this issue at the forefront of our cybersecurity discussion. This is an incredibly important bill, and I, once again, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 240.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in support of H.R. 240, the "Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2017," which requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to engage with innovative and emerging technology developers, including technology-based small businesses and startup ventures that can help tackle the rapidly expanding list of homeland security technology needs.

H.R. 240 helps to protect America's computer and communications networks, which security experts believe represent the nation's most critical national security challenge, including Internet functions and connected critical infrastructure such as air traffic control, the U.S. electrical grid, and nuclear power plants.

H.R. 240 authorizes DHS to establish personnel and office space in diverse geographic areas around the United States that have high concentrations of technology developers and firms.

The bill also directs DHS, within 6 months, to develop and submit to Congress a Department-wide strategy to engage with innovative and emerging technology companies.

Importantly, the bill specifically requires the Secretary to include in that strategy ways to effectively integrate technology-based small businesses and startup ventures.

Importantly, the bill also requires the DHS Secretary to coordinate with those in the venture capital industry to assist in the development of technologies that are ready for commercialization and use in the Homeland Security Enterprise.

Since its founding, the Department of Homeland Security has overcome many challenges as an organization but much more

progress must be made regarding effective inter-operable communication between the federal, state, and local agencies.

Although not a panacea, H.R. 240 is a step in the right direction because it will help improve DHS' overall functions so that it can more effectively protect our people.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 240, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODERNIZING GOVERNMENT TRAVEL ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 274) to provide for reimbursement for the use of modern travel services by Federal employees traveling on official Government business, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 274

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Modernizing Government Travel Act".

SEC. 2. FEDERAL EMPLOYEE REIMBURSEMENT FOR USE OF MODERN TRAVEL SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services shall prescribe regulations under section 5707 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the reimbursement for the use of a transportation network company or innovative mobility technology company by any Federal employee traveling on official business under subchapter I of chapter 57 of such title, except that the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall prescribe such regulations with respect to employees of the judicial branch of the Government.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) INNOVATIVE MOBILITY TECHNOLOGY COMPANY.—The term "innovative mobility technology company" means an organization, including a corporation, limited liability company, partnership, sole proprietorship, or any other entity, that applies technology to expand and enhance available transportation choices, better manage demand for transportation services, and provide alternatives to driving alone.

(2) TRANSPORTATION NETWORK COMPANY.—The term "transportation network company"—

(A) means a corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship, or other entity, that uses a digital network to connect riders to drivers affiliated with the entity in order for the driver to transport the rider using a vehicle owned, leased, or otherwise authorized for use by the driver to a point chosen by the rider; and

(B) does not include a shared-expense carpool or vanpool arrangement that is not intended to generate profit for the driver.

SEC. 3. REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION COSTS.

Section 5707(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(C)(1) Not later than November 30 of each year, the head of each agency shall submit to the Administrator of the General Services, in a format prescribed by the Administrator and approved by the Director the Office of Management and Budget—

"(A) data on total agency payments for such items as travel and transportation of people, average costs and durations of trips, and purposes of official travel;

"(B) data on estimated total agency payments for employee relocation; and

"(C) an analysis of the total costs of transportation service by type, and the total number of trips utilizing each transportation type for purposes of official travel.

"(2) The Administrator of the General Services shall make the data submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) publically available upon receipt.

"(3) Not later than January 31 of each year, the Administrator of the General Services shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate—

"(A) an analysis of the data submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) for the agencies listed in section 901(b) of title 31 and a survey of such data for each other agency; and

"(B) a description of any new regulations promulgated or changes to existing regulations authorized under this section."

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 274, the Modernizing Government Travel Act, is a bipartisan bill sponsored by Congressman SETH MOULTON of Massachusetts. Mr. WILL HURD of Texas and Congressman MARK MEADOWS of North Carolina have all come together on this bill. It is a good bill.

This bill came up in the 114th Congress. The same bill passed through the committee by regular order, and then in a close vote—much like the Clemson-Alabama game last night—when we voted on this bill last session was 415-0. I think there was a pretty good sense from the past Congress that is a good bill, and it should pass.

Federal employees' current transportation options on official travel are limited. While some agencies allow employees to be reimbursed for the use of sharing economy services, such as Lyft or Uber, not all of them do. As a result,

the whole Federal Government does not benefit from the cost savings that can occur while being associated with these services.

The Modernizing Government Travel Act allows the Federal Government to reap the benefits of the sharing economy. The bill ensures that new transportation services as they emerge, Federal employees can quickly take advantage of the efficiencies of the new technologies that may be offered.

By opening up a new market for transportation services, H.R. 274 will also help spur innovation and competition, creating greater cost savings. We have some 2 million Federal employees. So this is an important part and it shouldn't be glanced over. There could be considerable savings along the way.

We must ensure that there is accountability for travel expenditures. Our committee, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and other watchdog groups outside of government are looking at these expenses.

We have a duty and obligation to ensure that we are dealing with Federal taxpayer dollars responsibly. This bill mandates that agencies report their travel costs for each type of travel service to the General Services Administration, the GSA. The GSA must publish that data, helping make the Federal Government more transparent and accountable. The GSA will also report to Congress on agency official travel costs in order to make sure that they inform future transportation policy decisions. I urge passage of the bill.

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

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

I was trying to think of a BYU football analogy to go with the Clemson-Alabama analogy, but I haven't been able to come up with one yet. I will work on it.

I rise in support of H.R. 274, the Modernizing Government Travel Act, as amended. I appreciate the good work of Representatives Moulton, Hurd, Meadows, Bustos, and Swalwell on this bipartisan measure.

H.R. 274 would expand the transportation options for Federal employees on official government travel by allowing them to be reimbursed for the use of ridesharing services such as Uber and Lyft. This bill would also allow for the use of future mobility technologies not yet known or available to be covered as by reimbursable travel expenses. The General Services Administration would be directed to issue implementing regulations. The bill would require Federal agencies to submit to GSA detailed information on their travel costs, including breakdowns of costs by transportation type by November 30 of each year.

GSA would be required to submit annual reports to Congress containing an analysis or survey of agencies' travel costs as well as descriptions of new or revised regulations.

H.R. 274 is a commonsense, good government bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), the cosponsor of this bill and someone who has been very involved in this subject.

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, it is way past time that our government reconsiders the way that it views technology. Adherence to decades-old policy regarding technology costs our taxpayers billions of dollars, stifles creativity, and needlessly prevents our government from utilizing private sector technologies.

This bill, the Modernizing Government Travel Act, is simple. It will allow Federal employees to utilize the services of innovative companies while on official travel. Last Congress, as the chairman alluded to, this bill passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support, 415-0.

Private sector companies have had a tremendous impact on the way that people travel, and we should allow our government to recognize these changes. By widening the scope of reimbursable forms of transportation, we are encouraging the adoption of innovative technologies and promoting competition.

The bill also requires agencies to report what type of transportation their employees are taking while on official travel, and this data will be publicly available, thus increasing transparency and accountability in how taxpayer dollars are being spent.

□ 1645

H.R. 274, as amended, is a sensible piece of legislation that can help modernize our government and ensure that the United States is moving seamlessly into the 21st century.

I want to thank my colleague, Representative MOULTON, for his leadership on this important issue, as well as Representatives MEADOWS, BUSTOS, and SWALWELL for their support for this bill. I ask my colleagues to join me in the support of H.R. 274.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 274, the Modernizing Government Travel Act. This legislation is a bipartisan effort that demonstrates a consensus amongst all of us that the Federal Government has failed to keep pace with the technological advances and innovation that have come to define the 21st century.

Despite the emergence of new technologies designed to improve the way we travel, today, some Federal employees are unable to be reimbursed for using more cost-effective, innovative

modes of transportation when traveling on official business.

Innovative ridesharing services supported by mobile apps have dramatically changed how we get from one place to another. Now, with just a few taps on a phone, we can access a variety of new transportation options like rideshare, carshare, and bikeshare that complement rapid transit, take more cars off our congested roads, and reduce fuel emissions. According to a recent study, 52 percent of people using transit for work-related travel chose to use ride-hailing services and other innovative technologies.

While the General Services Administration allows agencies to authorize the use of these transportation options by Federal employees, it has not nor is it required by law to issue comprehensive guidance across the Federal Government.

H.R. 274 would require the General Services Administration to implement regulations to allow Federal employees to use transportation options like rideshare and bikeshare for official travel. The GSA Administrator would be required to submit annual reports to Congress on the implementation of these regulations and the resulting amount of government savings.

I want to thank my friend and colleague, Representative HURD, for working with me on this legislation, as well as Representatives SWALWELL, ISSA, MEADOWS, and BUSTOS for their support. This is truly a bipartisan effort that will increase the Federal Government's engagement in the sharing economy while saving taxpayer dollars.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. MOULTON, first and foremost, for his service to our country, serving in the armed services. We really do appreciate that. I can't thank him enough for that service. But I also appreciate him bringing forward this bill and his working with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

I appreciate what Mr. DESAULNIER and our ranking member on our committee, Mr. CUMMINGS, have done, too, to help move this bill forward.

So there was good, broad, bipartisan support, strong support in the 114th Congress, passing unanimously, with 415 votes. I think it is worthy to bring this up early in the Congress and get on with the idea of saving money and taking advantage of technology, as Mr. HURD said and as Mr. MOULTON talked about as well, save some money and tap into the technology that is available to save money for the government and, ultimately, for the taxpayers. It is their money indeed. So I would urge its passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 274, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1720

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia) at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

HELPING ANGELS LEAD OUR STARTUPS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 33 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 79.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) kindly take the chair.

□ 1721

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 79) to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law, with Mr. WOODALL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-2 offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 115-2 on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ of New York.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CLAY of Missouri.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 249, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

AYES—167

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

NOES—249

Abraham	Biggs	Budd
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Burgess
Allen	Bishop (MI)	Byrne
Amash	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Amodei	Blackburn	Cárdenas
Arrington	Blum	Carter (GA)
Babin	Bost	Carter (TX)
Bacon	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Banks (IN)	Brat	Chaffetz
Barletta	Bridenstine	Cheney
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Coffman
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Bera	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Bergman	Buck	Collins (NY)
Beutler	Bucshon	Comer

Comstock	Joyce (OH)
Conaway	Katko
Cook	Kelly (MS)
Cooper	Kelly (PA)
Costa	Kind
Costello (PA)	King (IA)
Cramer	King (NY)
Crawford	Kinzing er
Culberson	Knight
Curbelo (FL)	Kustoff (TN)
Davidson	Labrador
Davis, Rodney	LaHood
Denham	LaMalfa
Dent	Lamborn
DeSantis	Lance
DesJarlais	Latta
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (MN)
Donovan	LoBiondo
Duffy	Long
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk
Dunn	Love
Emmer	Lucas
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer
Faso	MacArthur
Ferguson	Marchant
Fitzpatrick	Marino
Fleischmann	Marshall
Flores	Massie
Fortenberry	Mast
Fox	McCarthy
Franks (AZ)	McCaul
Frelinghuysen	McClintock
Gaetz	McHenry
Gallagher	McKinley
Garrett	McMorris
Gibbs	Rodgers
Gohmert	McSally
Godlatte	Meadows
Gosar	Meehan
Gowdy	Messer
Granger	Mitchell
Graves (GA)	Moolenaar
Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Graves (MO)	Moulton
Griffith	Mullin
Grothman	Mulvaney
Guthrie	Murphy (PA)
Harper	Newhouse
Harris	Noem
Hartzler	Nunes
Hensarling	O'Halleran
Hice, Jody B.	Olson
Higgins (LA)	Palazzo
Hill	Palmer
Himes	Paulsen
Holding	Pearce
Hollingsworth	Perry
Hudson	Peters
Hultgren	Pittenger
Hunter	Poe (TX)
Hurd	Poliquin
Issa	Polis
Jenkins (KS)	Posey
Jenkins (WV)	Ratcliffe
Johnson (LA)	Reed
Johnson (OH)	Reichert
Johnson, Sam	Renacci
Jordan	Rice (NY)
	Rice (SC)

NOT VOTING—18

Becerra	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Black	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Danny	Lee	Schakowsky
Dingell	Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)
Duncan (SC)	Pompeo	Takano
Jackson Lee	Price, Tom (GA)	Zinke

□ 1742

Messrs. WITTMAN, BILIRAKIS, BERA, LUETKEMEYER, WEBSTER of Florida, MOULTON, and BISHOP of Utah changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CROWLEY, Mses. DELAURO and WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CLAY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) on

which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 253, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

AYES—163

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

NOES—253

Abraham	Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)
Aderholt	Black	Carter (TX)
Allen	Blackburn	Chabot
Amash	Blum	Chaffetz
Amodei	Bost	Cheney
Arrington	Brady (TX)	Coffman
Babin	Brat	Cole
Bacon	Bridenstine	Collins (GA)
Banks (IN)	Brooks (AL)	Collins (NY)
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Comer
Barr	Buchanan	Comstock
Barton	Buck	Conaway
Bergman	Bucshon	Cook
Beutler	Budd	Cooper
Biggs	Burgess	Costa
Bilirakis	Byrne	Costello (PA)
Bishop (MI)	Calvert	Cramer

Crawford Kind
Culberson King (IA)
Curbelo (FL) King (NY)
Davidson Kinzinger
Davis, Rodney Knight
Denham Kustoff (TN)
Dent Labrador
DeSantis LaHood
DesJarlais LaMalfa
Diaz-Balart Lamborn
Donovan Lance
Duffy Latta
Duncan (TN) Lawson (FL)
Dunn Lewis (MN)
Emmer LoBiondo
Eshoo Long
Farenthold Loudermilk
Faso Love
Ferguson Lucas
Fitzpatrick Luetkemeyer
Fleischmann MacArthur
Flores Marchant
Fortenberry Marino
Foxy Marshall
Franks (AZ) Massie
Frelinghuysen Mast
Gaetz McCarthy
Gallagher McCaul
Garrett McClintock
Gibbs McHenry
Gohmert McKinley
Goodlatte McMorris
Gosar Rodgers
Gowdy McSally
Granger Meadows
Graves (GA) Meehan
Graves (LA) Messer
Graves (MO) Mitchell
Griffith Moolenaar
Grothman Mooney (WV)
Guthrie Moulton
Harper Mullin
Harris Mulvaney
Hartzler Murphy (FL)
Hensarling Murphy (PA)
Hice, Jody B. Newhouse
Higgins (LA) Noem
Hill Nunes
Himes O'Halleran
Holding Olson
Hollingsworth Palazzo
Hudson Palmer
Huizenga Panetta
Hultgren Paulsen
Hunter Pearce
Hurd Perry
Issa Peters
Jenkins (KS) Pittenger
Jenkins (WV) Poe (TX)
Johnson (LA) Poliquin
Johnson (OH) Polis
Johnson, Sam Posey
Jones Ratcliffe
Jordan Reed
Joyce (OH) Reichert
Katko Renacci
Kelly (MS) Rice (NY)
Kelly (PA) Rice (SC)

NOT VOTING—18

Becerra Johnson (GA) Rush
Davis, Danny Kelly (IL) Ryan (OH)
Dingell Lee Schakowsky
Duncan (SC) Perlmutter Sewell (AL)
Gutiérrez Pompeo Takano
Jackson Lee Price, Tom (GA) Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1747

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEWART) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOODALL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration

the bill (H.R. 79) to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law, and, pursuant to House Resolution 33, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 344, nays 73, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—344

Abraham Comstock
Adams Conaway
Aderholt Connolly
Aguilar Cook
Allen Cooper
Amash Correa
Amodei Costa
Arrington Costello (PA)
Babin Courtney
Bacon Cramer
Banks (IN) Crawford
Barletta Crist
Barr Crowley
Barton Cuellar
Beatty Culberson
Bera Curbelo (FL)
Bergman Davidson
Beutler Davis (CA)
Beyer Davis, Rodney
Biggs DeFazio
Bilirakis DeGette
Bishop (GA) Delaney
Bishop (MI) DelBene
Bishop (UT) Demings
Black Denham
Blackburn Dent
Blum DeSantis
Blunt Rochester DesJarlais
Bost Deutch
Boyle, Brendan Diaz-Balart
F. Donovan
Brady (TX) Doyle, Michael
Brat F.
Bridenstine Duffy
Brooks (AL) Duncan (TN)
Brooks (IN) Dunn
Brown (MD) Emmer
Brownley (CA) Engel
Buchanan Eshoo
Buck Esty
Bucshon Evans
Budd Farenthold
Burgess Faso
Bustos Ferguson
Butterfield Fitzpatrick
Byrne Fleischmann
Calvert Flores
Carbajal Fortenberry
Cárdenas Foster
Carter (GA) Foxx
Carter (TX) Franks (AZ)
Castor (FL) Frelinghuysen
Castro (TX) Gaetz
Chabot Gallagher
Chaffetz Garamendi
Cheney Garrett
Chu, Judy Gibbs
Clarke (NY) Gohmert
Coffman Gonzalez (TX)
Cole Goodlatte
Collins (GA) Gosar
Collins (NY) Gottheimer
Comer Gowdy

LoBiondo Palmer
Loeb sack Panetta
Lofgren Paulsen
Long Pearce
Loudermilk Perry
Love Peters
Lucas Peterson
Luetkemeyer Pingree
Lujan Grisham, M. Pittenger
M. Poe (TX)
Luján, Ben Ray Poliquin
MacArthur Polis
Maloney Posey
Malone, Carolyn B. Price (NC)
Maloney, Sean Quigley
Marchant Ratcliffe
Marino Reed
Marshall Reichert
Massie Renacci
Mast Rice (NY)
Matsui Rice (SC)
McCarthy Roby
McCaul Roe (TN)
McClintock Rogers (AL)
McCollum Rogers (KY)
McEachin Rohrabacher
McHenry Rokita
McKinley Rooney, Francis
McMorris Rooney, Thomas
Rodgers J.
McNerney Ros-Lehtinen
McSally Rosen
Meadows Roskam
Meehan Ross
Meeks Rothfus
Meng Rouzer
Messer Royce (CA)
Mitchell Ruiz
Moolenaar Ruppertsberger
Mooney (WV) Russell
Moulton Rutherford
Mullin Sanford
Mulvaney Scalise
Murphy (FL) Schiff
Murphy (PA) Schneider
Newhouse Schrader
Noem Schweikert
Nolan Scott, Austin
Norcross Scott, David
Nunes Sensenbrenner
O'Halleran Sessions
O'Rourke Shea-Porter
Olson Shimkus
Palazzo Shuster

NAYS—73

Barragán Green, Al
Bass Green, Gene
Blumenauer Grijalva
Bonamici Gutiérrez
Brady (PA) Hanabusa
Capuano Hastings
Carson (IN) Huffman
Cartwright Jayapal
Cicilline Johnson, E. B.
Clark (MA) Kaptur
Clay Khanna
Cleaver Kihuen
Clyburn Kildee
Cohen Langevin
Conyers Lewis (GA)
Cummings Lowenthal
DeLauro Lowey
DeSaulnier Lynch
Doggett McGovern
Ellison Moore
Españillat Nadler
Frankel (FL) Napolitano
Fudge Neal
Gabbard Pallone
Gallego Pascrell

NOT VOTING—17

Becerra Kelly (IL) Ryan (OH)
Davis, Danny Lee Schakowsky
Dingell Perlmutter Sewell (AL)
Duncan (SC) Pompeo Takano
Jackson Lee Price, Tom (GA) Zinke
Johnson (GA) Rush

□ 1757

Ms. ADAMS changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on Tuesday, January 10, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 5 and H.R. 79—Vote “no”; H. Res. 33—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 5 (Regulatory Accountability Act of 2017) and H.R. 79 (HALOS Act)—Vote “no”; H.R. 79—Velázquez Amendment Made in Order—Vote “yes”; H.R. 79—Clay Amendment Made in Order—Vote “yes”; H.R. 79—Final Passage—Vote “no”.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 78, SEC REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 238, COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. NEWHOUSE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-3) on the resolution (H. Res. 40) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 78) to improve the consideration by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 238) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1800

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

TESTED ABILITY TO LEVERAGE EXCEPTIONAL NATIONAL TALENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 39) to amend title 5, United States Code, to codify the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 39

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Tested Ability to Leverage Exceptional National Talent Act of 2017” or the “TALENT Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. PRESIDENTIAL INNOVATION FELLOWS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER V—PRESIDENTIAL INNOVATION FELLOWS PROGRAM

“§ 3171. Presidential Innovation Fellows Program

“(a) POLICY.—It is in the national interest for the Government to attract the brightest minds skilled in technology or innovative practices to serve in the Government to work on some of the Nation’s biggest and most pressing challenges. This subchapter establishes a program to encourage successful entrepreneurs, executives, and innovators to join the Government and work in close cooperation with Government leaders, to create meaningful solutions that can help save lives and taxpayer money, fuel job creation, and significantly improve how the Government serves the American people.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator of General Services shall continue the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program (hereinafter referred to as the ‘Program’) to enable exceptional individuals with proven track records to serve time-limited appointments in executive agencies to address some of the Nation’s most significant challenges and improve existing Government efforts that would particularly benefit from expertise using innovative techniques and technology.

“(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Program shall be administered by a Director, appointed by the Administrator under authorities of the General Services Administration. The Administrator shall provide necessary staff, resources and administrative support for the Program.

“(d) APPOINTMENT OF FELLOWS.—The Director shall appoint fellows pursuant to the Program and, in cooperation with executive agencies, shall facilitate placement of fellows to participate in projects that have the potential for significant positive effects and are consistent with the President’s goals.

“(e) APPLICATION PROCESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall prescribe the process for applications and nominations of individuals to the Program.

“(2) PROGRAM STANDARDS.—Following publication of these processes, the Director may accept for consideration applications from individuals. The Director shall establish, administer, review, and revise, if appropriate, a Governmentwide cap on the number of fellows. The Director shall establish and publish salary ranges, benefits, and standards for the Program.

“(f) SELECTION, APPOINTMENT, AND ASSIGNMENT OF FELLOWS.—

“(1) PROCEDURES.—The Director shall prescribe appropriate procedures for the selection, appointment, and assignment of fellows.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—Prior to the selection of fellows, the Director shall consult with the heads of executive agencies regarding potential projects and how best to meet those needs. Following such consultation, the Director shall select and appoint individuals to serve as fellows.

“(3) TIME LIMITATION.—Fellows selected for the Program shall serve under short-term, time-limited appointments. Such fellows shall be appointed for no less than 6 months and no longer than 2 years in the Program. The Director shall facilitate the process of placing fellows at requesting executive agencies.

“(g) RESPONSIBILITIES OF AGENCIES.—Each executive agency shall work with the Direc-

tor and the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program advisory board established under section 3172 to attempt to maximize the Program’s benefits to the agency and the Government, including by identifying initiatives that have a meaningful effect on the people served and that benefit from involvement by one or more fellows. Such agencies shall ensure that each fellow works closely with responsible senior officials for the duration of the assignment.

“§ 3172. Presidential Innovation Fellows Program advisory board

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of General Services shall continue an advisory board to advise the Director of the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program by recommending such priorities and standards as may be beneficial to fulfill the mission of the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program and assist in identifying potential projects and placements for fellows. The advisory board may not participate in the selection process under section 3171(f).

“(b) CHAIR; MEMBERSHIP.—The Administrator shall designate a representative to serve as the Chair of the advisory board. In addition to the Chair, the membership of the advisory board shall include—

“(1) the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget;

“(2) the Director of the Office of Personnel Management;

“(3) the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government of the Office of Management and Budget;

“(4) the Assistant to the President and Chief Technology Officer; and

“(5) other individuals as may be designated by the Administrator.

“(c) CONSULTATION.—The advisory board may consult with industry, academia, or nonprofits to ensure the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program is continually identifying opportunities to apply advanced skillsets and innovative practices in effective ways to address the Nation’s most significant challenges.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER V—PRESIDENTIAL INNOVATION FELLOWS PROGRAM

“3171. Presidential Innovation Fellows Program.

“3172. Presidential Innovation Fellows Program advisory board.”.

(c) TRANSITION.—The Presidential Innovation Fellows Program established pursuant to Executive Order 13704 (5 U.S.C. 3301 note) as in existence on the day before the date of enactment of this Act shall be considered the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program described in the amendments made by this Act.

(d) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act. This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the government is many things. It is large, it is complicated, and it is ineffective. I don't think anyone would call it modern. While the world is rushing forward with things like voice-based interfaces, autonomous vehicles, online retail, and data analytics, government is stubbornly years, or even decades, behind.

We do not have to accept it. One of the purposes of the Innovation Initiative, our effort here in the House, is to bring government into the modern age.

Right now, it can still take hours for citizens to get the IRS on the phone to ask the most basic questions. Parents and students still deal with the clunky user interfaces when applying for tuition assistance. And the VA still uses a scheduling system that is a quarter century old. It doesn't have to be this way.

We have a program right now, the Presidential Innovation Fellows program, that brings in highly talented professionals from across the country to help upgrade our government's use of technology. Now, these are engineers, designers, innovators, and thinkers. They challenge the old ways of thinking and introduce new approaches to make our government work the way the American people deserve it to work.

I sponsored the TALENT Act to make sure this innovation program continues into the future. By drawing on the great talent of the American people, we can make government effective, efficient, and accountable.

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

I rise today in strong support of the TALENT Act, a bill to ensure that we continue to bring top private sector innovators into government to help solve complex technological problems at Federal agencies.

The Presidential Innovation Fellows program was established by President Obama in 2012 to identify and pursue projects that apply and implement innovative private sector techniques in as little as 6 months. The program was made permanent by Executive Order 13704 in 2015, and would be codified by the bill before us today.

H.R. 39 would require the General Services Administration to continue managing the program with guidance from an advisory board comprised of representatives from different executive branch agencies. Over 100 Presidential Innovation Fellows have already been appointed to work alongside dedicated civil servants at 25 Federal agencies and departments.

At those agencies, fellows have been able to merge their experience from

top universities, pioneering companies, and successful nonprofits with their desire to contribute to society through public service. This collaboration has allowed the Federal Government to obtain new tools, develop new technologies, and ultimately become more effective and efficient.

Presidential Innovation Fellows have reshaped the way Americans interact with their government in areas ranging from health care and science to law enforcement and disaster response. Fifteen million Americans can access their health data as a result of the program's Blue Button initiative, and cancer patients can search for clinical trials as part of work to support the Vice President's Cancer Moonshot initiative.

Scientists can now obtain more weather data collected by NOAA, and veterans can now more readily access custom prosthetic designs.

Citizens can review police records, including crime statistics and data on officer-involved shootings. And FEMA and other first responders can better target and prioritize their response to natural disasters.

All of these things have been made possible through the Presidential Innovation Fellows program, and it is crucial that we continue our support of these and other endeavors by ensuring its permanency.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 39.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Today, I am urging my colleagues to support H.R. 39, the TALENT Act, introduced by Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY of California. This bill passed the House on a strong bipartisan vote in the 114th Congress, and I am glad to be part of the team working to enact this important legislation into law.

The TALENT Act makes permanent the Presidential Innovation Fellows program that was created in 2012. This highly competitive program recruits talented, private sector innovators and technologists from across the United States.

Presidential Innovation Fellows serve in the Washington, D.C., area for 12 months at an executive agency. These agencies include the Department of Energy, NASA, and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Fellows bring with them their experience in the private sector to help government turn ideas into tangible results that ultimately benefit the American people. Since 2012, at least 96 top innovators have participated in the program.

Past and current fellows have come from companies large and small and hold degrees from top universities across the country. They have won a variety of awards, including Fulbright scholarships, Silicon Valley Business Journal's 40 Under 40 recognition, and Truman National Security Project fel-

lowships. These fellows truly are the best and the brightest the United States has to offer, and they seek to utilize their skills for the American people.

Presidential Innovation Fellows are giving the Federal Government the tools it needs to successfully operate in the 21st century. Previous projects completed by fellows include Uncle Sam's List. Fellows created a database to offer a centralized information center in which agencies can forgo buying new commodity IT and support services in favor of existing services provided by the Federal agencies. This program has saved an estimated \$2.5 billion, and it is helping government become more effective and efficient.

I commend Majority Leader MCCARTHY for the work to bring this innovation to the government. Again, I urge support for this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative HURD for his work, which has been an ongoing continuing work on this issue and on this particular program.

I rise in support of this bipartisan bill, which builds on the work that Majority Leader MCCARTHY and I and others in this House have been doing to modernize government technology and renew America's faith in government.

In 2016, exit polls showed that dissatisfaction with the government spanned the political spectrum. That is a shame because government is supposed to be a force for improving people's lives, keeping our country safe, and expanding opportunities for all Americans.

That is why I unveiled the House Democrats' Renewing Faith in Government agenda last summer. We must present bold solutions to reform our democracy and our government. Certainly, on both sides of the equation, that is what the American people were saying in the last election.

One of the goals of our agenda is modernizing government technology. Most Americans understand the transformative power of technology—the Majority Leader spoke of it in so many different aspects of our lives—and how digitizing businesses makes them more efficient, transparent, and accountable. We have seen it in the private sector. Every day, millions of Americans shop on sites like Amazon or Etsy and catch a ride using Uber or Lyft.

Government technology is in terrible shape, and bringing the latest practices from Silicon Valley into government would make a huge difference in serving our citizens and streamlining the way government works for the American people.

Last year, I worked closely with the Obama administration and Tony Scott to advance one of its top priorities in this area: creating a technology modernization fund for the rapid upgrade of

the most outdated, costly, and insecure technology systems across the Federal Government. Mr. HURD was involved deeply in that effort. The result was the Modernizing Government Technology Act, which the House passed overwhelmingly with the help of Chairman CHAFFETZ and Majority Leader MCCARTHY.

Last month, Majority Leader MCCARTHY and I expressed our bipartisan support for one of President Obama's most successful efforts at bringing Silicon Valley talent into the Federal workforce: the U.S. Digital Service and GSA's 18F program. In fact, I visited the 18F program in San Francisco and was extraordinarily impressed with the individuals who peopled that project and were giving of their time. I guess we were paying them a little bit, but, relatively speaking, they were giving their time.

Today's bill, the TALENT Act, would make permanent the precursor to both these programs: the Presidential Innovation Fellows. This program has a proven track record of bringing top talent from the innovation economy into the Federal workforce where it is sorely needed.

I hope the next administration will continue all of these innovative programs, which have begun to change the culture within our government.

I also hope that the talented individuals—many of whom, as I referenced, left high-paying jobs in the private sector—will stay on through the transition and continue to serve their country by improving government technology.

President Obama made real progress in this area, including with the launch of his Open Data Directive, his We the People petition platform, and his Cyber National Action Plan. More could have been achieved if Congress had agreed to his request to invest more in these areas. We have seen a dramatic example of why cybersecurity investment is so critically important for our country, not for Democrats, not for Republicans, but for all Americans. This is an effort toward that end.

I hope we can work together in this new Congress to unleash the transformative power of modern technology within government and help renew America's faith in our government. That is critical if we are to be successful as a Nation. I am sure it hopefully is what all of us want to do on a bipartisan basis.

I thank Representative DESAULNIER for his efforts, and I thank Representative HURD for his leadership on this effort.

I am pleased to join with my counterpart, Majority Leader MCCARTHY, in strong support of this legislation.

□ 1815

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the gentleman from California aware that I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I just briefly congratulate everyone who has been involved. As somebody who represents the bay area and struggles with the innovation in the private sector there to integrate it into the public sector at all levels of government, I really admire the work by Mr. HURD, the comments and the contributions by the administration, and Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. HOYER.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on our side. I congratulate Mr. HURD.

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

Mr. HURD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to thank for their years of service on such an important issue Mr. DESAULNIER and Leader HOYER and Leader MCCARTHY.

I would like to urge the adoption of this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 39.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NORTH KOREA MISCHIEF

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week, North Korea declared that it can launch an intercontinental ballistic missile at any time that it wishes.

Even our own Deputy Secretary of State recently warned that Little Kim's weapon capabilities have shown qualitative improvement within the past year resulting in "unprecedented level of activity."

Why is that?

Well, because this administration has done little to stop Little Kim. Instead, the administration has naively pursued a strategy it calls "strategic patience."

Strategic patience is a fancy phrase for ignoring the obvious. There was a time when we kept North Korea on the State Sponsors of Terrorism List. They came off the list because they have made promises that they have clearly broken.

Mischievous Little Kim's threats continue to grow bolder and bolder, with no repercussions. We cannot afford to risk the security of our citizens for the sake of diplomatic strategy that has proven to be a failure.

This week I will reintroduce legislation to put North Korea back on the State Sponsors of Terrorism List be-

cause Little Kim is a terror to world peace.

And that is just the way it is.

GIVING THANKS

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give thanks. I give thanks to the people of California's 44th District for giving me the honor and the privilege to serve them.

My district is rich with immigrants. My own mom, who turned 76 today, is an immigrant from Mexico who came here with a third grade education so her kids could have a shot at the American Dream.

In my district, only 10 percent of students go on to college. I am grateful to be one of those 10 percenters who beat the odds and got a piece of the American Dream.

But those numbers are unacceptable. I pledge to fight for them to make sure everyone, regardless of income, immigration status, or race has a shot at the American Dream.

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to be here and, especially, to look out and see some people for whom I have eminent respect in this body. That is a nice thing, being in a body where I actually have respect for the people in the body, a good thing.

We know that elections, as President Obama told us quite succinctly 8 years ago, have consequences. Elections do have consequences, and we have a new team coming to town. One of the things that has concerned me greatly, and I know it has concerned many in this body, is that we as a Nation have had the ability to give protection basically to this idea of freedom that our Founders had, cultivated, and gave their lives to create.

As I have mentioned from this podium previously, as I was told by some west African Christians in Togo, they said:

We were so excited when you elected your first Black President, but since your President has been there, we have seen America get weaker and weaker. We all are Christians and we know where we are going when we die, but we also know our only chance for peace in this world is if America is strong. So please go back to Washington and please tell the other Members of Congress to stop getting weaker. We suffer when you get weaker.

I seen this article from Melissa Mullins after a study was done. It said, "Christians Most Persecuted Religious

Group in the World.” And that is while America is supposed to be the strongest nation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I see a friend is here on the floor, and I now yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to serve the constituents of the Second Congressional District of West Virginia for a second term.

As we begin the 115th session of Congress, my top legislative priorities are rolling back anti-coal regulations that have been imposed by President Obama’s administration over the last 8 years; fighting the drug epidemic; repealing ObamaCare and making health care more affordable and accessible; and investing in our roads, bridges, airports, and other key infrastructure.

West Virginia needs good-paying jobs. President Obama has spent the last 8 years waging a war on coal on our country. During this session of Congress, we must continue to work together to promote an all-of-the-above energy strategy that conserves our natural resources, cultivates our economy and jobs, and promotes American energy independence.

One of our Nation’s and our States’ greatest natural resources is our fossil fuel. Fossil fuel, including coal, supplies around 85 percent of our Nation’s energy. West Virginia produces about 15 percent of that total.

Under the outgoing administration, we have seen our West Virginia energy industries come under attack even though we have made significant strides in recent years to improve the quality of our air, land, and water. By rolling back harmful regulations like the so-called stream protection rule, we can save 30,000 jobs in the Appalachian region right now. That is why last year I introduced my bill, the Supporting Transparent Regulatory and Environmental Actions in Mining Act, also known as the STREAM Act. My bill was passed by the House last year with bipartisan support, and I will continue to fight to stop this outrageous rule from taking effect.

Another top priority for this Congress must be stopping the drug epidemic in our country. Drug abuse ravages our communities, rips families apart, and further ruptures our State’s already-ailing economy. This issue is above party politics. It is a plague that both parties must come together to solve. There is no magical solution to this epidemic. We need local, State, and Federal officials to work together to effectively and efficiently fight back.

This past Congress I worked with Members on both sides of the aisle to find commonsense solutions to fight back against this scourge. That is why I introduced H.R. 4499, the Promoting Responsible Opioid Prescribing Act. This bipartisan bill struck out a harmful provision of ObamaCare that places unnecessary pressure on doctors and

hospitals to prescribe narcotic pain medicine. I am proud to say that the Department of Health and Human Services announced that they changed their policy and implemented my bill. This change in policy is an important part of the fight against opioid abuse. I will remain steadfast in my efforts to fight this epidemic.

Another important way to fight back against the drug epidemic is by making health care more accessible and affordable. The first step to do this is to repeal ObamaCare.

Healthcare costs are on the rise because ObamaCare adds burdensome taxes, regulations, and mandates onto American consumers. The limited choice in health insurance plans is harming families and their budgets. ObamaCare will kill 2.5 million jobs in 10 years. It has continued to raise health insurance costs and has placed the Federal Government in between patients and their doctors.

Research done by the National Center for Policy Analysis found that average monthly premium costs increased for almost everyone regardless of their age, race, or gender after ObamaCare was implemented.

As a Republican in Congress, I want to ensure that everyone has access to health care, but I want it to be quality health care that people choose for themselves. That is why Republicans have come up with a plan that we call A Better Way. Our plan recognizes that people deserve more patient-centered care, not more bureaucracy. That means more choices, not more mandates.

The A Better Way plan offers many improvements that will help West Virginia’s Second Congressional District, including commonsense reforms such as allowing health insurance sales across State lines. Simple changes like these will lower costs and increase choice for Americans.

Finally, it is imperative to pass bills that invest in our Nation’s deteriorating infrastructure. President-elect Trump has said that updating our Nation’s infrastructure is a top priority for his administration.

□ 1830

The Federal Highway Administration has classified more than 142,000 bridges as either “structurally deficient” or “functionally obsolete.” Also from the Federal Highway Administration, traffic delays cost the U.S. economy more than \$50 billion annually. Most major roads are rated as “less than good condition.”

Improvement to other Nation’s infrastructure would greatly benefit West Virginia, which needs road, bridge and rail repairs. We are also in need of water, sewer, and power line repairs.

By improving the transportation, our country will open the opportunity for job growth and expansion. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the House and the Senate, as well as the new administration, to make sure

that these legislative priorities take hold.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much my friend Mr. MOONEY’s points. Well made.

This administration hasn’t turned around health care in America, hasn’t seen more choices, people keeping their doctors, keeping their insurance policies they liked. They have seen deductibles skyrocket, such that so many people across America have had \$5-, \$6-, \$7-, \$8,000 deductibles. We never had deductibles that high before.

What that effectively meant was they weren’t going to get any health insurance help. They were totally on their own, that every single payment that they made, even if they got subsidies from the Federal Government, was for nothing. They got no help. They could never come up with enough money in 1 year to meet the deductible so that the insurance would start paying in.

What is even more egregious is that apparently we found out that much of this was known would happen before people had ObamaCare forced onto them.

Then, in the last week we have had this story from Stephen Dinan, from The Washington Times, finding out that the IRS prioritized their role in ObamaCare over taxpayer customer service. That is what their own inspector general report said.

You would think that an administration that says their number one concern was America’s health care, that they would not drive so many people off of the insurance they had, they loved, that they could afford, that had the doctor in the system they could use, had the medicine in the policy covered that they could use. Millions have been driven off of their policies to Medicaid, which so many doctors don’t even take, and this administration has called that a great victory.

Yet, in the midst of all of this, we knew—it was talked about back in 2010 when this bill was being passed—that there could be 18,000, 17-, 18,000 new IRS agents that would force ObamaCare upon the country. And as so many people have reported, when you get notice from the Internal Revenue Service that they are coming after you, it does not do anything to enhance your health.

KLTV, in my hometown, contacted me here today, wanting to know more about what was happening with the IRS. It has been outrageous what they have been doing across the country in their local taxpayer service assistance offices.

It was reported to us that a sign was put up by one of the IRS employees that, basically, if you don’t like the long line and the bad service, then contact your Member of Congress—and fortunately, many did, so we became acutely aware of it.

And what was worse, I mean, we had an office in Longview. Some people are able to go—are required to go get documentation from the IRS in order to do

what they need, whether it is with insurance, with their employer, and they couldn't get into the IRS office. The IRS office closed in Longview, making it so much more difficult for Americans in east Texas to get the customer service they needed.

Well, this article from The Washington Times points out that the IRS has made things much more painful for taxpayers than it should have been, and that is according to the IRS' inspector general. That was in a report Thursday that accused the agency of cutting money for customer service and ignoring phone calls while moving the money over to keep ObamaCare and other administration priorities on track.

Well, what that means is the IRS would be there to bully people who had concerns about or problems with ObamaCare, which certainly would not help their health at all.

But one reporter had told me that previously they were told by the IRS that Congress cut funding and, you know, that is why customer service was cut. Yet, when we presented the actual facts of what had happened, yes, in the past 6 years, the House of Representatives—not the Senate, for heaven's sake. They haven't cut anything in their own House of Congress. But the House of Representatives cut our own budgets about 22 percent over a 3-year period, and that is pretty dramatic.

Anybody that has ever had to cut their budget by a fourth understands. Americans have had to do that across the country. We did it right here in the House of Representatives, and it has been very difficult for some of our offices to provide the care for constituents. So many areas, we are it. We are the ones that can help them stand up against the bureaucracy and demand that they get what the government is required to provide, and yet we were able to do it.

On the other hand, the IRS wasn't cut 22 percent like the House cut ourselves down to the bone. In fact, they had a substantially smaller cut over 2 years, I believe it was.

In this past year, we increased the amount of money the IRS got by millions and millions of dollars. What the IRS chose to do is not help taxpayer service, which could also help the IRS from increasing their punitive work against taxpayers that make mistakes because they didn't get proper advice or service from the IRS assistance.

But no, they moved the money. The massive increase we gave to the IRS, they moved it over to be a bigger bully regarding ObamaCare and cut out offices, like the one in Longview, and fell more into the stereotype than I have ever seen for the IRS, this as "IRS employees ignored more than 30 million phone calls from desperate taxpayers seeking help in the run-up to the 2015 filing deadline—and those who did get through often waited a half hour before getting help.

"The IRS apologized publicly for the poor service and blamed Congress, say-

ing lawmakers needed to pony up more money if they wanted better results.

"But Inspector General J. Russell George said the IRS cut its own funding by eliminating nearly \$150 million from customer service, slashing more than 2,000 staff positions"—and that is so they could go after more enforcement of ObamaCare, as if ObamaCare wasn't doing enough damage to people's health as it was.

As my friend, House Ways and Means Committee Chairman KEVIN BRADY pointed out: "The IRS is running out of excuses for its abysmal customer service record and poor management decisions." This new report is even more proof the IRS is failing the very people it was created to serve—American taxpayers.

Congress did add more money for the agency last year, just as I was saying, Mr. Speaker. This article also echoes the same thing. The IRS doubled the number of calls it was able to answer, but the agency has promised to maintain a level of service for next year.

But let's face it, the IRS has shown they will target people because of their political beliefs. They will allow themselves—not just allow themselves. They insert themselves and have allowed themselves to be political weapons. Certainly saw that occurred from what has come out from 2012.

Did they affect the election? It is hard to say. But they certainly prevented many conservative groups from being able to organize.

I have heard some who are liberal, not that smart, asking questions: Well, I don't see how that would hurt conservative groups just because the IRS did not recognize them. They could still have gone ahead and organized and done their thing.

Again, apparently they pay too much attention to the mainstream media and don't think for themselves, because when one begins to understand the power of the Internal Revenue Code in the United States, you put a group together and you pool your money into one pool to start spending as a group, somebody's going to be in trouble and going to be accounting for that money as income. I mean, there may be creative ways to handle it, but the way you are supposed to handle it is to get recognition from the Internal Revenue Service that you have a group that can come together, put your money together, and work together toward a common goal. Liberal groups have not had much problem getting that kind of approval, but conservative groups really were targeted by the IRS.

And there is a law—we didn't need to pass a new one—that, according to the facts that have come out regarding Lois Lerner and others at the IRS, it certainly appears that there is probable cause to believe crimes were committed and should have been pursued. Yet nothing was done.

Why?

Because they were groups that were persecuted, not allowed to organize,

that did not support this administration; therefore, according to the Justice Department that became more of "just us department," they weren't going to pursue anything like that.

And in the further category of further de-Americanization of America, this report from Paul Bedard that U.N. shipped 6 of 10 refugees to the United States, even more this year.

Then there is a list from the United Nations refugee resettlement referrals. This report just came out in the last week, less than a week. The U.N. reports that of the 134,044 refugees settled in 2015, gee, 82,491 of the 134,000 were sent to the United States, that despite the fact information came out, study done, that actually we can support 12 refugees in place in the Middle East for the same price of bringing 1 refugee to the United States.

□ 1845

In fact, this administration didn't have to use the term redline. This administration could have simply said: we are going to make sure there is a safe zone in which people can live in the Middle East in a certain area and the U.N. will assist them with food—hopefully, without raping the women and girls, because they have in some areas. We will provide them a safe zone, and their needs will be cared for there. We can handle 12 times as many for the same price as bringing 1 into the United States.

I think voters understood that, when they voted Donald Trump as President, there are so many of these refugees that simply cannot be vetted.

We know this administration has made mistake after mistake, not only with people that we have no information to use to determine whether or not they are a threat because we have no background information on so many of these, but also, once they are here, we don't know where they are, we don't know where they go. We don't know even the threat.

Then, on top of that, we find out hundreds, maybe thousands—we know hundreds—of people were supposed to be deported that this administration accidentally—instead of deporting them and getting them out of the country so they were no longer a threat, this administration accidentally granted them citizenship.

There are some things that this government could do and you would say: well, it is easy to understand. That is an easy mistake. Instead of a 1, they put an 11. Or, instead of a 0, they put a 3.

Instead of deporting people and getting them out of our country, this administration accidentally gives them citizenship and has made clear that they are not capable of protecting us from the threats that we are seeing all over Europe and other areas of the world.

A point of personal privilege, really, I would like, Mr. Speaker, a shout out to the TSA, which is underneath our

Department of Homeland Security. It was such an honor to be singled out last Friday for the two molestations. Apparently, I am attractive when it comes to TSA agents. They want to feel up and down, make sure all the parts are actually attached.

They did a very good job of that both times on Friday evening when I was flying back to Texas. So my thanks to the TSA. Job well done. It delayed me 30 minutes or so. I kept thinking the TSA agent was going to lie back and have a cigarette or something, but that never happened.

Anyway, due regards for the TSA. I am really and truly hoping that we can change substantially management of the TSA in this coming year. At airport after airport, we see two, three, four times longer lines for the TSA PreCheck than there is for the general boarding. Yet, TSA continues to encourage people to go ahead and apply. We can streamline your getting through the inspection. And yes, that does mean when you are in PreCheck, you will enjoy having hands laid on you, not in a Christian kind of sense.

Over and over, there are good TSA agents, I am finding, all over the country, but the management is atrocious. How long would any security agency stay in business if every day they had longer lines in one area that was the least threat to our security as they do in the general boarding lines that need to be more carefully monitored, we are told? Well, you would fire them. You would hire another security agency.

I haven't seen a study done on this, but, as I recall—I was watching back during my days as a judge and chief justice, and I will have to go back and look—there were so many screams from Congress, especially the Senate, especially on the other side of the aisle, that we have got to have the Federal Government take over security at the airports. We have got to. We are in such danger. We have to have that happen.

Has security been enhanced by adding tens of thousands of people to the government unions? No, it hasn't. It really hasn't.

So, what I want to go back and look at, it seems like I remember back years ago, after the Democrats were able to prevail over Republicans who were in the majority and get them to agree to federalize the security at airports so that they could get them in the government unions, I was thinking, I don't know that that is really going to help. Are we going to see a better quality of TSA agent than we had in private security? I would like to see an official number.

Maybe if somebody in Homeland Security is listening, Mr. Speaker, they could, in their time between looking the other way as people come into the country illegally, they might just look up how many private security airport personnel were not hired by TSA.

The reason for federalizing the security was so that we will get a better

quality of security. It seems like there was a lawsuit back there by a couple hundred people, maybe. We are the only ones not hired by TSA. Out of the thousands and thousands, we are the only ones that weren't hired.

It seems like there was a problem in response that yeah, we really needed people that could read and had finished high school. If you couldn't read or hadn't finished high school, we really needed that level.

So, basically, it seems what happened is one group here in Congress—and it wasn't the Republicans—had their way. The security at airports was federalized. We are not seeing an increased percentage of capturing items that are coming in, but I have got to say they do a good job of feeling up and down my person.

I am not really a threat, though Homeland Security would assume that. Well, I was in the Army for 4 years. I am a strong Christian. I believe in the Bible, and I believe in the United States Constitution as the greatest governing document that was ever promulgated.

Apparently, according to the minds at the top of this Homeland Security Department, that makes me more of a threat than most anybody in the country. I was even told back in London, coming back, I believe that was from another trip to Egypt or maybe Israel, and I had to go out from security and come back through. I was told by one of the security guys: Sir, I know who you are and your position, but your Homeland Security Department tells us we have to thoroughly inspect your baggage and you personally. I got it from the British security folks as well.

Apparently, if you believe in the Constitution, you believe in the Bible, you have served your country in the United States Army, and you are a Christian then you are a big-time threat.

It will be so nice to have an administration that doesn't see the world the way this administration has seen it.

We had a lecture from the Secretary of State. The President of the United States said amen and hallelujah when he condemned Israel over and over and over. We stabbed our friend, Israel, in the back. There are reports in some sectors that not only did we abstain but we encouraged the resolution to be brought forward so that Israel could be condemned.

It apparently generated this article from Victor Davis Hanson from National Review. He said:

"Secretary of State John Kerry, echoing other policymakers in the Obama administration, blasted Israel last week in a 70-minute rant about its supposedly self-destructive policies. Why does the world, including now the U.S.—I would submit, Mr. Speaker, not for much longer—"single out liberal and lawful Israel but refrain from chastising truly illiberal countries? Kerry has never sermonized for so long about his plan to solve the Syrian crisis that has led to some 500,000 deaths

or the vast migrant crisis that has nearly wrecked the European Union. No one in this administration has shown as much anger about the many thousands who have been killed and jailed in the Castro brothers' Cuba, much less about the current Stone Age conditions in Venezuela or the nightmarish government of President Rodrigo Duterte in the Philippines, an ally nation.

"President Obama did not champion the cause of the oppressed during the Green Revolution of 2009 in Iran. Did Kerry and Obama become so outraged after Russia occupied South Ossetia, Crimea, and eastern Ukraine?"

"Ambassador to the United Nations Samantha Power was never so impassioned over the borders of Chinese-occupied Tibet, or over Turkish-occupied Northern Cyprus.

"In terms of harkening back to the Palestinian 'refugee' crisis that started in the late 1940s, no one talks today in similar fashion about the Jews who survived the Holocaust and walked home, only to find that their houses in Eastern Europe were gone or occupied by others. Much less do we recall the 11 million German civilians who were ethnically cleansed from Eastern Europe in 1945 by the Soviets and their imposed Communist governments. Certainly, there are not still 'refugee' camps outside Dresden for those persons displaced from East Prussia 70 years ago.

"More recently, few nations at the U.N. faulted the Kuwaiti government for the expulsion of 200,000 Palestinians after the liberation of Kuwait by coalition forces in 1991. Yet on nearly every issue—from 'settlements' to human rights to the status of women—U.N. members that routinely violate human rights target a liberal Israel."

□ 1900

"When President Obama entered office, among his first acts were to give an interview with the Saudi-owned news outlet Al Arabiya championing his outreach to the most nondemocratic Islamic world and to blast democratic Israel on 'settlements.'

"Partly, the reason for such inordinate criticism of Israel"—well, the article says "sheer cowardice," but that might be inappropriate for a Member to say about the President, so I am not even going to read that part. "If Israel had 100 million people and was geographically large, the world would not so readily play the bully.

"Instead, the United Nations and Europe would likely leave it alone—just as they give a pass to human-rights offenders such as Pakistan and Indonesia. If Israel were as big as Iran, and Iran as small as Israel, then the Obama administration would have not reached out to Iran and would have left Israel alone.

"Israel's supposed Western friends sort out Israel's enemies by their relative natural resources, geography, and population—and conclude that supporting Israel is a bad deal in cost/benefit terms.

“Partly, the criticism of Israel is explained by oil—an issue that is changing daily as both the U.S. and Israel cease to be oil importers.

“Still, about 40 percent of the world’s oil is sold by Persian Gulf nations.”

And I might add parenthetically, when we have a new President, that will drop even further because the United States will begin to produce more of the energy that we have been blessed with. There will be more nations in the world that will not have to go begging to Russia, which supposedly those on the left are so concerned about these days. Well, if they are so concerned, let us produce more west Texas oil, more east Texas natural gas, more oil and gas from around the country, and, boy, we will be energy independent. And as smart people have pointed out for a long time, it is a whole lot easier to take on terrorists who are throwing rocks than terrorists who are launching nuclear weapons.

Back to this point being made here in *National Review*: “Partly, the criticism of Israel is explained by oil—an issue that is changing daily as both the U.S. and Israel cease to be oil importers.

“Still, about 40 percent of the world’s oil is sold by Persian Gulf nations. Influential nations in Europe and China continue to count on oil imports from the Middle East—and make political adjustments accordingly.

“Partly, anti-Israel rhetoric is due to herd politics. The Palestinians—illiberal and reactionary on cherished Western issues like gender equality, homosexuality, religious tolerance, and diversity—have grafted their cause to the popular campus agendas of race/class/gender victimization.

“Western nations in general do not worry much about assorted non-Western crimes such as genocides, mass cleansings, or politically induced famines. Instead, they prefer sermons to other Westerners as a sort of virtue-signaling, without any worries over offending politically correct groups.

“Partly, the piling on Israel is due to American leverage over Israel as a recipient of U.S. aid. As a benefactor, the Obama administration expects that Israel must match U.S. generosity with obeisance. Yet the U.S. rarely gives similar ‘how dare you’ lectures to less liberal recipients of American aid, such as the Palestinians,” for example, “for their lack of free elections,” not to mention their lack of paying, encouraging, immortalizing people who are suicide bombers who are successful in killing innocent victims.

The article says: “Partly, the cause of global hostility toward Israel is jealousy. If Israel were mired in Venezuela-like chaos, few nations would care. Instead, the image of a proud, successful, Westernized nation as an atoll in a sea of self-inflicted misery is grating to many. And the astounding success of Israel bothers so many failed states that the entire world takes notice.

“But partly, the source of anti-Israelism is ancient anti-Semitism.

“If Israelis were Egyptians administering Gaza or Jordanians running the West Bank” as they did for 20 years or so, “no one would care. The world’s problem is that Israelis are Jews. Thus, Israel earns negative scrutiny that is never extended commensurately to others.

“Obama and his diplomatic team should have known all this. Perhaps they do, but they simply do not care.”

Then we find out this administration, we see what happens when there is yet another terrorist attack in Israel. What does this administration do after such a powerful chastising of our dear friend Israel?

Nothing. But “a Palestinian who may be linked to ISIS rammed his speeding truck into a group of Israeli soldiers in Jerusalem Sunday, killing four people and wounding 15 others before being shot dead in one of the deadliest attacks in a year-long campaign of violence.”

Now, even that, from friends at FOX News, is not as accurate as it could be. Yes, they were soldiers that were killed. They were on a sight-seeing tour, and apparently the insidious radical Islamist sat parked and waited for them to be in a vulnerable position, not in a position to use weapons, not fighting. They were sightseeing. As this radical Islamist saw these people getting off the bus, that is when he moved and became the murdering, blood-thirsty, radical Islamist that he was.

Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FASO). The gentleman from Texas has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to finish talking about this issue that has been raised about the Russians being such a big threat to our elections. Some of us have been screaming here on Capitol Hill that we need to have security of the Internet. And as part of that, one of the last things we needed to do was give control over Web site determinations to the international community. That was created as an American entity, the Internet. We had control over ICANN, the organization controlling the Web sites, and this President did irreparable damage to our security. Oh, I know he thinks he didn’t, so I am not accusing anything untoward, but irreparable damage was done by giving over that power to the so-called international community.

This article from John Fund, who had a great book about election fraud, points out, and he quotes from a former colleague, Rahm Emanuel: “‘You never want a serious crisis to go to waste,’ Rahm Emanuel, Obama’s just-named chief of staff, told a Wall Street Journal conference of top CEOs in November 2008 while his boss was still President-elect. Since then a slew of constitutionally dubious executive orders, presidential emergencies, and rushed legislation have characterized

the Obama presidency. Now he is leaving office by issuing a blizzard of ‘midnight regulations’ and edicts.

“One of the most troublesome came last Friday and gave the federal government the power to begin centralizing our election systems. The Constitution explicitly gives states the power to set the ‘times, manner and places of holding elections.’

“But Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson used the excuse of Friday’s release of a report on Russian hacking of the Democratic National Committee to declare that state and local voting systems will be designated as ‘pieces of critical infrastructure’ so that the U.S. Department of Homeland Security can protect them from hackers.

“His move—coming just 15 days before President Obama leaves office—led many experts to question both its wisdom and its constitutionality. ‘While the Federal Government has the general power to protect the nation’s cyber infrastructure, it cannot intrude into areas of state sovereignty without clear constitutional mandate,’ John Yoo, a law professor at UC Berkeley, told CNSNews.com.

“‘There is no federal power to control or secure elections. Each state administers its own elections, restricted only by constitutional protections for voting rights,’ agreed Ilya Shapiro, senior fellow in constitutional studies at the Cato Institute. ‘It may make sense for states to request federal support here, but it would set a dangerous precedent for a federal agency to unilaterally take over state electoral processes.’

“Secretary Johnson’s decision sparked outrage among many of those who are most knowledgeable about our election system—the 50 secretaries of state who, along with local officials, run the election process. Even Johnson admitted that ‘many of them are opposed to this designation.’

“Secretary of State Brian Kemp of Georgia, told me in an interview that Johnson’s action ‘uses security as an excuse to subvert the Constitution and establish the basis for Federal encroachment into election systems.’”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to pause and look at what happened in this last election. Now, there have been some people saying, as I heard down at the Senate in the Kennedy Room at JEFF SESSIONS’ hearing this morning, there were 17 intelligence agencies that agreed about the Russian hacking. Well, I am not sure. They must have seen something I didn’t, but I had understood there was, like, three, and that we have been told actually they had these conclusions, but people have admitted—no, actually, they didn’t hack our election system. They didn’t hack any voting machines. Clapper even admitted that. Of course, he has said: I have testified very falsely. He has admitted under oath that he has not been truthful under oath to the Senate before.

So as a law professor once asked: If you have admitted lying, well—he

would say—are you lying now or were you lying then? If you admit you are lying, which one is really the lie?

We don't know. Is he lying now or lying then?

You have said—you have told us you are a liar. Which one is it?

What we find among smart juries, once they found you lied to them, is that they are not going to trust you about anything else. I think that contributed to the voting results we had.

But Conservative HQ had an article: "Russian Hacking Story A Twofer For Obama And the Left." Say, gee, they get to blame the Russians and they get to take control of the voting system.

□ 1915

Well, all that has come out is somebody hacked John Podesta's emails—most likely an unprotected server like Hillary Clinton was using—and we lost secrets we may never know. But it was unprotected. Podesta's was at least protected. And people saw published what Democratic people participating in the Hillary Clinton campaign had said about Christians, Catholics, the duplicity of trying to bring down BERNIE SANDERS, the duplicity at debates, the if it is not illegal, the certainly rule-violating strategies of revealing questions before a debate.

Shockingly, when the truth was revealed and certain people in the Hillary Clinton administration, or in their campaign, were exposed as lying about so many things, those people are now saying: Hey, when America found out we were lying, they voted against Hillary. They hurt our election. They affected our election because we were exposed as liars and it cost us votes. That is grossly unfair. The American people should never have known the truth that we were lying about so many things, that we were conspiring to bring down BERNIE SANDERS and defeat him unfairly. The American people weren't supposed to find those things out and, doggone it, those Russians need to be punished.

Well, I don't know where it came from. And I also know, as a fact, that some intelligence personnel have lied to the chairman of our Intel Committee in the last Congress. I know it is a fact. I don't know who it was, but they did.

When you have Clapper say, Yeah, I came in here and testified about a bunch of stuff that wasn't true, you wonder wouldn't it be a good idea to take those incredible individuals in our intelligence agencies that have been faithful to our country, served our country, not their political agenda, and done great things for America, let's get them in the positions of authority in the intelligence agencies. And since they have been working there, they will know what to do; they will know who to trust, who not to trust.

As you find out, if you ever sit on the bench as a felony judge very long, it doesn't matter what area of life you are in, there are people that are not

honest. Fortunately, in law enforcement, intelligence agencies, homeland security, places like that, in my opinion, there is a much higher number of good, honorable, honest people that care about providing for the safety of the American people. That is where we need to go. Find those people in those departments and put them in positions of leadership.

We have a great opportunity now before us, and if you are agnostic or atheist, you should believe it was all a roll of the dice. This kind of stuff happens. Hey, even a pragmatist agnostic would probably say: Well, if I am honest, somebody—Julian Assange said it wasn't the Russians. Indications were it may well have been an unhappy Democratic operative in the party that provided. But wherever they came from, information was provided to the American public showing the terribly unfair and untruthful things that have been said or done, and they voted against the party that had apparently done the unfair, untruthful things.

So I think we need to look, as Shakespeare would say, not to our stars, but in ourselves. Personally, I think we were mercifully given another chance to give back to the American people the power that this Congress and the executive branch has used for far too long and let America be America, not the evil parts—the KKK, the lynchings, the horrid things that mar our history—but the goodness, the part of America that would say, "I don't care about the KKK. I am going to take you into my home. I am going to protect you"; the parts of America that said, "I don't care what color your skin is. We are fellow human beings and we have got some good ideas and we are going to work together and we are going to raise this Nation to heights it has never seen before." I am hoping and praying that is where we are headed.

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

WHO GETS THE BREAKS FROM REPEALING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT? THE SUPERWEALTHY

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, indeed, we do have an extraordinary country. Down through the last 230 years, this Congress has met, has discussed, decided, voted upon, and set in place policies that advanced our country. And we are so very fortunate, all of us Americans, to be living here with all the promise that this incredible history has given us.

But at this period of time, we also have some profound questions about where this country is going. We wake up and we say: What is happening here? What is happening in the international

scene? What is all this about Russia hacking? What is all this about trying to influence the American election? Did they really, and did it really happen, and was it effective?

Well, we know it really happened. The American public is scratching their head and they are saying: What is it?

And then all this talk about change, all this talk about we are going to change things; we are going to repeal ObamaCare, and we are going to replace it with something great. Hmmm. I wonder what that might be. And I suspect all across this Nation there are men, women, families that are also wondering: What do they mean it will be great? What is it that is great?

Well, if you were to go around the Capitol, if you were to talk to Members in the House of Representatives or over in the Senate and say: So it is gonna be great; what is it?

Well, we will tell you tomorrow or we will tell you later, but it will be great.

Maybe, maybe not.

Right now, the Senate is working on a piece of legislation that will set the stage for the repeal of the Affordable Care Act—and some would derisively call it ObamaCare. Repeal it.

Oh, yeah, get rid of that thing. But not to where it is going to be great as soon as it is gone.

Really? I don't think so.

I know that in my part of California, a lot of people—in fact, more than 20,000—don't think it is great at all. They are going to lose their health care. And there are a whole lot of seniors in my community that are going: Wow, it is going to be great.

Really?

But I will lose my annual check-up. And that awesome drug doughnut hole that was so frightening just years ago is going to come back? That is not so great.

I drove into town or into the Capitol today. I don't live so far away, but it is 20 degrees, and I decided I would rather drive than freeze. So I drove in and an advertisement came on the radio, and it said: You are going to get a trillion-dollar tax cut. Wonderful. The middle class will have a trillion-dollar tax cut. I said: Well, that is not what I saw last night when I read the statistics about the great repeal of the Affordable Care Act. In fact, I read something quite different from the tax committees, from Americans, various people.

Let me put something up here. Here it is. Who gets that trillion-dollar tax cut? Who is it? Is it the middle class? Well, I don't think so, because when you look at the numbers, it goes to the very wealthy. They are the ones who are going to get the tax cut with the repeal of ObamaCare.

When the Affordable Care Act is repealed the way it is presently going, the bill that is over in the Senate will require that the taxes that were put in place to support the Affordable Care Act and to provide insurance for 20 million people—that is both the government insurance, the Medicaid, Medi-

Cal in California, and the subsidized insurance from the various programs that exist State by State—that money was raised from the wealthy.

When the tax cuts come into place, here is the real story. The top 1 percent—do you remember the 1 percenters? Do you remember all that discussion about the 1 percenters and the 99? The 1 percenters get 57 percent of that trillion dollars, and everyone else gets to split the remaining 43 percent. The top one-tenth of the taxpayers in California—we are talking about the superwealthy. We are talking about the folks that are actually going to be in the President-elect's Cabinet, you know, the billionaires that he is going to put in the Cabinet. We are talking about those guys—oh, roughly a \$200,000-a-year tax break. But after all, they are hurting. They need a few more hundred thousand dollars along the way.

So the trillion-dollar tax break that is the foundation of the repeal, if you eliminate the money, the program is not working. There will not be annual visits for seniors so that they can stay healthy, so that they can control their blood pressure, diabetes, mammograms, and all the rest that go with it. There won't be money for the 3.7 million Californians that presently are able to get coverage under the Medi-Cal program. There won't be money for the almost 2 million Californians that are in the subsidized pool called Covered California. That money won't be there. Those folks are going to be out.

And by the way, the repeal will remove the insurance for 30 million Americans all across the country. But who gets the real benefit here? The superwealthy, the top 1 percent will get 57 percent of that trillion-dollar tax break, and the rest of us will share in the 43 percent remaining.

Another way to look at it, folks. It will be great, but for whom? Well, if you break the American public into the five sectors, the first 20 percent, next 20, next 20, next 20, and then the top 20—so these are the real poor down here in the lower 20 percent, and these are the superwealthy in the top 20 percent.

So what happens? When you repeal the Affordable Care Act, as is now happening in the Senate—and it will be over here either this week or early next week; and then this House will take it up and it, too, will vote on that very same budget bill that will create a trillion-dollar tax cut over the next decade—who will get the money? There you go. The top 20 percent will wind up with a full 74 percent of that.

□ 1930

Despite that little advertisement that I heard on the radio, which said, "Oh, the poor and the middle class are going to get it," really?

Let's see. Of the bottom 20 percent—6.7—oh, and the next will get 5.9 percent of it—do you have any idea what they are going to lose?

They are going to lose the subsidies on their insurance programs. They won't be able to afford it. They will lose their insurance. For some of them, they are on the Medicaid or the Medi-Cal program in California, and they will be out of luck unless, of course, the State of California can find \$16.8 billion to replace the money that just disappeared with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and that money is then transferred to the top 20 percent.

These folks down here, the bottom 20 percent—actually, the bottom 60 percent of the American public are the losers.

Who are the winners?

The ones who are already able to buy insurance. I love this trick. I was the Insurance Commissioner in California. I loved this little trick: "Not to worry. We are going to give an opportunity for people to buy their own insurance and give them a tax break."

Do you mean these people down here have enough money jingling around in their pockets that they are going to be able to go out and buy the insurance and get the tax break?

Uh-uh. It is the folks up here on top who will, once again, benefit.

This really is a massive shift of \$1 trillion from those people who are now insured, for those people who are now able to get care in the clinics that have been established across America—in outlying areas and in rural areas in my district. It is a massive shift from the ability of those people to get health care, for those people who are on the exchanges and are able to get subsidized insurance so that they can afford it, for those people who are seniors and are able to get their free annual checkups and have their drug costs reduced as the doughnut hole shrinks. It is a massive shift of money being taken directly out of their benefits and their pockets and going to the wealthy of America. That is what is happening. That is what this repeal of the Affordable Care Act is.

Then you look at the implications of that. What about the hospitals that have been able to ramp up their services? What about the reforms that were in the Affordable Care Act—the insurance reforms—that said to the insurance companies: "Oh, no, no, no, you can no longer discriminate because that person happens to be a woman or has a preexisting condition"?

This is important, Mr. Speaker. If you are scratching your head and wondering what is going on here, listen carefully because this super rapid train is about to come into the House of Representatives and sweep through here, wiping out the healthcare benefits of 30 million Americans. For those who are not directly affected, they, too, are going to wind up in a very precarious situation because the reforms will also be repealed.

Joining me tonight to discuss this and Social Security—oh, by the way, Social Security is also on the chopping block—are two of my colleagues:

MARCY KAPTUR from Ohio, who has been an extraordinary leader on the issues of manufacturing, of making it in America, of looking out for seniors, and for people who are in need of help and support.

Congresswoman KAPTUR, would you care to join us and share with us your thoughts on what is happening in Washington?

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI. You are such a rare and talented Member. I thank the people of California for sending you here. You serve them every day of the week, 7 days a week—24/7. It is a privilege to appear with you tonight and also with Congressman PAUL TONKO, one of our most talented Members from upstate New York—a region like my own that has just been battered by the global economy and the outsourcing of jobs. We all are just honored to serve in this Congress, and we respect it and its history and its potential.

Mr. Speaker, as I travel my own district and State, I am finding I have to reassure people. Anytime there is a change, I guess, in public life, people need to be bolstered that everything is going to be okay. We are here to be that squad and to say to the American people that they have power, too, and that it isn't just the super rich of this country or the billionaire class.

We can label them "wealth power." And that has power; yes, it does. Sometimes extraordinary power. But there is also "people power." I consider myself having been lifted here by people power over many years, and I appreciate the people of my region for allowing me to serve our country and to learn every day, to learn from them, to learn how to make the instruments of the Nation work better for them.

There is also "spiritual power." I am amazed at how people's spiritual groundings help them through difficult situations and transitions.

Then there is "intellectual power." We hope to use some of that here once in a while. That is a power in and of itself. We think about the power of liberty of a free people to improve their Nation, to heal their Nation, to expand opportunity in their Nation.

We are aided and abetted by a very curious media—sometimes more ridiculous than it needs to be—but also of people digging, trying to find that elusive truth that should lead us all forward. So we find ourselves helping to heal our Nation by being Members here, and we all hope for the best for our people and for our country. I think the Members here are very well motivated.

I rise to defend, really, and to support two foundational programs of our society: Social Security and Medicare. I will try to be brief so others can comment.

I am very proud to say that our family is one of those families who would have been completely destroyed had it not been for Social Security and Medicare. Those didn't exist when my parents were born and grandparents were

living in our country. But in 1935, after our country crashed economically and there were major bank failures and the stock market crashed and wiped out the savings of millions of Americans, the Nation turned to the Federal Government, to the President, to guarantee for a large segment of our society—senior citizens—decent incomes.

The Social Security Insurance Act was enacted at the urging of Democratic President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He was regarded as a saint in our household because what happened around our country was that seniors before that time—many of them—were living in what we called poorhouses. They were dying in terrible circumstances, and there was no security as a person aged.

Can you imagine how revolutionary it was at that time to create a social insurance program—probably the largest insurance program America has ever had—to ensure that as people aged or if workers became disabled in the workplace or if they died that their children would have sources of income?

The program did all of that. In thinking back, gosh, over 70 years, how transformational was that?

As for our grandpa, who died in a county hospital in Ohio before the enactment of Medicare, I know the conditions that he died under. And I know that, when our mother died, it was a different situation. She had Social Security and Medicare, and we were able to take care of her. The same was true with our father.

Intergenerationally, I see our country getting better. I am proud of that. I am also proud to be a Democrat and a member of a party that has created Social Security, which has become an indispensable part of our way of life. As I have said to seniors and to workers, it is an earned benefit. People pay for it every time their paychecks are nicked, and their employers match it.

Obviously, to survivors—and, obviously, I have neighbors who have lost spouses, whose children then benefit from the survivor benefit—what an incredible gift this idea is to the American people. There are 35 million people today in our country who depend on Social Security—one out of every six Americans. Every day, Social Security lifts 20 million people out of poverty—people who used to live in poverty.

Can you imagine what that was like?

We don't ever, ever want to go back to that world.

In 2014, the latest data show us that more than 6 million children under the age of 18 live in families who receive income from Social Security, lifting more than a million children out of poverty. Social Security has never been a welfare program. It is an earned benefit, and all Americans who contribute to it during their working lifetimes receive benefits. Social Security is a compact of trust between generations. It is the ever-present sentry at the economic security gate for retirees, for those hurt on the job, or for their

survivors, and it is America's greatest insurance program ever.

I happened to be living when Lyndon Johnson helped to create the Medicare program, which provides health insurance coverage now to over 55 million people in our country—essential health security for seniors. Today, only 2 percent of the elderly in our country lack health insurance compared to 48 percent—half the people of this country—in 1962, after World War II, before Medicare even existed. That seems sort of modern times, the 1960s; yet it really was not. I would say that that is a “wow” by any measure.

Yes, people are living longer. Thank God the program is working. People are getting free preventative healthcare screenings and are lowering the long-term costs of care because of early diagnosis. Seniors don't have to pay for mammograms or diabetes or cancer screenings, thanks to the Affordable Care Act; so we keep trying to make the system better.

Since House Republicans won the majority in 2011, every House Republican budget has tried to end the Medicare guarantee and turn Medicare into a privatized voucher program.

Do you know what that is going to do?

It is going to shut out millions of Americans who are elderly—or who are about to be elderly—from insurance. The reason we have Medicare is that insurers weren't insuring seniors—that is the reason it exists in the first place—or they will make the price so high that people won't be able to pay for it; or they will cherry-pick only the healthy people. Then those who have diabetes, those who have had prior cancers, those who have multiple sclerosis, those who have Parkinson's will be cast aside.

What kind of a country would this be, for heaven's sake?

The American Association of Retired Persons and the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare completely opposed the Republicans' plan to voucherize and let every senior go out there in the market and try to find a plan of his own, because they know what that means. These two programs are the most pro-life programs this Nation has ever created. We should be so proud of what we have been able to do as a country over the last century.

The Republican attacks on Social Security and Medicare need to stop. They are America's bulwark for millions and millions of people, and they have proven themselves to be America's most important, lifetime security programs.

I thank Congressman GARAMENDI and Congressman TONKO for being down here tonight. I know how passionately you care about the people of our country way beyond just your districts and why we are here. We are here to stand with them.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Ms. KAPTUR.

I loved your talk of the history and how it came to pass that we have So-

cial Security and Medicare and what happened when we did not. It was really profound. It reminded me of my own history.

I remember, as a young kid, that my father took me to the county hospital where the neighboring rancher was—we were out on a ranch in California—and it was horrible. That is where he was sent to die because there was no Medicare.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman would yield, I can remember the stench.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Oh, the stench was unbelievable.

Ms. KAPTUR. I can remember that.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am sorry your father endured that.

Ms. KAPTUR. My grandpa.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Your grandfather.

Ms. KAPTUR. Our father had to fight to get him in there because there wasn't enough space for people who were ill and dying. That was before hospice and that was before Medicare. I remember, as a young girl, that that was a hard thing to experience, but our mother and father never protected us from the inevitable.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I was just thinking that I have got more stories to tell, but I really want to turn to our colleague from New York. Mr. TONKO and I are often on the floor—with you also—to discuss jobs in America, how to enhance our American economy with research, economic development of all kinds, transportation infrastructure, Make It In America.

Mr. TONKO, tonight we are on a somewhat different subject, but I know it is one that you are very familiar with, one that you have spent your entire career addressing in trying to help seniors and others who have been on the short end of the stick. Thank you so much for joining us, Mr. TONKO.

□ 1945

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative GARAMENDI for bringing us together in this Special Order format to talk about some key critical components that address American families significantly. Representative GARAMENDI and Representative MARCY KAPTUR, who both do their homework, are a great addition to the House because they challenge us with facts, not fiction. They care deeply and passionately about improving and enhancing the quality of life. So to stand with both on this issue is a good feeling for me.

Just a couple of observations: I think it is okay for government to have a heart. We speak to the heart and soul of working families across this country by understanding that health care is not a privilege; it is a right.

So let's begin with that fundamental basic observation, a right. What we have seen with this right is that over 30 million Americans have been added to the rolls of the insured over the course of the Affordable Care Act.

Now, Representative KAPTUR did a great job of speaking to history of

Medicare, of Social Security, and of the Affordable Care Act, as did Representative GARAMENDI. I remember being at the 75th anniversary celebration of Social Security, and people were talking about the discrediting going on before Social Security was enacted into law. There were those who demonized it before it became law. There were those who have fought it ever since. They don't want that right for working families.

I would suggest that Social Security, Medicare, and the Affordable Care Act are rock solid elements of a foundation upon which to grow quality of life and longevity. It is a basic fundamental additive that, when brought to our working families across this country, we are providing a service and we are addressing them with dignity. That is what this is about.

The demonization of the Affordable Care Act is interesting. Because if you look at polling, you will find that people say that ObamaCare is destroying the Nation. Well, what about the Affordable Care Act? That is working. My friends, it is the same issue, it is the same concept, and it is the same program.

So what we have tried to do is discredit a program that took on a major challenge, took on major industries, and needed to provide a balance and an actuarial outcome that is providing a go-forward and accomplish what you have enacted as a mission. The actuarial science has got to be precise.

So for those who want to repeal, they are talking about, in cases, pulling a brick out of the foundation and having it get wobbly, and it is going to crash the marketplace. We are going to have all of these people who have been enrolled or have been forever enrolled in health care impacted by rising costs and disruptive outcomes that will put them at risk.

So like the Social Security Program before the ACA, like Medicare before the ACA, as you floated these boats, as you went forward with time, you learned where you needed to tweak, and you adjusted, by amendment format, to make the program stronger. That is what we have been asking for in a partnership here in the House and with the Senate. Let's work on those areas that may need improvement, but do not repeal because repeal without replacement is a disaster. It is a disaster waiting to happen.

We have provided hope for working families across this country. We have had the testimony presented to us, anecdotal evidence, that this is working, that for the first time families have enjoyed a connection to a system, a standardized approach. What was the program?

People say: Well, I don't want to pay for someone else's health care. You have been paying for it before the ACA. It was called the emergency room. It wasn't standardized because whoever you got at that emergency room in whatever location, as you traveled

looking for assistance, didn't provide a steady flow. It was a wasteful outcome for taxpayers and an insufficient outcome for a cruel outcome for those consumers who were impacted by being underinsured or uninsured.

So let's set the record straight. We have had a program up and running for 8 years now. The Republicans have chastised this program saying it needs to be repealed. We have taken over 65 votes, or 65 votes, I believe, to repeal, but there has never been a replacement plan. So what kind of gimmick is this to pull away a program that is working for tens of millions of families added to the rolls but not replace? That is disaster waiting to happen.

So we challenge our colleagues here in the House and in the Senate down the hall to be academic about this, to be compassionate about it, to be passionate in our resolve, and to make a difference by putting together the improvements that we require and not repealing.

Now, we look at the Affordable Care Act and what it means to our health care. But if you repeal, you will wreak damage on the budget. You will destroy our economy. You will have a huge workforce displacement, and you will slash care for America's working families. Is this the outcome that we want?

Remember, we were the last industrialized nation to come to the table and provide guaranteed health care for our families. That is not something of which we are proud. That was destructive. That was insensitive. It was not effective. It was a waste of tax dollars the way we did it.

So now we go forward with a program that allows us to now take a look at the history, albeit brief, on the Affordable Care Act, but understanding where we need to fine tune. We do that, and the challenge is there for all of us: take the cost out of the system for a stronger future and provide at least the same level of quality, if not enhanced quality, as we go forward. That should unite us in a common cause, cutting the cost of the program and enhancing the quality of services provided. What a great mission for all of us to embark upon.

So let's not play politics with the health care for tens of millions of people who are new to the system and for all of us who have been covered routinely by the system. We can do better than that.

Let the lessons of Social Security and Medicare, which, as my colleagues indicated earlier, address the American public with dignity, improvement, enhancement, and hope, the best commodity we can deliver as a government to her people.

So I thank Representative GARAMENDI for the opportunity for us to speak to these issues. Frankness is required right now. The lack of theater would be an improvement. No theater on this. Let's settle for facts, not fiction, and working together to bring

about what is a sound resolve that allows us to provide stability and success for the American public. That, I don't think, is too much to ask.

So I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) for bringing us together.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure for me to be on the floor with Representative TONKO because of his passion, his knowledge, his ability to articulate with clarity, in this case, the importance of the Social Security program, Medicare, as well as the Affordable Care Act. The gentleman makes a compelling argument.

I want the public of America to really grasp the importance of what is happening here in Washington. Yes, we are going to have a new President, and there will be an inaugural and all of the celebration that goes with that.

Let me put it this way: When that is done, there is a majority of the Congress and the Senate, together with the President, that fully intend to embark on unraveling the very critical safety net for more than 30 million Americans. And for everyone else who has insurance at every age—Medicare all the way down who has insurance—they will also see a dislocation and an unraveling of their insurance benefits because this market could seriously unravel. So as the gentleman said so clearly, be academic, study the facts, and study the pros and the cons of the various alternatives that are out there.

I know, as an insurance commissioner and having been dealing in the issues of health care for many years now, that there are improvements needed in the Affordable Care Act. There is no doubt. We have been saying that since shortly after it became law. And even when it became law, I said this should be done this way or that way a little differently. We are 8 years into this and, as you say, millions, tens of millions actually—around 30 million directly—are involved and benefiting from the program, either through Medicaid, through the exchanges, or through the various benefits that are out there. So it is really, really important.

I want to also pick up on something that Representative KAPTUR brought to our attention. I am going to put one more chart up here. I was surprised and a little bit appalled, just before we broke for Christmas, that the new chairman of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee who deals with Social Security introduced a piece of legislation. We looked at it.

It was just before the Christmas holidays, so I picked it up and started looking at it. I go: whoa, wait, wait, wait. This is a major step to unravel the Social Security system. Remember, back in the George W. Bush administration, in the first 3 years of his administration, he tried to privatize Social Security. He failed miserably at that. Thankfully, he failed. Congress wouldn't stand for it. At least, the Democrats in Congress wouldn't stand for it.

I see this piece of legislation introduced in the last session, in the last days, and I am going: Whoa, what does this mean? This man becomes the chairman of the subcommittee that deals with Social Security, and I am going: oh, no, they wouldn't; they wouldn't go after Social Security again. But the bill does. It does it in a way that, once again, gives enormous benefits to the wealthy and not so much for the others.

This is a little chart about what happens if that piece of legislation by Mr. JOHNSON actually becomes law. These are the benefits that would be received today. In 10 years, these would be the benefits. This is the top 20 percent rather, and right here is the middle. That is about a \$3,000 a year reduction.

Keep in mind that, I think, well over 50 percent of the seniors in the United States depend upon Social Security as their principal source and, in many cases, their only source of income.

So you get a decline. What do they want to do? They want to increase the age to 69 before you could apply for full Social Security. They want to radically change the cost-of-living index. I know what I heard from my constituents when there was no cost of living over the previous 2 years—and a very small one this last year—the cost of care for seniors continues to rise because they are on the expensive side of things. There are some other provisions in it. So this is a wake-up call. This is a wake-up call.

Clearly, the majority party here in the House and in the Senate have promised to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which we have talked about. They have also made it clear that in the past—and we believe in the months ahead—they will attempt to privatize a large portion of the Medicare program. So Medicaid will be largely gutted, and the increases that we have seen through the Medicaid program will be wiped out.

The Medicare program will have significant benefit reductions, and, if they intend to voucherize it, which they have talked about, then as Representative KAPTUR said, they will throw the seniors to the mercy of the insurance companies.

My basic point tonight was to raise the alarm and to begin to discuss here amongst our colleagues the reality of what is being planned for America. Don't look at this as a partisan issue, Republican or Democrat. Look at this as a personal issue.

Look at this as an issue that was given to me by a woman who is a farmer in the community I represent north of Sacramento who never had insurance. She was an entrepreneur, a self-employed farmer. She never had insurance. If she needed care, she would go to the emergency room. That worked when she was young, but then she became a little older, and then cancer.

□ 2000

The treatments for her cancers were unaffordable. She would go bankrupt.

The Affordable Care Act came along with guaranteed coverage and an insurance policy through the exchange in California that she could afford that would provide her with unlimited medical services for the rest of her life. No cap, no annual cap, no lifetime cap. She got her cancer treatments, and she has moved along. She said: I still need care. And if they repeal the Affordable Care Act, I won't get it and I will die.

That story is repeated across America. It is repeated in my district. I can give many more examples. So this really is, in her case and in many others, a life-or-death situation. So, yes, we will be academic as Mr. TONKO has said. We should be. We should understand the implications of one policy versus another. We should understand when you start with repealing a trillion dollars of taxes, that will have a profound impact on health care in America. And the benefits will go to the wealthy. That is academic.

But it is also this woman, a small farmer who developed cancer. She had no hope. The Affordable Care Act comes along, and she is able to get insurance and she is able to get the chemotherapy necessary to save her life. She is back on the farm.

Repeal the Affordable Care Act and this woman, along with millions of Americans, are in serious jeopardy. So be aware. Social Security on the chopping block; Medicare on the chopping block; the Affordable Care Act is on the chopping block. Tax reductions for whom? Yes, mom and pop would get \$130 a year from the tax cuts. The billionaires in the Trump administration would get \$200,000 a year in tax cuts. Mom and pop are likely to lose their insurance.

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

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

As you talk about public sentiment about Social Security, the Affordable Care Act, and hearing the evidence you have provided from your constituent within your district, it becomes very apparent where the American public is.

When polled recently, only 20 percent of the American public is in support of efforts to repeal without replacement—20 percent. So the great, great majority understands what is going on here.

We have also seen during the recent campaign season, which probably went a year and a half to 2 years long, a lot of talk about repealing the Affordable Care Act, undoing the act. That happened in the same timeframe as 11.5 million people were added to the rolls for 2017. So there is an appeal here that is drawing the American public toward the coverage provided by ACA. So the sentiment here is to get things done and provide, again, the stability.

I am also a cosponsor of legislation entitled Strengthening Social Security Act that would improve how we calculate the benefits for Social Security. We are not advancing reducing those benefits or raising the retirement age

to 69 or whatever level; we are talking about enhancing benefits. When you talk to seniors, they will say we either have got nothing or we got just a bit of an increase that was taken away with the other hand for some other purpose.

So, yes, we need to revisit just how we give that green light to a COLA adjustment, and we need to calculate that approval with items that are truly essential for the senior citizens, not big screen televisions or certain items that are adding to a luxurious note, but one that speaks to their basic core needs to live day to day. So the Strengthening Social Security Act does just that. It takes into account all of the essentials in that calculus that will determine whether or not a COLA adjustment is given that given year. So that is important.

I also believe it is time for us to look at that cap that we have created, that we have placed on contributions to Social Security. You know, some people by February 12 or 14, whatever date it is, are done paying. They are done contributing by that point in the year. Well, the standards of \$118,000, or \$127,000 coming this year, are just capturing most of those revenues. The hardship is placed on the working, middle-income community, those looking to ascend the middle class. There could be a far greater contribution from other income strata that we ought to look at to provide stability.

A point needs to be made that Medicare, Medicaid, and the Affordable Care Act are all intertwined. There were strengtheners that were provided for these programs. There was a partnership of revenue stream that was calculated and assumed that again provides for the quality of response to the consuming public, and especially those in senior years.

I have a large percentage of senior citizens in the makeup of my constituency. It is important to recognize that many who are on Medicare end up getting Medicaid assistance because of situations that are called upon where they are perhaps placed in nursing homes, adult homes, or the like. So we have to be cognizant here of the public sentiment, where is their thinking, and we know exactly what they want. They want stability for these programs. They want strengthening of the programs. They want to make certain that all of these efforts that have lasted for decades, or were introduced as late as 2010, will continue so they have a future that is that more secure, that more certain.

So tonight we talk and implore our colleagues to please help improve the Affordable Care Act. Let's not repeal, and certainly do not repeal without a replacement plan. That is a disaster that will really cause havoc in the marketplace. It is one that doesn't prove to be actuarially sound. Also, let's make certain that we don't have these efforts again to voucherize Medicare, to privatize Social Security. These are programs that have provided stability.

When I came into the House in 2009, it was at the lowest point of the recession which President Obama was handed upon his entering into the Presidency. There were 700,000, 800,000, 900,000 jobs lost a month in the deepest, darkest moment of the recession. What did we see? We saw individuals who took their lifetime's worth of savings and entrusted them to a marketplace, and they lost everything for which they had ever worked, and others realized they didn't lose a single cent of Social Security. Therein lies a tremendous bit of testimony as to the meritorious achievements of a Social Security system, one that provided that safety net for all families, one that made certain there was some sort of continuous flow, a backup, a reinforcement, as you went into retirement years.

We are reminded of Medicare and what the results were for retirees, how long they were expected to live and what their quality of life was like. It was tremendously, favorably turned around with the benefits of Medicare.

So with an impassioned plea, I encourage this House, the Senate, to do the right thing: stand for the American public and allow them to be addressed with dignity with these programs that have proven themselves. And where there is a need to further assist, as there has been time and time and time again with Social Security, as there has been time and time again with Medicare, let's provide that same approach to the Affordable Care Act.

I thank the gentleman from California for bringing us together and being able to share our thoughts and advocacy to do the right thing.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. TONKO very much. It is always a pleasure and learning experience to be on the floor with Mr. TONKO.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). We are about to wrap it up as we are nearly out of time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. TONKO, and I want to place in the RECORD, since both of you have talked so eloquently about the Affordable Care Act, you know how you will be walking through your district, maybe at a parade or some public event, and someone will break from the crowd and run toward you. I am thinking about one particular woman who came up to me in one of my smaller communities. She was in tears. This was during the summertime. She has cerebral palsy, and she never was able to get care. I don't know why she didn't qualify for insurance, I don't know all of that, but she hugged me and thanked me.

And then around the corner from where we live, there is a little produce market that I go into all the time. I am friends with one of the women who works there. This little business couldn't afford insurance, so their employees, when the Affordable Care Act passed, went to the private marketplace to get a plan. This particular

woman who works long hours and lost her husband to cancer told me: MARCY, why are people complaining about the Affordable Care Act? Guess what, now I have cancer.

She said: I was able to go and get all of the tests, and now they have me on chemotherapy.

So, with cancer, this woman is working. She was only able to get insurance through the Affordable Care Act. Multiply that times 10,000, 20,000, 1 million, 20 million, whatever the number is. Think about the number of people in our country who were without insurance. Sometimes I am speechless when I meet these citizens because I think: Where were you hiding before? Where were you?

Another place I was, a woman was mixing up. She said: Well, I have health insurance, right? I pay car insurance.

I said: No. Car insurance doesn't cover health insurance.

People sometimes don't act in their own self-interest. She didn't even know that because she had auto insurance, that didn't cover health insurance. Can you believe that? So she was in a job where, with the Affordable Care Act, she could go out to the exchange and buy a plan.

It is amazing to me some of the things that have happened and how I see the Affordable Care Act off to a very good start.

As Mr. TONKO said, don't just repeal it until you have something to replace it with. You cannot pull the rug out from under these people's lives. It would be unconscionable to do that.

We have several Christians, several other denominations in this House. It would be very unChristian to do that, for those who are Christian. And for those of other denominations—pick your denomination—I just think it would be very cruel.

I thank the gentleman for allowing us to speak out this evening on behalf of citizens who can't speak for themselves and to try to help perfect what we as a Republic can do for our citizenry.

□ 2015

Mr. TONKO. Representative GARAMENDI, if I just might, I am listening to Representative KAPTUR talk of the interaction she had with her constituents, and I would just add my similar experience.

Some of the most cherished efforts of the Affordable Care Act are about pre-existing conditions. Being a woman, being a pregnant woman, or being a woman or a man fighting cancer made it very difficult for people to get that insurance, and lifetime caps. You know, people being rolled into surgery, wheeled into surgery, and being told that they were discontinuing their plan.

So these are elements of the Affordable Care Act that could be at risk if we start playing around with the actuarial balance that has been achieved.

And preexisting conditions, they rang right up there as one of the biggest concerns people have about repeal.

Ms. KAPTUR. On that point, another woman came up to me, I was over at the medical hospital with my brother, and she has epilepsy, and she has another condition. She told me, she said: You know, MARCY, I have to cut my pills in half. Can you help me try to find pills so that I can afford to pay for all the medicines that I need to take care of myself?

Rather than repealing, can't we find a majority of Republicans to help us, to help our citizens be able to get medicine at prices they can afford?

Why can't we have competitive bidding for pharmaceuticals? Why can't we have that? We have it for the VA. We have it for the Department of Defense. Why can't we have it for the rest of our citizenry so that we can get the best price?

But I thought: Cutting your pills in half? And so what happens to her is, if she doesn't take enough of the medicine, then she has a seizure. But she has got other things wrong with her, so she is trying to cut this pill and cut that pill. And I thought, this is crazy. This is crazy.

Can't we do better as a country than this for our people?

I have never understood why the price of pharmaceuticals has shot up so much. I can't tell you how many cases we get in our office where we have to call these companies and beg, you know, do you have some foundation where we can get a few more pills from Lilly or a few more pills from this company or that company in order to help people in our district.

It shouldn't be our job to turn into a medical dispensary because the system isn't working. There ought to be a way to take care of this.

Mr. GARAMENDI. As we look at this issue, this conversation puts before us and the American people really two paths to travel. The President-elect recently said: We're going to repeal ObamaCare, and it'll be great. And our Republican colleagues have bought into that and are now processing legislation to do that.

The discussion today from my two colleagues here indicates another path, and that is, make it better. Make the Affordable Care Act better. The drug issue, there is no reason in the world that the pharmaceutical companies should be prevented from price competition. They are. It is the law of the land that prevents the government and other purchasers—the government from negotiating prices. That is a law that can be changed.

There are many things that we could do to improve the health care of America. But two paths: one, working together to improve the Affordable Care Act and Medicare and Medicaid, and the Veterans Administration, the programs that provide the health care and the insurance for Americans; or another one, a path that is going to be extraordinarily destructive.

The repeal of the Affordable Care Act, which is already underway in the Senate and will soon be over here in the House, promises Americans not just the 30 million that have insurance but all Americans with a very serious health problem in the future.

Final comments, and then we will be out of time.

Mr. TONKO. Just a quick comment. We have talked about much here this evening. I joined you a bit after you started. I don't know if you mentioned the hospital situation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Very briefly.

Mr. TONKO. But representing a number of hospitals, from stand-alone clinics to some very specific specialty type of health centers, they are all concerned about the impact of repeal. And certainly, being a major employer, if not the major employer in some of my counties, as you reduce that care, you are reducing the workforce. So now we are creating another impact, and it is why the ripple effect of repeal is so strong and devastating, and will raise our deficit.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for joining us. I can assure you, we will be back.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and January 11 on account of traveling to see the President's farewell address.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 11, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

127. A letter from the Supervisory Regulatory Analyst, GIPSA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fees for Official Inspection and Official Weighting Services Under the United States Grain Standards Act (USGSA) received January 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

128. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Division of Consumer and Community Affairs, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's joint final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations [Regulation BB; Docket No.: R-1554] (RIN: 7100-AE64) received January 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public

Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

129. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's joint final rule — Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Depository Institutions and U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks (RIN: 3064-AE42) received January 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

130. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations— Assistance to States for the Education of Children with Disabilities; Preschool Grants for Children with Disabilities [Docket ID: ED-2015-OSERS-0132] (RIN: 1820-AB73) received January 6, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

131. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps [Docket No.: EERE-2016-BT-TP-0029] (RIN: 1904-AD71) received January 6, 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.

132. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Atlanta; Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0248; FRL-9957-89-Region 4] received January 9, 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.

133. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Minnesota; Sulfur Dioxide; Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0842; FRL-9958-15-Region 5] received January 9, 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.

134. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Nevada, Lake Tahoe; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0399; FRL-9958-11-Region 9] received January 9, 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.

135. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District; Prevention of Significant Deterioration [EPA-R09-OAR-2016-0305; FRL-9956-52-Region 9] received January 9, 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.

136. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Illinois: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R05-RCRA-2015-0555; FRL-9958-05-Region 5] received January 9, 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.

137. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — State of Iowa; Approval and Promulgation of the Title V Operating Permits Program, the State Implementation Plan, and 112(1) Plan [EPA-R07-OAR-2016-0453; FRL-9957-84-Region 7] received January 9, 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.

138. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs under the Clean Air Act [EPA-HQ-OEM-2015-0725; FRL-9954-46-OLEM] (RIN: 2050-AG82) received January 9, 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.

139. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustment Rule [FRL-9958-06-OECA] received January 9, 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.

140. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Rules of Practice and Procedure (RIN: 3064-AE52) received January 6, 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.

141. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Transaction of Interest — Section 831(b) Micro-Captive Transactions [Notice 2017-08] received January 9, 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.

142. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Updated FFI Agreement (Rev. Proc. 2017-16) received January 9, 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.

143. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2017-3) received January 9, 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.

144. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2017-5) received January 9, 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.

145. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Internal Revenue Bulletin: 2017-1 (Rev. Proc. 2017-4) received January 9, 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.

146. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Qualified Intermediary Agreement (Rev. Proc. 2017-15) received January 9, 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.

147. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's removal of temporary regulations; final regulations; and temporary regulations — Regulations Regarding Withholding of Tax on Certain U.S. Source Income Paid to Foreign Persons, Information Reporting and Backup Withholding on Payments Made to Certain U.S. Persons, and Portfolio Interest Treatment [TD 9808] (RIN: 1545-BL17) (RIN: 1545-BN74) received January 9, 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.

148. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's removal of temporary regulations; final regulations; temporary regulations — Regulations Relating to Information Reporting by Foreign Financial Institutions and Withholding on Certain Payments to Foreign Financial Institutions and Other Foreign Entities [TD 9809] (RIN: 1545-BL72) (RIN: 1545-BN79) received January 9, 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. NEWHOUSE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 40. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 78) to improve the consideration by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 238) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risk, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 115-3). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 388. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that veterans in each of the 48 contiguous States are able to receive services in at least one full-service hospital of the Veterans Health Administration in the State or receive comparable services provided by contract in the State; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROYCE of California (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 389. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude a loan secured by a non-owner occupied 1- to 4-family dwelling from the definition of a member business loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WEBER of

Texas, Mr. TROTT, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H.R. 390. A bill to provide for emergency relief to victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria, to provide accountability for perpetrators of these crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 391. A bill to modify the treatment of unaccompanied alien children who are in Federal custody by reason of their immigration status, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LOVE, Ms. MENG, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. STEWART, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 392. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, to increase the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 393. A bill to provide for an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. STEWART, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BLUM, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. BRAT, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. EMMER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama):

H.R. 395. A bill to end the practice of including more than one subject in a single bill by requiring that each bill enacted by Congress be limited to only one subject, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 396. A bill to prohibit the award of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold to a potential contractor or grant applicant with a seriously delinquent tax debt, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 397. A bill to require Members of Congress to disclose delinquent tax liability and to require an ethics inquiry into, and the garnishment of the wages of, a Member with Federal tax liability; to the Committee on House Administration, 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. KATKO (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 398. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to civil forfeitures relating to certain seized animals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISLOSKY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 399. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COOK, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MCLINTOCK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. YOHO, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LATTI, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. COMER):

H.R. 400. A bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and 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. CHENEY:

H.R. 401. A bill to designate the mountain at the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyoming, as Devils Tower, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 402. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require the inclusion of credit scores with free annual credit reports provided to consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 403. A bill to limit the construction or alterations of wind turbines near a military airbase or military airfield; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 404. A bill to ensure the functionality and security of new Federal websites that collect personally identifiable information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional new markets tax credits for distressed coal communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BYRNE):

H.R. 406. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to facilitate the replacement of military decorations for relatives of deceased members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 407. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for premiums for insurance which constitutes medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 408. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 409. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to sunset certain penalties relating to meaningful electronic health records use by Medicare eligible professionals and hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each

case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 410. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude coverage of advance care planning services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COLE, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. YODER, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 411. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a review of the deaths of certain veterans who died by suicide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 412. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the provision of legal assistance to junior enlisted personnel of the Armed Forces and their dependents in connection with their personal civil legal affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 413. A bill to establish an Early Federal Pell Grant Commitment Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 414. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow an individual to qualify for both teacher loan forgiveness and public service loan forgiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 415. A bill to amend GEAR UP to require that schools receiving funding under the program provide students with access to academic and mental health counseling services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 416. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to strengthen accountability of authorized public chartering agencies and reduce charter school authorizing misconduct; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 417. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the improvement of consumer confidence reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 418. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to improve access to supportive services and community coordination for families of disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for manufacturing job training expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 420. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently increase the limitations on the deduction for start-up and organizational expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. STEWART, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. KINZINGER):

H.R. 421. A bill to allow women greater access to safe and effective contraception; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK (for himself, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 422. A bill to ensure the payment of interest and principal of the debt of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 423. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to expand and clarify the prohibition on provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. KIND, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. BERGMAN):

H.R. 424. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue final rules relating to listing of the gray wolf in the Western Great Lakes and Wyoming under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 425. A bill to authorize the revocation or denial of passports to individuals affiliated with foreign terrorist organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 426. A bill to prohibit any regulation, rule, guidance, recommendation, or policy issued after May 15, 2015, that limits the sale or donation of excess property of the Federal Government to State and local agencies for law enforcement activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 427. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to Tourette syndrome; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 428. A bill to survey the gradient boundary along the Red River in the States of Oklahoma and Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 429. A bill to provide that the salaries of Members of a House of Congress will be held in escrow if that House has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 by April 15, 2017; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HILL, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 430. A bill to modify authorities that provide for rescission of determinations of countries as state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SOTO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ):

H.J. Res. 26. A joint resolution denying Congressional consent for President Donald J. Trump to accept any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign state throughout the tenure of his Presidency; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H. Res. 36. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H. Res. 37. A resolution providing for the attendance of the House at the Inaugural Ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H. Res. 38. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that offices attached to the seat of Government should not be required to exercise their offices in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H. Res. 39. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing Committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H. Res. 41. A resolution supporting a uniform adoption process for foster youth; 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. PETERS (for himself, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. KILMER):

H. Res. 42. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for the consideration of reported bills or joint resolutions that have not been considered by the House within 60 calendar days; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H. Res. 43. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of a concurrent resolution to provide for a recess of the House after July 31 of any year unless the House has approved each regular appropriation bill for the next fiscal year; to the Committee on Rules.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. SHEA-PORTER:

H.R. 388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence [note l]and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;...

By Mr. ROYCE of California:

H.R. 389.

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. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 to the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress “to provide for the common Defence”, “to raise and support Armies”, “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 Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common

Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 9:

No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(a) Section 8, Clause 1 of Article I of the Constitution; and

(b) Section 8, Clause 3 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution (relating to the general welfare of the United States).

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9 of the Constitution of the United States; the power to constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress the authority to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: “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 Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate foreign and interstate commerce) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—Commerce Clause and Taxing and Spending Clause

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 16.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 412.

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

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3—The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes;

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3—The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes;

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3—The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes;

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3—The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes;

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 417.

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.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 418.

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.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1—The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1—The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is in the power of the Congress To regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution as applied to providing for the general Welfare of the United States through the administration of the Federal Drug Administration, and in the power of Congress To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States as enumerated by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. McCLINTOCK:

H.R. 422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 2 of the United States Constitution, which confer on Congress the power to collect and manage revenue for the payment of debts owed by the United States and to borrow money on the credit of the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 2:

“The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;”

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 10, 11, and 15

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 427.

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. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.J. Res. 26.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 25: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 36: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BOST, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LATTI, Mr. JONES, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GRIF-FITH, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PITTINGER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FLORES, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 37: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BOST, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LATTI, Mr. JONES, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PITTINGER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FLORES, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 38: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. BUDD, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 51: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 52: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 76: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 78: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 83: Mr. MARINO, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 146: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 147: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 175: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 184: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 193: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 244: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 255: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 257: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 258: Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 274: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 277: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 285: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 288: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 299: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BYRNE, Ms. BEUTLER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KATKO, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 305: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.

H.R. 308: Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. COLE, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 312: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 331: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 332: Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 334: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 352: Mr. BIGGS and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 355: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COLE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LONG, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 356: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 357: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 358: Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 365: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 369: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 371: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. RUSH.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. BACON.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. BACON.

H.J. Res. 6: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. BOST.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. GAETZ.

H. Con. Res. 5: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H. Res. 23: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H. Res. 28: Mr. CASTRO of Texas and Mr. NOLAN.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2017

No. 6

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Honorable TED CRUZ, a Senator from the State of Texas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our hope for years to come, we worship You. Your Name is great, and we offer You our adoration and praise.

Bless our Senators. Open their eyes so that they can discern Your involvement in human affairs. Prepare their hearts and minds for today's challenges, inspiring them to conduct themselves with courtesy and honor. Keep their motives pure, their words true, and their actions constructive.

Almighty God, we acknowledge that our lives are in Your hands. So please keep our feet from stumbling.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 10, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable TED CRUZ, a Senator from the State of Texas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CRUZ thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

CABINET NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Senate committees have been working for many weeks to process President-Elect Trump's Cabinet nominations. I commend the committees and their staffs for their very hard work. Now we begin the next phase of this process with committee hearings. In fact, it just began this morning in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

I would like to say a word about our colleague from Alabama. Each of us knows Senator SESSIONS. We have worked with him. We know he cares about his country and the Department he will be tasked to lead. We know he is a forthright colleague, an experienced lawyer, and someone who believes strongly in the rule of law. We know that he will reach across the aisle as well.

He supported President Obama's first Attorney General nominee, Eric Holder. He worked with our late colleague Ted Kennedy on prison reform. He worked with our current colleague Senator DURBIN on sentencing reform.

Senator DURBIN, in fact, noted that Senator SESSIONS is "a man of his word." Senator LEAHY called him "wonderful to work with." Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, said he is "straightforward and fair."

Let me quote from a former Democratic Senate colleague who knows

Senator SESSIONS after having served with him for 16 years:

I always found JEFF to be an honorable and trustworthy person, a smart and good lawyer, and a thoughtful and open-minded listener.

He then continued with this:

I believe that he will be a principled, fair, and capable Attorney General. If I was in the Senate today, I would vote "aye" on his nomination.

That is the former Democratic candidate for Vice President of the United States, Senator Joe Lieberman.

But it is not just our Democratic colleagues who have praise for Senator SESSIONS. Let me read another letter from one of Senator SESSIONS' constituents in Alabama, Albert F. Turner, Jr. Here is what he had to say:

My family and I have literally been on the front line of the fight for civil rights my whole life. I believe that [Senator SESSIONS] is someone with whom I, and others in the civil rights community, can work with if given the opportunity. I believe that he will listen, as he has in the past, to the concerns of my community. More than most I am very familiar with him. I believe he will be fair in his application of the law and the Constitution; as such I support his nomination to be the next Attorney General of the United States.

Now, a lot of unfair things have been said about our colleague from Alabama in recent weeks. I am glad he is finally getting the chance to show Americans and the committee the Senator SESSIONS we all know and serve with. I look forward to the Senate's fair treatment of our colleague's forthcoming nomination, just as it fairly processed an incoming President Obama's pick for Attorney General—a nominee, whom, as I noted, Senator SESSIONS supported.

So let me turn to a larger point. The nominations process for an incoming President is important. As President Obama recently said when he met with President-Elect Trump, the Presidency "is bigger than any one person, and that's why ensuring a smooth transition is so important."

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S181

I certainly agree. When President Obama was elected, Republicans worked across the aisle to confirm seven—seven—of his nominees on inauguration day and five more by the end of his first week. These nominees were hardly centrists. We had reservations about many of them. But Democrats had won the Presidency and the Senate, and we hadn't. I ask our friends across the aisle to now demonstrate the same courtesy and seriousness for President-Elect Trump's nominees, especially his national security team.

The Senate has a longstanding tradition of confirming the Cabinet nominees of a newly elected administration in a timely fashion, and the Senate and its committees are now following the same standard for President-Elect Trump and his nominees as we have for past Presidents.

I know some are urging Democrats to play partisan games and needless delay. I hope they will not. The American people will see through it, anyway.

Here is a perfect example. The Democratic leader has been quoting a letter I sent to then-Senator Harry Reid in 2009. He apparently missed the fact that the letter he has been quoting was not only sent after every one of President Obama's eligible nominees had hearings but after all but one had been confirmed. So it is actually an important reminder of how Republicans fairly treated incoming President Obama's Cabinet nominees and how Democrats should now do the same.

This is time for serious consideration and cooperation. Americans aren't looking for partisan games. We are a nation at war. We are a nation grappling with a slow economy. Americans want the incoming President to have his national and economic security teams in place to get to work. They want us to work together across the aisle to get this done.

That is what Republicans did in 2009, it is what we are doing now, and it is what we invite our Democratic friends to join us in getting accomplished.

OBAMACARE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, families across the country have been hurt by ObamaCare's rising costs and limited choices, and we continue to hear the stories from constituents back home.

My own home State of Kentucky was once championed as a success story by ObamaCare supporters. That is hardly the case today. Too many Kentuckians are watching their insurance premiums grow higher and higher. They are struggling to meet deductibles so high that their insurance is almost useless. They are watching their friends and neighbors lose their plans or access to family doctors. They sit around the kitchen table and try to budget for their family's future. They know one thing for sure: The promises of ObamaCare have failed them.

ObamaCare promised lower costs, but premiums have skyrocketed. It promised families could keep their plans or doctors, but many have seen their options, in fact, limited. Kentuckians want to see lower costs, more choices, and better care. But after 7 long years of rising costs and diminishing options, ObamaCare has not delivered, and the people of Kentucky are demanding change. They have been loud and clear in their distaste for ObamaCare.

Like other Members here, I have received letters, emails, and phone calls. I have met with constituents directly who are feeling the pain of higher costs and fewer choices.

Consider this mom in Kentucky. She is facing a higher cost of health insurance, and she literally doesn't know what to do. Here is what she said:

My family is being pushed out of the middle class by the ObamaCare law. How can we pay almost \$1,200 a month on health insurance?

Listen to this veteran and father from Louisville. After his plan was discontinued, he tried to buy insurance through ObamaCare, only to find that his children's pediatrician wouldn't accept it. This dad worries that unless something is done, he will be "one of thousands of Kentuckians that will find that they do not have insurance options."

I have heard from many constituents expressing similar frustration, disappointment, and anger about the outcomes of ObamaCare. They expected the law to deliver on its promises, but, instead, they paid more and received less.

This year the cost of insurance premiums in Kentucky spiked up to 47 percent. These price increases are a direct result of instability injected into the market by ObamaCare. Families across Kentucky are scrambling to find ways to fit the extra expenses into their budgets.

To make matters worse, the choices that families once had for health insurance continue to disappear. Nearly half of the counties in Kentucky only have one option for a health insurance provider on the exchange, and, when there is only one choice, there is really no choice at all.

For the people of Kentucky and for people across the country, repeal means relief. The time to act is now.

However, our friends on the other side of the aisle are doing everything they can to stop us from fulfilling our promise to help the American people. Instead of continuing to push their political agenda, I urge them to help us. I ask them to listen to the American people, who are demanding change. A recent Gallup poll showed that 8 out of 10 Americans wanted to see ObamaCare significantly changed—significantly changed—or completely replaced.

It is time to admit it. ObamaCare has failed. This partisan experiment is hurting more than it is helping. It is time to finally move past it and replace it with something that works.

The repeal resolution is the first step to bring relief to hardworking Americans and to prevent health insurance markets from imploding. Next, we need to work together to replace ObamaCare with health care policies that actually work for families. Once we repeal ObamaCare, we can use the stable transition period to deliver on another promise.

I would encourage colleagues on both sides to offer their input as we work to lower costs, increase choices, and promote better care. But one thing is certain. Republicans will continue to follow through on our promises and act on behalf of our constituents to bring relief from ObamaCare.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CABINET NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as hearings for the President-elect's nominees get underway starting today, I want to reiterate that a fair and thorough vetting process is a top priority, not only for my caucus but for the American people.

Chief to achieving that is a fair hearing schedule and process. First, it means hearings that are sufficiently spaced out so Members who sit on multiple committees can actually attend all the hearings. It means only holding hearings after the full committee paperwork—OGE review, FBI background check, and a full divestment plan—has been received and Senators have adequate time to review the information. That means, if there are Senators with remaining questions that weren't covered in a first hearing, they can have the nominee come back for a second day.

Our caucus and much of America was alarmed and disappointed by the announcements of the hearing schedule this week, which did not meet these basic courtesies and best practices that have always been extended in the past. However, I am happy to say that after negotiating with my friend the majority leader and his respective committee chairs, we have been able to make some progress on a fair hearing process.

I appreciate the majority leader's openness and efforts to accommodate our caucus in the last few days. Originally there were six hearings scheduled for this Wednesday, all especially important Cabinet posts: State, Attorney General, Education, Transportation, Homeland Security, CIA. That was largely unprecedented. We have looked back in history and can only find one instance where there were that many hearings of important Cabinet members on one day like that.

After negotiations with the majority leader, we have moved things around so

that there are now only three hearings scheduled for Wednesday: Secretary of State, Transportation, and the second day of the AG hearings. All of these nominees have their paperwork in. The nominee for Secretary of Education, who does not yet have a signed ethics agreement and whose paperwork is not close to complete, was moved. That hearing will take place next week, pending her paperwork being submitted with time for Senators to review.

It is still a busy week. It is a little too busy for my personal taste, but it is a good first step. I hope we can continue to negotiate in good faith, to sort out the schedule in a way that is acceptable to both of our caucuses.

I also want to make clear that this progress does not mean our caucus is any less intent on having the President-elect's nominees complete the standard ethics forms, questionnaires, and FBI background checks required of every nominee. To have all this information come in after the hearing is sort of like "Alice in Wonderland"—it makes no sense and has things upside down. I am still concerned, for example, that we don't have a completed FBI background check for the nominee for Secretary of State. His hearing starts tomorrow. And today there are reports in the media that under Rex Tillerson's leadership, Exxon conducted business with Iran, potentially in violation of U.S. sanctions law. There are serious questions that need to be answered.

In this particular case, Mr. Tillerson should release all his tax returns and promise to answer any questions on the Iran dealings that members ask. This is too serious a subject to have questions ducked. It demands a completely open airing of all relevant information. Did Mr. Tillerson go around our Iran sanctions simply to line Exxon's pockets? That would be a very bad thing. The American people ought to know about it before the Senate has to vote to confirm. For Rex Tillerson to answer the questions, and particularly questions about Exxon setting up a separate subsidiary to get around our Iran sanctions, is what the Founding Fathers wanted us to do when they enumerated in the advise and consent process.

This is not a partisan game. We are not doing this for sport. These aren't obscure procedural complaints. This is standard process. As I reminded my friend the majority leader yesterday, this is the same exact process my counterpart demanded in 2009 when the shoe was on the other foot. Just as then-Minority Leader MCCONNELL laid out in his 2009 letter to then-Majority Leader Reid, Democrats expect each nominee to have all the prerequisites, with time to review, before we move forward with the hearings. President Obama's nominees completed all of their paperwork in 2009 before the hearings. We expect nothing less from President-Elect Trump's nominees. Particularly, we expect the paperwork to be all in with

time to review. Having the paperwork in at 7 a.m. and holding a hearing at 10 a.m. is unacceptable. We expect there will be adequate time for followup questions on a second day of hearings if Senators are unable to finish their questions.

Today my colleague the majority leader said: Well, most of the Cabinet nominees were in already when this letter came out. But the letter doesn't specify who. It includes Cabinet members, and there were future Cabinet members who would come forward. It is a good standard. We are all for it. We are asking our friends on the other side of the aisle to stick with it. What was good for them in 2009 is good for the country in 2017.

We are insistent on the process because it is the right thing to do; it is the American thing to do. We don't hide nominees and rush them through. They have huge power. If the President-elect and our Republican colleagues are as proud of the nominees as they state, then they should be happy to have them answer a lot of questions in a hearing that is not rushed. It is how we will ensure that Cabinet officials, who are imbued with an immense power in our government, are ethically and substantively qualified for these positions.

If there is any group of Cabinet nominees that cries out for this process, it is this group of nominees. This proposed Cabinet is unlike any other. It is wealthier than any other. It has complex webs of corporate connections—so many of the nominees—that pose huge potential conflict of interest problems. Frankly, it is the most hard-right Cabinet in its ideology. It is quite different from the way President-Elect Trump campaigned. The potential conflicts of interest for multimillionaires such as Rex Tillerson or Betsy DeVos or Steve Mnuchin are enormous.

As I said, the nominees have views far to the right of what the President campaigned on. The most glaring example is Representative PRICE. His whole career has been focused on ending Medicare as we know it. My colleague the majority leader said the American people want us to move forward and give President-Elect Trump his nominees. If they knew that one of the nominees had been dedicated to basically getting rid of Medicare, would they want us to vote for him? I will bet not. It sure explains why they want to rush these nominees through.

They don't want all of these things brought to light, but that is the wrong thing to do. We are going to fight to get to the right thing to do. The American people have a right to know if they voted for a President who might be going back on one of his key campaign promises. They deserve nothing less than open and deliberate hearings going forward. Will Representative PRICE stick with what President-Elect Trump said—no cuts to Medicare, Medicaid—or will he pursue his lifelong dream of privatizing and limiting

them? We shall see, but we need answers at hearings before we vote. The American people are entitled to it.

Once again, I thank the majority leader for dealing in good faith and trying to address our concerns. I hope for the sake of the national interests that our two parties can come together on an agreement for the remainder of the process, as we have for the process so far.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, last night the Senate Democrats held the floor late into the night to demonstrate our solidarity and commitment to defending ACA, to defending the tens of millions of Americans who have been afforded the opportunity to access care for the first time and the tens of millions more whose coverage is fairer, more generous, and more affordable because of the law.

More than 35 Members participated on the floor or on Facebook Live, Snapchat, or Twitter. I thank each and every one of the Members on my side—the vast majority of our caucus—for participating. Many of them discussed the threat the Republican plan to make America sick again poses to the health care of 300 million Americans. Beyond that, the Republican budget resolution calls for a massive increase in the Federal debt.

Yesterday Shaun Donovan, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, released a letter explaining that this budget resolution would allow publicly held debt to increase by \$9.5 trillion, from \$14.2 trillion in 2016 to \$23.7 trillion in 2026.

Our colleagues have talked about being deficit hawks. Democrats bring up ideas. They say: Can't do it; it increases the deficit. Well, is that going to apply to this, which increases the deficit by massive amounts? The deficit would exceed \$1.3 trillion in 2026. That is almost as high as the \$1.4 trillion at the depths of that recession and financial crisis President Obama had to meet. Are my colleagues now going to do a 180-degree reversal and say that now a debt increase of such dramatic numbers is OK? I hope not. It wouldn't be right. It wouldn't be fair. It wouldn't be consistent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of Director Donovan's letter.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, January 9, 2017.

Hon. JOHN A. YARMUTH,
Ranking Member, House Budget Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD E. NEAL,
Ranking Member, House Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YARMUTH AND CONGRESSMAN NEAL: I am writing in response to

your letter requesting OMB's analysis of the Republican budget resolution and its impact on the budget outlook.

On January 3, 2017, Republicans in the Senate Budget Committee introduced an FY 2017 budget resolution. Based on the numbers provided in the resolution, the Republican budget includes virtually no deficit reduction and would allow debt held by the public to increase by roughly \$9.5 trillion, from

\$14.2 trillion in 2016 to \$23.7 trillion in 2026. After a sustained period of historically fast deficit reduction under the President's leadership, the Republican budget would allow for a relatively steady increase in annual deficits, with the annual on-budget deficit increasing to over \$1 trillion by 2026.

Assuming that Republicans will not make cuts to off-budget programs like Social Security, unified annual deficits will be even

larger: growing to over \$1 trillion by 2022 and reaching more than \$1.3 trillion by 2026.

Comparisons of debt and deficit totals over time are best viewed as a share of the economy. Based on the Congressional Budget Office's most recent economic projections, it is clear that the Republican budget would fail the key fiscal test of stabilizing debt as a share of the economy.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET RESOLUTION AND CBO ESTIMATES OF THE PRESIDENT'S 2017 BUDGET

(On-Budget Deficits, Unified Budget Deficits, and Debt Held by the Public, Billions of Dollars)

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
On-Budget Deficits:										
Resolution	-\$583	-\$542	-\$674	-\$729	-\$785	-\$897	-\$893	-\$863	-\$946	-\$1,009
PB17	-447	-386	-500	-536	-566	-671	-665	-614	-669	-675
Unified Budget Deficits:										
Resolutions	-571	-548	-710	-798	-891	-1,043	-1,080	-1,094	-1,226	-1,341
PB17	-433	-383	-518	-585	-651	-791	-826	-813	-917	-972
Debt Held by the Public:										
Resolution	14,593	15,199	15,955	16,792	17,714	18,787	19,901	21,033	22,302	23,692
PB17	14,454	14,906	15,484	16,121	16,818	17,656	18,532	19,402	20,379	21,417
Difference										2,275

Sources: <http://www.budget.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/S.Con.Res.RepealResolution.pdf>, pp. 5-6; <https://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/114th-congress-2015-2016/reports/51383-APB.pdf>, Table 2; Resolution unified deficits derived using off-budget deficits from <https://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/114th-congress-2015-2016/reports/51384-marchbaseline.pdf>, table 1

Compared to the President's Budget, which drives down deficits as a share of the economy and maintains our fiscal progress through smart savings from health care, immigration, and tax reforms while making critical investments in economic growth and opportunity, the Republican Budget would lead to significantly larger deficits in each year and add more than \$2 trillion in debt over the next decade.

Notably, the budget resolution also contains exceptions to existing Congressional budget rules that seem targeted towards making it easier to pass legislation that would further increase deficits.

Sincerely,

SHAUN DONOVAN,
Director.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, many of my Republican colleagues like to claim they care about the deficit. During President Obama's administration, there was an obsession over deficit and debt reduction—and, by the way, no praise for the President for reducing the deficit by a dramatic amount. Now many of those same Members who chastised President Obama for much smaller deficits than proposed in their budget are supporting this budget resolution.

I wish to say to my colleagues, you can't claim to be a fiscal hawk and support a budget that piles on trillions in additional debt. That is not being fiscally conservative; it is being fiscally hypocritical in the extreme. So far, my friend Senator PAUL of Kentucky has made this point forcefully. My question is, Will other Republicans stand with him and stand up against this fiscal hypocrisy?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2017

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 3, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

Pending:

Sanders amendment No. 19, relative to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. for the weekly conference meetings and the time in recess count equally against S. Con. Res. 3; further, that Senator SANDERS or his designee control the time from 2 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.; and finally, that there be 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form prior to the vote on the Flake amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, clarifying that recent request, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. for the weekly conference meetings but that that time not count against S. Con. Res. 3.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the modified request is agreed to.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last week the Senate began consideration of the ObamaCare repeal resolution, which is the first step in the process of repealing the law. It is time for repeal.

Seven years ago, ObamaCare was sold to the American people with a lot of promises. The law was going to reduce premiums for families. It was going to fix problems with our health care system without hurting anyone who was happy with their health coverage. If you like your health plan, you will be able to keep it, people all across this country were told over and over again. If you like your doctor, you will be able to keep your doctor—also a promise and claim that was made over and

over again. As everyone knows, every one of these promises was broken. Premiums for families have continued to rise. Millions of Americans lost health care plans that they liked. Americans regularly discovered that they couldn't keep their doctors and that choice of replacement was often limited.

These broken promises were just the tip of the iceberg. The law hasn't just failed to live up to its promises, it is actively collapsing, and the status quo is unsustainable. Premiums on the exchanges are soaring. Deductibles regularly run into the thousands of dollars. For 2017, the average deductible for a bronze-level ObamaCare plan is rising from \$5,731 to \$6,092. With deductibles like that, it is no wonder that some Americans can't afford to actually use their ObamaCare insurance.

I receive a lot of mail from constituents in my State struggling to pay for their health care. One constituent contacted me to say: "My ObamaCare premium went up from \$1,080 per month to \$1,775 per month," a 64-percent increase, \$21,300 a year for health insurance. Let me just repeat that, a 64-percent increase in premiums, \$21,300 a year for health insurance. That is like paying another mortgage. That is a lot more than many people pay for their mortgage, and of course that is before any deductibles or other out-of-pocket costs are considered.

Another constituent wrote to tell me, "Today I received a new premium notice from my ObamaCare insurance. My policy rate for myself, my wife and my teenage son has increased by 357 percent."

The problems on the exchanges aren't limited to soaring costs, unfortunately. Insurers are pulling out of the exchanges right and left. Health care choices are rapidly dwindling. Narrow provider networks are the order of the day. One-third of American counties have just one choice of health insurer on their exchange.

This is not the health care reform the American people were looking for.

So it is no surprise that a recent Gallup poll found that 80 percent of Americans want major changes to ObamaCare or want the law entirely repealed and replaced or that 74 percent of American voters ranked health care as a very important voting issue for them in the 2016 elections. ObamaCare has not fixed our Nation's health care problems. It has made them worse. The American people deserve better.

Last week, the Senate started considering the ObamaCare repeal resolution, and we are continuing that process this week. This resolution will provide us with the tools we need to repeal the law, and then committees will get to work on the actual repeal bills. Then we will work step-by-step to replace ObamaCare with real health care reform that focuses on personalized, patient-centered care.

One massive problem with ObamaCare is the fact that it puts Washington in charge of health care decisions that should be made at a much lower level. The ObamaCare reform the Republicans pass will focus on fixing this. We are going to move control from Washington and give it back to States and the individuals. Health care issues don't have one size-fits-all solutions. It is time to stop acting like they do.

States should have the power to innovate and embrace health care solutions that work for the individuals and the employers of their States. Individuals should be able to make health care decisions in consultation with their doctors, not with Washington, DC. Another thing we are going to focus on is breaking down the ObamaCare barriers that have artificially restricted choice.

As I said earlier, ObamaCare has defaulted to a one-size-fits-all solution when it comes to health care, and that means that many Americans have found themselves paying for health care they don't need or want. We need much more flexibility in insurance plans. A thriving health care system would offer a wide variety of choices that would allow Americans to pick a plan tailored to their needs, that would be a competitive system that gives people in this country more choices, and inevitably what happens in those circumstances, that pushes the cost down.

We also need to give Americans the tools to better manage their health care and control costs. Of course, any reform plan has to make sure small businesses have the tools they need to provide the employees with affordable health coverage. ObamaCare has placed huge burdens on small businesses that have made it difficult for them to thrive and even to survive. It is time to lift these burdens and free up these businesses to grow and create jobs.

Our health care system wasn't perfect before ObamaCare. We all acknowledge that, but ObamaCare was not the answer. Instead of fixing the problems in our health care system, it

just made things worse. Republicans are ready to implement the kind of health care reform the American people are looking for: more affordable, more personal, more flexible health care coverage that meets their needs and is less bureaucratic.

The American people are ready for health care reform that actually works, and that is exactly what Republicans are going to give them starting right now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate my colleague from South Dakota for his comments. I am hearing the same thing in Wyoming that he has been hearing about the ObamaCare health care law and the impact on people in his State. I am hearing the same thing. I heard it this past weekend in Wyoming talking to people about what impact ObamaCare has had on their lives.

It is very interesting because people all around the State of Wyoming are talking about the fact that their costs have gone up and choices have gone down. Many who had insurance that worked for them lost that insurance all related to a law passed in the House and the Senate and signed into law by President Obama.

Tonight, in Chicago, President Obama is going to give a farewell address. I am assuming he will talk about ObamaCare, and I am assuming he paints a very different picture than the American people have seen and are living with. The President is using scare tactics about what Republicans plan to do. No matter what President Obama wants, the American people have spoken. They have voted, and 8 out of 10 people say that what this costly and complicated health care law has done to them, they would like to see it either significantly changed or repealed and replaced. They know better than to believe what the Democrats are continuing to tell them because they have been living with it every day.

Seven years ago, Democrats made one false claim after another when they were trying to sell this law to the American people. Democrats said: If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. They said: If you liked your health care plan, you could keep your health care plan. That one was labeled the Lie of the Year a few years ago. They said premiums for the average family would go down by \$2,500. None of it was true. Now Democrats are out telling more tales about ObamaCare. All of these new stories are going to be just as false as the ones

they told us all in the past. For one thing, Democrats have been saying that millions of Americans are going to lose their health insurance if we repeal the ObamaCare health care law.

In a letter just last week, Senators SCHUMER and SANDERS said that Republicans are planning to take health care coverage away from more than 30 million Americans. It is not going to happen. The Democrats absolutely know it is not going to happen. It doesn't stop them from saying it.

The fact is, this should never have been about health insurance in the first place. As a doctor, I will tell you this should have been about health care and patients. Republicans are going to make sure that is where the focus is from now on. The number of people with good health insurance coverage under ObamaCare actually has been a lot less than what the Democrats are claiming. That is because lots of people who bought ObamaCare coverage only did it because the health care law forced them to give up the insurance they already had and liked and worked for them. I have heard many stories from people in Wyoming who had insurance. It worked for them. They chose it because it was best for them and their family, and they lost it because the President said it wasn't good enough for him. These are people who were hurt by the broken promises and by President Obama's well-earned award of Lie of the Year.

With the health care law, most of the people who got insurance for the first time were actually forced into the broken system called Medicaid. Most of those people were actually eligible for Medicaid before the law was even signed, but for people who didn't have insurance before, a lot of them still can't afford care now because they may have insurance, but the deductibles are so high they can't afford to use it. Half of ObamaCare enrollees say they are skipping doctor visits in order to save money. If a family's health insurance doesn't cover the care they need, then the number of people covered is totally meaningless.

Democrats are out there saying that if we try to replace ObamaCare with a better solution, that it is just going to, in their words, cause chaos in the health insurance industry. Where have they been? There is chaos everywhere because of ObamaCare. When you look at what Democrats did to America's health care system, what you see is chaos. Premiums are up 25 percent in 1 year. That is chaos. Deductibles are up by an average of \$450 in a year. That is chaos. There is no functioning marketplace for ObamaCare in one-third of the country. That is chaos. When Americans look at this, what they see is already chaos, and ObamaCare caused it.

I want to mention one of the false claims the Democrats are making, and it has to do with Medicaid. That is because Medicaid was broken long before ObamaCare. All the health care law did

was add more people onto this broken program. One reason Medicaid is struggling is the same reason the rest of ObamaCare isn't working—because Medicaid tries to impose too many rules and regulations from Washington. It tries to make one size fit all.

There are different needs in every State. States know what those needs are, and they know much better than Washington about the people who live in those States. There are Republican Governors like Mike Pence of Indiana who understood this very important fact—and I am glad he is soon going to be Vice President. Governors like Mike Pence fought for waivers, waivers to make sure they could do what the people of their States needed. Every Governor should have that kind of freedom to look out for the best interests of the people in their home States. They shouldn't have to ask permission from some unaccountable, unelected Washington bureaucrat before making improvements to their own Medicaid Program. Giving States the freedom to come up with better solutions is just one of the things Republicans are going to do to replace ObamaCare with real health care reform. States need and deserve to have that freedom, and people should be free to buy the health insurance that meets their needs, not what meets the needs of the President of the United States.

People shouldn't have to pay more for coverage that isn't a good value for them. That is why so many people aren't even signing up in the first place and would rather pay the penalty—a penalty that, in my mind, is still unconstitutional. Families should have more flexibility to save for their own medical care. That is a way to make sure they are not stuck with empty coverage they can't afford to use. People shouldn't be mandated to buy this overpriced, unusable insurance or face a penalty from the IRS. It is one of the most outrageous parts of the entire health care law. To me, it is the first thing that has to go on the chopping block.

Republicans are going to repeal damaging and destructive ideas like ObamaCare's many taxes, mandates, and penalties. Then we are going to walk through better solutions one-by-one, step-by-step. I hope some of the Democrats in Congress will join us.

The Democratic Senators must be heading home on weekends and listening to people who have been impacted the way I described the people of Wyoming believe they have been impacted by the health care law. They have to realize there are things we must do better and more freedoms that must be given to the American people.

The American people have suffered long enough with the chaos created by ObamaCare. It took years for health insurance markets to get this bad, and it is going to take time to get things fixed.

This resolution we have submitted to repeal ObamaCare is the start.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Wyoming, the doctor, the Senator who has been involved in health care all of his adult life and particularly since he got to the Senate. He has been looking at alternatives to what we have and will play an intricate part in any replacement that we do.

We know what the problems are, and we are in the land of denial right now with the Democrats making speeches about the fearmongering of what might be changed. This isn't the point at which it gets changed. This is the point at which it gets set up so that it can be changed, and I look forward to actually doing the repeal and the replacement under the guidance of Senator BAR-RASSO from Wyoming.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, let me first say to the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee that we look forward to seeing the replacement as well because that is really the key right now. People across the country are saying: Wait a minute. You are going to unravel a system. You are going to repeal and take away the health care that I have and the patient protections that I have, and we don't even know if it will be better.

Why in the world would that be done if the new system wasn't going to be better than the old system?

Right now we don't see anything. We see 6 years of repeals coming from the House and Senate and no plans. We still don't see a plan, and we have no idea. More importantly, there are millions of people with insurance who are either getting patient protections or affordable care they couldn't get before or have Medicare strengthened or Medicaid support, and no one knows what will happen next. Doctors, nurses, health care providers—no one knows what is going to happen next. I think it is the most irresponsible approach to addressing one of the basic needs for all of our families that we could ever have. So we know that in the end, when you pull the thread, essentially, you unravel the whole system. That, minimally, creates instability in the entire economy. There is no plan being held up that would improve health care, which we are all for. I am all for making the health care system more affordable for families, strengthening health care. Let's do it. Unravelling and creating chaos in the health care system—no. It makes absolutely no sense, and we know that it is just going to make America sick again.

I want to share a couple of stories. First, we hear from Mary of Dundee, who owns a small business and has a 20-year-old daughter with a preexisting condition. For her, coverage—but, also, what we call the Patients' Bill of Rights—is absolutely critical. That is part of the Affordable Care Act that af-

fects everybody with insurance. Seventy-five percent of Americans get their insurance through their employer. In the past, they could get dropped if they got sick, if they had diabetes or had a child with juvenile diabetes or had a heart condition or high blood pressure. Women who were of childbearing years could be viewed as having a preexisting condition. In the past, insurance companies had total control to decide who got coverage, when they got dropped, what would happen when you got sick and needed medical care. That changed with a Patients' Bill of Rights in the Affordable Care Act. There are a whole range of protections to make sure the insurance you pay for every month actually provides the medical care when you need it for you and your family.

Let's start with Mary's story. She wanted to express her concern about repealing the Affordable Care Act, and I appreciate very much the fact that she shared her story with me. She says:

My family and I have purchased our coverage through the [ACA] marketplace for 2015, 2016, and 2017. This opportunity has allowed us to become self-employed. . . .

They could open their own business. They weren't tied to their job because of the need of health insurance. They now have opened their own small business in Dundee, MI.

Prior to the ACA, I was working to provide coverage—

How many times have we heard that? I have heard that even in my own extended family—

then I lost my full time status and as a part-time employee, the hours I worked barely covered my portion of my employer provided healthcare.

By enrolling for coverage through the marketplace, I was able to pick the coverage needed for our family at an affordable price . . . not knowing what the future held becoming self employed. We have three daughters. Our oldest has life threatening allergies and asthma. I did not need to worry that we would be denied coverage due to preexisting conditions.

As Congress proceeds to dismantle the ACA, I am concerned for my oldest daughter who is in her sophomore year at the University of Michigan-Dearborn. She is 20 years old. . . . Will she continue to have coverage through our insurance until she is 26 as the ACA provides? If not, what kind of coverage will she be able to afford due to her pre-existing conditions? Why put more obstacles in the way of our young adults?

That is a really good question, Mary. It makes no sense to do that.

She goes on to say:

The ACA, we're sure, has faults . . . and like everything, could be improved, but to scrap it and not use it at least as a "seed" to grow and improve is beyond my understanding. To suggest that there is nothing to keep is absurd and 20-30 million Americans enrolled . . . agree with us.

I agree with you as well, Mary. Thank you for sharing your story.

The coverage in the Affordable Care Act and the strengthening of Medicare and Medicaid are critical, as are the patient protections—the Patient Bill of Rights that affects people who buy insurance now, who finally got control

back from insurance companies that made every single decision. Being able to know that, if, in fact, you get sick or your child has a serious health condition, they won't be denied care for the rest of their lives, and also being able to have them on your insurance as they start off in life—there are so many protections. The caps on treatments and the number of treatments and services provided have been eliminated. The Patients' Bill of Rights is absolutely critical.

I want to take just a moment to speak about another piece of this, which relates to the Patients' Bill of Rights as it relates to women. In the past, the majority of plans—about 70 percent of the insurance plans in the private sector that a woman might try to choose and purchase—wouldn't cover basic maternity care. I couldn't believe it when I first heard that. Wait a minute. It wouldn't cover basic maternity care? Now every plan has to cover basic maternity care. It makes sense. No longer is just being a woman a preexisting condition. That is part of the Patients' Bill of Rights.

The capacity to now get preventive care, a mammogram, cancer screenings, and other types of preventive care is done without a copay. So we want people to go and get that checkup and, if there is a problem, to be able to tackle it early. That is most important because it is better for the person, but it also means there will be less cost to the health care system if you can catch something early. So the Patients' Bill of Rights is really critical to that.

There is something else that is also in here that is appalling to me and goes directly to the question of women's health care, and that is the fact that this bill repeals Planned Parenthood services and, basically, guts health care for women across Michigan and women across the country. For 75 percent of the women who use a Planned Parenthood clinic in Michigan, their visit will be the only health care they get all year.

We have rural counties in northern Michigan where the only health care clinics doing preventive care—cancer screenings, basic services, OB/GYN visits—are the Planned Parenthood clinics. So many women across Michigan will see their access to health care denied if this passes and Planned Parenthood loses its funding. There were 71,000 patients, the majority of them women, in Michigan in 2014, who received care—breast exams, Pap smears, prenatal visits. Again, tying this all together, we want to cover maternity care, but we also want healthy moms and healthy babies, and that means prenatal care. We have communities in these small towns, as well as in the big cities. But it affects small towns and rural communities around Michigan, where women are going to be denied services, and it is the only clinic that is there.

I want to share a story from Laurie in Jonesville about the Affordable Care

Act and her particular situation. She said:

I have had type I diabetes for 54 years and when I needed to retire early at the age of 62 because of complications related to diabetes, I looked at the ACA for health insurance. . . . I couldn't afford COBRA.

I was able to buy health insurance at what I consider an affordable price with a small copay for my medications, the most expensive one being insulin at a retail price of \$296 a month. As you know, my preexisting conditions of type I diabetes, heart disease and a visual impairment, both complications of diabetes, would have been uninsurable without the ACA. I would have been uninsurable.

That is without the Patients' Bill of Rights, which says she has a right to be able to purchase health insurance.

In June of 2016 I was diagnosed with breast cancer, luckily diagnosed at Stage 1 in a routine mammogram. Without the ACA I wouldn't have been able to afford the mammogram or the subsequent treatment without depleting our life savings. I quickly reached my maximum out of pocket cost and while some people would complain about having to pay that, not me! My total bill so far is over \$150,000. . . .

That is for her cancer treatment.

There is the combination here of repealing Planned Parenthood funding for health clinics that allow someone like Laurie to go in and get a mammogram rather than waiting until she has a level of breast cancer that cannot be effectively treated or might otherwise cause loss of life. She was able to catch this early because she was able to get a screening—a mammogram—the kind of treatment that women in small towns all over Michigan have the capacity to do now because of the reasonable copays for care and partly because there is no copay for that mammogram but also because they have a clinic available in their community where they can get the care. All of this fits together—the access to preventive care for women, the health care clinics that are available around Michigan and around the country, and the Patients' Bill of Rights, which says you have a right to care. This is not just about the insurance company basing every decision on the fact that they want to make more money rather than cover you. You have a right to make sure that when you get sick, you don't get dropped, and, if you have breast cancer or diabetes, you have a right to have access to affordable health care.

So I would hope that our colleagues would join together, stop this craziness of trying to repeal health reform and protections for every single American, and, instead, sit down together and look at how we can make it better.

Our Republican colleagues will find willing partners in making the system more affordable and better, but we will continue to be the strongest possible opponents of ripping the system apart and creating chaos for American families.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENT NO. 52

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 52 and ask unanimous consent that it be reported by number.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for Mr. FLAKE, proposes an amendment numbered 52.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strengthen Social Security and Medicare without raiding it to pay for new Government programs, like Obamacare, that have failed Americans by increasing premiums and reducing affordable health care options, to reform Medicaid without prioritizing able-bodied adults over the disabled, and to return regulation of insurance to State governments)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . . . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTIONS FOR THE ELDERLY AND VULNERABLE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protections for the elderly and vulnerable, which may include strengthening Social Security and Medicare, improving Medicaid, housing reform, and returning regulation of health insurance markets to the States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

RECESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:01 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as the ranking member of the Budget Committee, I want to take this opportunity to make several points in opposition to the Republican side-by-side amendment and in support of the amendment that I have offered.

Like many Republican proposals, if you read the Republican amendment, it sounds good on the surface, but if you probe half an inch into it, you recognize what an incredible disaster it will be for working families of this country—nice words, but devastating impacts. So I want to talk about that.

No. 2, I want to talk about what it will mean if, in fact, the Republicans

are successful in doing what they want to do, which is repealing the Affordable Care Act—something which I, and I think virtually every Democrat, will do our best to oppose—and what it will mean to the American people if the Affordable Care Act is repealed without any alternative to replace it.

What that, in fact, will mean is throwing 30 million people off of their health insurance. Thirty million people will lose their health insurance. I have not seen any Republican studies as to how many of those people will die, but certainly many thousands of them will die because if you are sick and you don't have any money and you don't have any health insurance, you cannot get to a doctor or you cannot get to a hospital. In fact, there have been some studies suggesting that thousands of people will die, and certainly many others will become much sicker than they should be. That is what happens when you simply throw 30 million people off of health insurance and you have no alternative plan.

Nobody in the Senate thinks the Affordable Care Act is perfect, least of all me. I think it needs significant changes. Let's work together to change it. But you cannot just repeal it without any alternative.

Not only will a repeal throw 30 million people off of health insurance, it will devastate millions and millions of low- and moderate-income families by making major cuts to Medicaid, and that includes many middle-class families who use Medicaid to support payments for their parents who are in nursing homes.

If you repeal the Affordable Care Act without a replacement, you are going to significantly increase the cost of prescription drugs for senior citizens, many of whom have a hard time right now paying for their medicine. And while you have thrown millions off of health insurance, while you make devastating cuts to Medicaid, while the repeal of the Affordable Care Act will raise the cost of prescription drugs for seniors, a repeal would do something else, which is not terribly surprising coming from Republicans. It would provide \$346 billion in tax breaks to the top 2 percent. Millions lose their health care, the costs of prescription drugs go up, middle-class families will not be able to afford nursing home care for their parents, but, importantly, from the Republican perspective, \$346 billion in tax breaks will go to the top 2 percent.

Now, this is a set of priorities which I, frankly, believe the American people do not support.

Also this afternoon I want to touch on another issue that is actually even more important than the previous two, and that is, to my mind, in a Democratic society, a candidate for President—in this case Mr. Trump—cannot simply say one thing over and over again, cannot go out to the American people and make campaign promises, but the day after the election, forget about what those promises were about.

Now, here is the purpose of the Republican amendment. This is what is in front of all of us right now.

Purpose: To strengthen Social Security and Medicare without raiding it to pay for new Government programs, like ObamaCare, that have failed Americans by increasing premiums and reducing affordable health care options, to reform Medicaid without prioritizing able-bodied adults over the disabled, and to return regulation of insurance to State governments.

That is the exact quote of the purpose of the Republican amendment that we will be voting on in a few moments. It sounds pretty good. But let us translate it into English, and let us be very clear about what these words actually mean and why this amendment should be opposed by every Member of the U.S. Senate.

The Republicans say in their purpose that they want to “strengthen Social Security and Medicare.” Well, count me in. That is exactly what I want to do. But how do they propose to go about doing that? They are going to strengthen Social Security and Medicare by making devastating cuts to Social Security and Medicare. That is a strange way to strengthen a program.

As we speak right now, the Republican chairman of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Social Security—the committee that has jurisdiction over Social Security—has introduced legislation which will make devastating cuts to Social Security. That is a very unusual way to strengthen that program.

My Republican friends will tell us that the only way we can “strengthen Social Security” is, in fact, to cut Social Security. Now, talk about fake news; talk about Orwellian language. We are strengthening Social Security by cutting Social Security. To all those seniors and disabled veterans who are out there and who are trying to get by on \$13,000, \$14,000, \$15,000 a year in Social Security benefits, my Republican colleagues are going to “strengthen” Social Security and they are going to do it by cutting your benefits. That is a very strange way to strengthen Social Security.

It seems to me that if we are serious about really strengthening Social Security, what that means in plain English—not Orwellian language—is, No. 1, if you want to strengthen it, we have to extend the life of Social Security. Social Security now can pay out every benefit owed to every eligible American for 17 years. That is OK. It means we are not in a crisis, but it is not good enough. I want to see Social Security be solvent for another 50 or 60 years. That is strengthening Social Security.

When we talk about strengthening Social Security, that means increasing benefits, not cutting benefits. The truth is that seniors in this country cannot make it on \$13,000 or \$14,000 a year in Social Security benefits; we need to increase and expand their benefits.

Thirdly, if we are serious about strengthening Social Security, we need

to end the absurdity of seniors who this year got a COLA of three-tenths of 1 percent, and in recent years have gotten COLAs of zero percent because the formula that determines COLAs for people on Social Security is totally inadequate and an incorrect formula, not really measuring the cost-of-living expenditures of senior citizens.

That is what we have to do to strengthen Social Security.

How do we do that? I have legislation that will do just that. But do my colleagues know what? Despite all of the talk of my Republican colleagues wanting to strengthen Social Security, we have zero Republican cosponsors on that idea.

The way we do it—a concept supported by many of the major senior organizations in this country—would eliminate the earnings cap on all taxable income above \$250,000. Right now, if you make \$1 million a year, \$10 million a year, you contribute the same amount into the Social Security trust fund as somebody who makes about \$118,000. That is wrong. That is unfair. Lifting that cap, starting at \$250,000 and above, would impact only the top 1.5 percent. If we do that, we can extend the life of Social Security for well over 50 years and we could expand benefits for people living on less than \$16,000 a year by more than \$1,300 a year. That is how we strengthen Social Security. But I have not heard one Republican in this body speak in support of that proposal.

Now, Republicans say they want to strengthen Medicare without raiding it to pay for new government programs like ObamaCare. That is what they state in their purpose. So let me be absolutely clear. That is a totally false statement. It is not true. The so-called raid was an effort to save some \$700 billion over a 10-year period by making Medicare more efficient and more cost effective.

My Republican friends talk every day about the need to bring increased efficiencies into government programs. They are right. We need to do that. And that is precisely what the Obama administration did. My Republican friends will not get up here and tell us that there was one nickel of Medicare benefits cut as a result of the creation of the Affordable Care Act. There was not one nickel of benefits cut. They know it. I know it. They will not say otherwise.

So the \$700 billion was in savings, doing the right thing—not cutting a nickel of benefits from Medicare. I hope my Republican colleagues will not continue to try to spread this mistruth.

The Republican amendment that we are going to be voting on talks about reforming Medicaid without prioritizing able-bodied adults over the disabled. It sounds good. What are they talking about in real English? What they want to do is “reform” Medicaid without prioritizing able-bodied adults over the disabled. What does that

mean? It means not only do they not want to see Medicaid expanded, as over 30 States have done, what they want to do, and what this language is really about, is to throw millions of people off of Medicaid. We are the only major country on Earth that does not guarantee health care to all people. Some 28 million Americans today have no health insurance. They want to throw millions more off health insurance.

So if you are an “able-bodied” adult making the Federal minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour—which, by the way, they don’t want to raise. Vermont has raised its minimum wage to \$10 an hour. I don’t know what it is in Wyoming—\$7.25. But if you are in a State where minimum wage is still \$7.25 and you are able-bodied, do the arithmetic. If you have a couple of kids, health insurance will cost you \$10,000, \$15,000 a year. How do you afford that when you are making \$8, \$9, \$10 an hour? You don’t afford it. That is able-bodied.

The last I heard, it is not criminal activity to be working and making \$8, \$9, \$10 an hour. Unfortunately, that is what millions of people do. They cannot afford health insurance. What many of us have tried to do is expand Medicaid so that they will get health insurance, but what the Republican proposal and their language is about is the denying health insurance for the so-called able-bodied. Let’s get rid of the word “able-bodied.” Let’s talk about working people at starvation wages who cannot afford health insurance. That is what that language means in English.

The Republican’s proposal we will be voting on also talks about “returning regulation of insurance to State governments.” OK. It sounds good. What does that mean in the real world? That means you could be denied coverage for a preexisting condition.

I just met a woman last night dying of breast cancer. That is her reality, but she was able to get health insurance, despite having a very severe situation, because we abolished the insurance companies’ ability to say no to her and to millions of other people who have preexisting conditions.

When you want to return regulation of insurance to State governments, that is precisely what they can do—the law is gone. The insurance companies can say: You have cancer; we are not going to cover you because you are going to cost us too much money, and we can’t make any money from you. Insurance companies could refuse to cover needed things like maternity care, prescription drugs, or high-cost diseases like HIV and many others. That is what they mean when they talk about returning regulation of insurance to State governments, doing away with all of the patient protection we have passed here in Washington that is widely supported by the American people. Go out to Wyoming, go to Vermont, go to Oregon, go to any State and ask the people if we should repeal preexisting conditions so insurance

companies can discriminate against people with illness, and they will tell you overwhelmingly no.

So the Republican proposal, which sounds nice, is in fact a devastating amendment that would very negatively impact many millions of people. I hope every Member of the Senate will reject that Republican amendment and in fact vote for an amendment I will be offering which addresses two very important issues:

No. 1, at a time of massive income and wealth inequality, at a time when a tiny sliver of our population—the people on top—are getting phenomenally wealthy, phenomenally richer, we have an explosion of billionaires in recent years while the middle class continues to shrink. At a time when we are the only major country on Earth not to guarantee health care as a right to all of our people, it would be absolutely unacceptable to take away health insurance from 30 million Americans, unacceptable to privatize Medicare, unacceptable to slash Medicaid, unacceptable to increase the costs of prescription drugs for seniors, unacceptable to defund Planned Parenthood—a high-quality health care organization providing health care to over 2 million Americans, many of whom are low income women. So a vote for the Sanders amendment rejects all of those very bad ideas.

If we throw 30 million people off health insurance and if we do not have a plan to replace it, I would hope my Republican colleagues would have the decency to tell us how many of those 30 million people will die. If we are going to be considering this legislation and throwing 30 million people off who can no longer get to a doctor, can no longer get to the hospital because they don’t have the money, how many of them will die? Tell us. Tell us so we can hold that in consideration as we look at this proposal.

For years, it is no secret Republican leaders like PAUL RYAN and Congressman TOM PRICE have wanted to end Medicare as we know it. That is what they have told us. It is not what I am saying. It is not a great secret.

What does that mean? What does it mean if we end Medicare as we know it and if we turn it into a voucher program, handing a 65-year-old senior who has been diagnosed with cancer an \$8,000 check and telling them to go out to a private insurance company and buy insurance on their own. That is what privatizing Medicare is about. It is a voucher program. Here is a check. You go out to the private insurance companies. You do your best.

If you are an 80-year-old suffering with cancer and you have a check for whatever it may be—\$8,000, \$9,000 a year—and you go to an insurance company and you say: What do I get for my \$8,000 check, they will laugh at you. They will laugh at you because they understand the cost of your care—your hospital care, your prescription drugs—will go well beyond 8,000 in the first

week, let alone year. You will get nothing. That is what the Republican idea is in terms of privatizing Medicare.

Let me get to the last point I want to make, and that gets well beyond the Affordable Care Act and well beyond Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security. It gets to the essence of what our political system is supposed to be about, and that is, if we run for office—and every person in the Senate has run for office. If you run for President, you cannot say over and over again that you are going to do this, and the day after the election decide you are not going to do it. That is why so many people in this country are disgusted with the political process. They see people saying: Hey, vote for me. I am going to do A, B, and C, and the day after the election you do the very opposite, D, E, and F.

When he ran for President, Donald Trump ran a very unconventional campaign. That is for sure. He said: I am not a typical Republican. That is what he said. He said: If I am elected President, I, Donald Trump, am not going to cut Social Security, I am not going to cut Medicare, and I am not going to cut Medicaid. He didn’t say that once. He wasn’t caught in an ambush interview. That was the heart and soul of his campaign. That is what he said to the elderly and to working-class Americans, and many voted for him precisely because he said he would not cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

On May 7, 2015, Mr. Trump tweeted: “I was the first and only potential GOP candidate to state there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.”

April 18, 2015, Trump said:

Every Republican wants to do a big number on Social Security. They want to do it on Medicare, they want to do it on Medicaid, and we can’t do it. And it’s not fair to the people that have been paying in for years. Now, all of a sudden they want to cut it.

August 10, 2015, Trump said:

I will save Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security without cuts.

Without cuts.

We have to do it. People have been paying in for years and now many of these candidates want to cut it.

March 29, 2016, Trump said:

You know, Paul [Ryan]—

PAUL RYAN is, as we all know, the Speaker of the House—

wants to knock out Social Security, knock it way down. . . . He wants to knock Medicare way down.

Two things. You will lose the election if you are going to do that. I am not going to cut it, and I am not going to raise ages, and I am not going to do all the things that they want to do. Welcome to “they.” That is what the Republicans are trying to do.

Back to the quote:

But they want to really cut it, and they want to cut it very substantially—the Republicans—and I am not going to do that.

That is where we are today. Republicans have a proposal which will make

devastating cuts to Social Security over in the House, and here by repealing the Affordable Care Act, they are going to cut Medicare and Medicaid.

In December of 2011, Trump wrote:

Now, I know there are some Republicans who would be just fine with allowing Social Security and Medicare to wither and die on the vine. The way they see it, Social Security and Medicaid are wasteful entitlement programs. But people who think this way need to rethink their position. It's not unreasonable for people who paid in to a system for decades to expect to get their money's worth. That's not an entitlement. That's honoring a deal. We as a society must also make an ironclad commitment to providing a safety net for those who can't make one for themselves.

On May 21, 2015, Trump tweeted:

I am going to save Social Security without any cuts. I know where to get the money from. Nobody else does.

On and on and on. These are just some of the quotes. This is not like a statement in the middle of the night. This is what he campaigned on.

What this amendment is about and says to my Democratic colleagues and says to my Republican colleagues is, do we hold and support the process in which a candidate runs for office and over and over and over again tells working families and the elderly he will not cut Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid—do we hold him to his word or do we just say: Hey, that is just campaign rhetoric. He lied. That is OK. That is politics in America. It doesn't matter what he said. This is the reality. We are going to cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

So this amendment tells us that if we go forward with what the Republicans want to do, it will be devastating to the American people, but perhaps, more importantly, what this amendment says is that in a democratic society, we must have faith with the American people. You cannot run a campaign, make promises, and the day after forget about everything you said.

I would hope very much that my Republican colleagues will join all of us on this side in supporting what democracy is supposed to be about. We have differences of opinions. Mr. ENZI and I disagree on a lot of things, but I have never suggested that Mr. ENZI—when he campaigns, I believe he says what he believes. People vote for him or they vote against him. It is called democracy. Now you have a situation where a candidate for President goes to the working class and says: I will not cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Let us tell Mr. Trump: Let us keep faith with the American people. We heard what you said, and we are going to hold you to your word. Let us support the Sanders amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, Senate Democrats will be voting to protect three programs—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. These programs represent core commitments our Nation has made to seniors, low-income Americans, children, and those living with disabilities.

Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid reflect who we are as Americans. At one time or another throughout our lives, most of us have or will count on these programs for health care or for financial stability.

During last year's Presidential debate, President-Elect Trump sought to distinguish himself from the field of Republican candidates by stating he was the first and only Republican candidate who would promise not to cut Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid. Yet, in their first major action of the new Congress, Republicans have taken the first step to dramatically alter and decimate core programs that comprise our safety net. Congressional Republicans want to gut funding, limit benefits, constrict eligibility, and turn guaranteed earned benefits into a voucher and a "good luck" wish. Their approach would violate the pledge we have made to millions of Americans and truly disrupt lives. This is unacceptable. That is why I am cosponsoring Senator SANDERS' amendment to prohibit the Senate from considering any legislation that would violate Donald Trump's promise of not cutting Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security.

I am committed to ensuring that we meet the promise we made to Americans. Sixty million Americans, including 2 million Illinoisans, depend on Social Security for their well-being, and we must make sure that this vital program is there for both current and future generations.

By 2034, without any reform, Social Security will be unable to fulfill its promise to its beneficiaries. If Congress does not act, beneficiaries would immediately see their benefits reduced by one-fifth.

It remains Congress's responsibility to look to the future and protect the long-term solvency of Social Security while ensuring benefits meet the needs of beneficiaries, especially the most vulnerable among us.

Waiting until tomorrow to do what we could do today—an approach that I have seen fail in Illinois—only makes the task more difficult and likely to cause disruption.

I was a member of the Simpson-Bowles Commission, where we tried to address our budget challenges and the long-term solvency of Social Security. I voted for the Commission's report because I believe we must face the difficult reality that doing nothing may harm the very people we are trying to protect—beneficiaries that rely on the promises we have made. I firmly believe that we, as Members of Congress, have a duty to have these debates and make difficult decisions, not just wait for the inevitable.

While I did not support everything in the final Commission's report, I believe the report included some commonsense options to improve the long-term solvency of Social Security: accelerating the alignment of payroll taxes to their intended level of 90 percent of wages

and realigning benefits to reflect current poverty levels among seniors.

I believe there can and should be evenhanded, bipartisan agreement on a path forward. To do so, we need a collaborative and good-faith partnership to examine the universe of policy options.

Make no mistake—I oppose privatization of Social Security. And recent solvency changes have weighed heavily on beneficiaries. That is why conversations should be balanced and targeted. There must be a dual goal of ensuring the adequacy of benefits, especially for those who rely on Social Security the most, and the long-term solvency of this program.

I look forward to working across the aisle in the future to maintain and build upon our promise to Americans.

AMENDMENT NO. 52

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 52, offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, for Mr. FLAKE.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in favor of the Flake amendment, No. 52, to protect the elderly and vulnerable.

I think the Senator speaking on the other side of the aisle talking about Republicans wanting to cut Medicare and Social Security has it a little backward. According to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, under current law Social Security's disability insurance trust fund will be exhausted by 2022 and its retirement fund will be exhausted by 2030. Once exhausted, Social Security beneficiaries could be subject to a cut in their benefits as high as 31 percent if we do nothing, unless we fix these programs.

The problem with the other side of the aisle right now is they don't want to fix these programs. If we adopt the Sanders amendment, it will make it difficult to actually go in and reform these programs in a manner that will make sure they survive for future generations.

We all know we have to have entitlement reform. We want to do it in a way that protects future generations. Unless we reform these programs—and they go in 2022 and 2030—if these benefits are exhausted, people might be subjected to a 31-percent cut. That is not what we want. That is why we have to go in and reform them, and that is why we need to adopt my amendment.

With that, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, when my friend Senator FLAKE talks about reforming Social Security, what he is talking about is cutting Social Security. He is suggesting that is the only way we can save Social Security. Of course, that is nonsense. I would urge my good friend from Arizona to get on board legislation that I will be offering. Do you know what it does? It extends the life of Social Security for 55

years and expands benefits, and it does that by lifting the cap so that billionaires contribute more into the Social Security trust fund.

To suggest that nobody on this side wants to do anything is inaccurate. We do want to do something. We want to raise benefits and extend the life of Social Security. And, yes, some campaign donors—billionaires—may have to pay more in taxes.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Flake amendment and support the Sanders amendment.

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment, No. 52, is not germane to the underlying resolution and therefore violates section 305(b)2 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of the act and applicable budget resolutions for the purpose of the Flake amendment, No. 52, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 31, nays 67, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 5 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Burr	Gardner	Portman
Cassidy	Graham	Risch
Collins	Heller	Rubio
Corker	Hoeven	Sasse
Cotton	Inhofe	Scott
Crapo	Johnson	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Ernst	McCain	Young
Fischer	Moran	
Flake	Murkowski	

NAYS—67

Alexander	Duckworth	Manchin
Baldwin	Durbin	Markey
Barrasso	Enzi	McCaskill
Bennet	Feinstein	McConnell
Blumenthal	Franken	Menendez
Blunt	Gillibrand	Merkley
Booker	Grassley	Murphy
Boozman	Harris	Murray
Brown	Hassan	Nelson
Cantwell	Hatch	Paul
Capito	Heinrich	Perdue
Cardin	Heitkamp	Peters
Carper	Hirono	Reed
Casey	Isakson	Roberts
Cochran	Kaine	Rounds
Coons	Kennedy	Sanders
Cornyn	King	Schatz
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Schumer
Donnelly	Leahy	Shaheen

Shelby	Van Hollen	Wicker
Stabenow	Warner	Wyden
Tester	Warren	
Udall	Whitehouse	

NOT VOTING—2

Sessions Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 31, the nays are 67.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 19

Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 19, offered by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this amendment does two basic things. No. 1, it says that the Senate should not go on record in throwing 30 million people off of health insurance, raising the cost of prescriptions drugs for seniors, and privatizing Medicare.

But it also does something else maybe even more important. It says that we should support President-Elect Trump when he campaigned throughout this country saying that I, Donald Trump, will not cut Social Security, will not cut Medicare, will not cut Medicaid. Let's tell the American people that we think that when a candidate for President says something over and over and over, when he promises the working people and the elderly that he will not cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, we stand with him and we are going to support him and make sure that there are no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I don't think that is exactly what this is about. This amendment is corrosive to the privilege of the budget resolution, meaning it is outside of the scope of what is appropriate for a budget resolution. Any inappropriate amendment could be fatal to the privilege of this resolution, which would destroy our efforts to repeal ObamaCare.

In other words, a vote in favor of this amendment is a vote against repealing ObamaCare. In addition, this amendment is not germane to this budget resolution. This budget resolution is much more focused than a typical budget resolution. The Congressional Budget Act requires that amendments to a budget resolution be germane. Since this amendment does not meet the standard required by budget law, a point of order would lie; as such, I raise a point of order under section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act for purposes

of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 6 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Heitkamp	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Udall
Coons	Manchin	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markey	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Duckworth	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Franken	Murray	

NAYS—49

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Cochran	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Young
Ernst	Moran	
Fischer	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—2

Sessions Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 49.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the 115th Congress convened just last week. I had hoped that with all the turmoil in the country that we would begin the year with a renewed sense of cooperation. But I am sorry to say, my friends in the Republican Party have chosen a different path.

The very first thing on the agenda is to press forward with a sham budget. If you ask why we have a sham budget, a fake budget, an unrealistic budget—we find out that its only purpose is to set up a process to repeal the Affordable Care Act with a simple majority vote. Why? Because they know the American people would never allow a repeal to pass otherwise.

So instead of working to finalize appropriations bills for this year—already more than 3 months in—or to invest in our Nation's critical infrastructure, or to truly bolster our Nation's cyber security, when we see countries such as Russia and other places attacking our cyber systems, or even to improve the Affordable Care Act so we can ensure that more people can receive affordable coverage, I am afraid the Republicans are recklessly rushing forward solely to fulfill an ill-considered campaign promise.

They are pushing American families over the cliff with the vague promise: Yeah, we will repeal it, but don't worry because eventually we will come up with a plan to replace it.

Jump first, plan later is anything but a responsible formula for someone's health, for sound decisions; and all the more so when the health insurance of tens of millions of Americans and American families all over the country—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike—is at stake.

The majority leader and others have said the repeal of the Affordable Care Act is only the first step. They say that a full repeal is necessary to pave the way for a replacement. They say: Let's leave ObamaCare in the past. Well, when you strip away the rhetoric and get rid of it, the only alternative they offer the American people is don't get sick—because if you get sick, you are in trouble.

The American people have a right to know what a vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act really means. A repeal of this law would not just take away the rights and care of millions of patients and their families; it would eliminate insurance coverage for millions more—especially the aging, the elderly, men and women with preexisting conditions, and the most vulnerable children.

A repeal of the Affordable Care Act would turn back the clock to a bad time in this country where once again women would have to pay more for health insurance than men, where insurance companies could rescind a health insurance policy simply because someone gets sick, and coverage could forever be denied to someone born with a disease or ailment, and that includes children. So you could buy a health insurance policy so you were covered in case you got sick, but the insurance companies could then say: Oh, you are sick. Sorry, no more insurance.

Now, in my State of Vermont, the Affordable Care Act has reduced the number of Vermonters without insurance by 53 percent. Tens of thousands have gained coverage under the expansion of Medicaid. And because the Affordable Care Act closed the prescription drug "donut hole," more than 10,000 Vermont seniors saved \$12 million in prescription drugs in 2015 alone. And this is just in the second smallest State in the Union. Can you imagine what it is like in larger States?

I have heard stories from many Vermonters about how vital this law is

to them and their families. I have heard from family doctors, like one in the southwest corner of our State in Bennington, who remembers when his patients couldn't afford treatment because of lifetime and annual limits on health care coverage, something that was very common. Or a woman from Westminster, VT, whose family hit hard times—she moved from job to job. She couldn't afford continuous health coverage until the Affordable Care Act offered her a quality plan she could keep. Now, we are talking about throwing her off.

Other young Vermonters are able to pursue careers in public service or the arts because they can stay on their parents' health insurance until age 26. Countless others have underscored that because of previous health issues, such as diabetes or cancer, health coverage would otherwise be unaffordable.

It would be a vicious cycle. They had a disease, but they couldn't afford to do anything about it, and they would go into greater debt. Now, even though they have a preexisting condition, they have guarantees and subsidies provided by the Affordable Care Act so they can have health coverage, instead of health coverage being unaffordable.

Opponents of the Affordable Care Act have gone to new lengths to repeat and prolong this political battle. And that is all this is. They have had 6 years to propose a better alternative. Instead, congressional Republicans and the President-elect have decided to put the cart before the horse. They want to dismantle our health care system, and they don't want to figure out how to fix it. They just want to figure out how to get rid of it. And, by the way, they say somebody is going to come up with a bright idea for something better.

The American people rightly expect us to work together and make progress on the many challenges that we face today. Instead, we are engaging in dangerous political gamesmanship that will not affect Members of the Congress, but the millions of families we represent throughout this country because they will not have health insurance, and their children will not have health insurance. Just think what this is eventually going to cost Americans—a lot more than we pay now.

I will not support a return to less protection, less coverage, less fairness, and higher costs because that is what a repeal means. The Affordable Care Act extended health insurance to millions of families, not only in Vermont, but across the country. Those who represent the American people in Congress should stand ready to get to work for their constituents. Not to make their constituents sick, but to give them a program that works.

I will not support an effort to reverse the many reforms and achievements we have made through the Affordable Care Act and instead cobble back together a broken system that for too long burdened most American households with health coverage uncertainty and crippling costs.

I am not going to go and tell Vermonters: Too bad that you have cancer. Tough. We just fixed it so you can't have insurance. Too bad that you have diabetes. We just fixed it so you can't get insurance. Too bad that your child was born with a physical defect. Too bad. We just fixed it so you can't get insurance. Or to the person who just lost a job who doesn't have insurance: Too bad that you are without health insurance. Better pray you don't get sick because, if you do, you will lose a lot more than your job.

No, I can't look Vermonters in the eye and say that is what I support.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I rise to speak on a subject that often goes overlooked in this body.

The subject of wasteful spending on parochial pet projects is often treated as a trivial matter—simply the cost of doing business around here. Imagine if every Member of Congress were as obsessed with searching for government waste as the players of the mobile game Pokemon Go are obsessed with finding the elusive Pokemon, as the chart shows here.

Just like the monsters in the popular game, government pork projects come in all shapes and sizes. They pop up just about everywhere. As individual expenses, these pet projects can seem rather harmless—cute, even. But taken together, their cost adds up to one very menacing boondoggle debt monster that continues to grow and threaten every taxpayer. In fact, within days, the U.S. national debt will top \$20 trillion.

As we debate the budget resolution, we need to get serious about controlling the debt like the true national security challenge it is. We start by eliminating unnecessary spending and catching government waste.

My friend and former colleague Senator Tom Coburn of Oklahoma created an annual report cataloging some of the most egregious ways Washington wastes our tax dollars. It is called the Wastebook. Today, I am releasing the latest installment, which profiles 50 new examples of questionable expenditures. This year's edition is entitled "Wastebook: PORKemon Go."

Like the Pokedex, which lists the various Pokemon for players to catch, Wastebook provides an index of questionable expenditures lurking throughout the Federal budget. These collectively cost taxpayers more than \$5 billion, but instead of Pikachu, we are looking out for PORKachu.

The top entry in this year's Wastebook is a spaceport—which is just a fancy word to say a rocket launch site—all the way over in Alaska. It has been derided as space pork, not because it is launching an elite unit of porcine astronauts into the big trough in the sky, it is because Congress used earmarks to force the Department of Defense to build the facility, over the objections of the military, as part of an illegal kickback scheme.

A midlevel DOD employee, who was sentenced to prison for masterminding the plot, eventually confessed that building the launch facility “doesn't make sense.” He said the Pentagon “just paid for meaningless work.” Keep in mind, this was a contractor on that project. After sitting unused for several years, the Pentagon is now sinking another \$80 million into the spaceport. This is despite the fact that it is not even equipped with the type of missiles that DOD plans to launch for the site.

Another entry, the National Comedy Center in New York must be laughing all the way to the bank with \$1.7 million from the Economic Development Administration, or EDA. This will be spent to bring Lucille Ball back to the stage as a hologram. The three-dimensional illusion of Lucy is formed with light beams from a laser, which will replicate standup routines using existing audio recordings.

Holograms of other comedians who are no longer with us will also take the stage in the center's comedy club. Other features will include a boot camp on how to deliver jokes—maybe I need that one—as well as a heckle booth, which we can do without. This is likely to once again make Washington the punch line of jokes, but it is no laughing matter for taxpayers.

Next up, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, has a program that allows taxpayer-funded farm loans to literally be paid back with peanuts. This program shelled out \$74 million in the past year. In typical Washington fashion, the government pays more for the peanuts than the market price, which has turned the program into a cash cow, or pig—however you want to view it—and the pile of surplus peanuts the government has amassed is so large that government can't even give it away.

Here we have a farm program where we are giving loans to farmers to grow peanuts. If they check at the end of the year and the market price for peanuts isn't very good, they can unload those peanuts on the government and keep the cost of the loan. Then, government has to store these peanuts, which we do in warehouses all over the country.

Based on USDA's own numbers, the Congressional Research Service is warning that the storage costs alone could pile up to \$1 billion a year. That is not just peanuts; that is enough to make anyone salty about our debt and deficit.

Instead of filling potholes, \$35,000 from the Department of Transpor-

tation literally went to pot. The money was paid for a giant glow-in-the-dark doobie displayed in Denver that was intended to remind motorists who smoke marijuana not to drive while they are stoned; \$35,000 for a big poster or banner on a building of a giant joint.

Even the Nation's most prestigious science agencies are spending taxpayer funds investigating subjects that most of us would consider obvious or rather offbeat. Studies on the habits of college students funded with \$5 million of NIH grants counted more than 500 different drinking games that are popular on college campuses.

According to researchers, “All of these games have the same goal—causing participants to become intoxicated.” I think that is rather obvious. They observed that fraternity brothers drink, smoke, and generally party more than other students, and they also sleep in later. This led the researchers to speculate that “one explanation for this finding is that Greek students recognize their sleep needs.” A more likely reason is that they are sleeping off their partying lifestyle, but you are paying for it.

NIH is also drilling down to determine why some people are afraid of the dentist as part of another \$3.5 million research project. The researchers found that—surprise here—“fear of pain has been shown to be a critical component.”

The monkey business doesn't end there. NIH spent nearly \$1 million to study the evolution of monkey drool and another \$230,000 to determine if the color red makes female monkeys feel more romantic. In case you are wondering, it does.

As part of an effort supported by both the National Science Foundation and DOD to teach computers how to understand computer behavior, the machines were programmed to watch television shows. After viewing over 600 hours of “Desperate Housewives,” “The Office,” and other shows, the computers were still unable to predict how humans would behave in most situations. Anybody who has watched those shows realizes that is rather obvious.

A \$1 million NASA project is preparing the world's religions for the possible discovery of extraterrestrial life forms—\$1 million to prepare the world's religions for the possible discovery of extraterrestrial life forms. Do we need to spend that, really?

A major sticking point for the participants was defining what life is: “Much of the discussion centered on the question, ‘What is life?’ It turns out that life is notoriously difficult to define,” they concluded.

The fishiest study of all tested how long a fish can run on a treadmill. This was part of a study paid for by a \$565,000 grant from the National Science Foundation. Everyone remembers the infamous shrimp on a treadmill funded by NSF. It turns out that last year's competitor had a leg, or several, up on the competition. With five

pairs of walking legs and five pairs of swimming legs, the shrimp could run for hours. The latest NSF-funded treadmill study participant was literally a fish out of water. The experiment forced mudskippers to “run” for as long as 15 minutes at a time on a treadmill. These fish possess the unique ability to survive out of water for extended periods of time, using their fins like legs, although they didn't appear to enjoy running on the treadmill, as you can imagine.

Certainly, we have bigger fish to fry with our Federal research dollars and, I might add, better puns to find as well. I could go on and on with examples of completely unnecessary spending identified by this year's Wastebook. There is waste in every department, every agency. All you have to do is look. Ferreting out every bit of wasteful spending, no matter how small, is the only way to reduce our debt and to rein in the cost of our Federal Government. It can be a daunting task because, much like Pokemon, these programs are good at hiding. Our mission is simple: You have to catch them all.

Madam President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I rise this afternoon to supplement some remarks I made on the floor last evening about the Affordable Care Act. Last night, I talked about my own experience as a young staff member in the U.S. Senate 43 years ago when, because I had an insurance policy provided by my employer—that policy had preventive care as part of the policy, just as Affordable Care Act policies do today—I had a routine physical checkup. It was the first I had in a number of years, which caught malignant melanoma, a particularly virulent form of cancer. Because it was caught early and because I was treated, here I am today.

As I mentioned last night, it has always haunted me that someone who didn't have insurance, a young man or a young woman somewhere in the country who was in exactly my situation, because they didn't have insurance, they didn't have preventive care, didn't get the checkup, the disease wasn't caught, and they are gone.

I find it very hard to justify that, to understand that. It doesn't seem fair. It doesn't seem ethical. It doesn't seem moral. Today I wanted to also bring to the attention of the Senate some stories from today about the effect of the Affordable Care Act in Maine, where we have over 80,000 people enrolled, many of whom had never been able to have insurance before.

A young woman, Whitney, who graduated from college in 2013, said:

I graduated . . . with a degree in wildlife ecology, [but it was very difficult to find a job.]

Thanks to the ACA, I was able to stay on my family health insurance plan through this period of unemployment. I did finally get employed in my field, but permanent, year-round jobs with benefits are the equivalent of winning the lottery.

Many young people are in that situation. It even has a name. It is called the gig economy, people who work gigs, who work short periods of time, several months here, several months there, but there are no benefits attached to those jobs. She said:

Many of us work seasonal jobs, building trails on the Appalachian Trail, rescuing lost hikers, managing volunteers, and running programs for veterans to reconnect with Maine's woods. We do good work in this state. Before the ACA we worked dangerous outdoor jobs that only provided minimum worker's comp. . . . But with the ACA and the tax credit, I could afford a silver plan, I could get dental for my teeth, could go to the doctor again, get flu shots and get my joints looked at.

It is important to realize that without the ACA, this young woman would have literally no options. A health savings account is unrealistic for somebody who is making \$15,000 to \$20,000 a year. Buying insurance across State lines isn't going to help this young woman.

She said getting the ACA coverage "was life changing. I know it is not perfect but I am terrified of going back to [where we were] before, where health and financial ruin was one wrong step away."

Another letter from an older adult:

My wife is sixty-three years old she is no longer able to work full time. She has had major back surgery and has arthritis in her neck. Because of these health issues she had to reduce her work hours.

Here is the catch-22. She had to reduce her work hours. Therefore, her employer dropped her from her health care coverage.

We were fortunate [enough] to obtain coverage for her through the Affordable Care Act. It is expensive and is not the best coverage—

Nobody in this body says it is best possible result and that the law is perfect. We all agree it needs to be repaired and fixed and modified. The writer goes on to say—

but it is good enough for us to know that a major health issue will not bankrupt us.

We are appealing to you as our representative to insure that a reasonable replacement will be put in place when the Affordable Care Act is ended. Better yet, improve it, don't destroy it.

I couldn't have said it better myself. Donald, in his letter to me, says: "Better yet, improve it, don't destroy it." That is what we ought to be talking about.

This letter is from a fellow named Ryan in North Central Maine. He also makes an important point about the Affordable Care Act. The term that I refer to is "job lock." There are hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people in this country who are locked into the jobs they have that they don't really like, that isn't giving them the satisfaction they want because they can't afford to leave their health care.

One of the hidden benefits of the Affordable Care Act is it has allowed those people to follow their dreams, to start a business and not have to worry

about having health insurance. This is an entrepreneur in Maine, a small business person. He said:

Affordable healthcare is a major roadblock to those calculating whether they can take the leap to become self-employed. As we prepare for next year's ice cream season, I am about to leave my benefit-providing job in order to commit to making the volume of ice cream we need. This is a scary and questionable decision given our financial situation and the fact that we are raising our two small children of four and seven years old. The first comment I hear from everyone who finds out I am leaving my job is, "Are you sure? What are you going to do about health insurance??"

The answer is, the Affordable Care Act. It enables this young man, this gentleman, to follow his dream, to start his business, to commit to his business, and this is good for the country. This is a hidden benefit that is rarely discussed about the Affordable Care Act to allow people to give vent to their dreams and their innovation and their contribution to the economy.

Here is how he ends his letter. He says:

Please don't let me down. Please don't let my family down. Please don't let down the millions of families who really are on the bottom of this country and are the very ones that all of you from every party claim to support. I don't care about the details of how it gets done, whether the ACA is thrown out, or just revised, or what compromises have to be made by either party, but please make sure there is a health care option available and that it is at an affordable price for those of us with the guts to take a stab at our own small business. The key is "Affordable Care." It matters.

As in my own case, health insurance also saves lives. There was a study done by the Journal of Public Health in 2009, which basically concluded that for every million people without health insurance, there are a thousand premature deaths. It is pretty easy math. Before the Affordable Care Act, we had 45 million people without health insurance in this country. The calculation in this extensive study was that 46,000 deaths were attributable to not having health insurance. I am living proof of that. If I hadn't had health insurance, I would be gone. With the disease that I had, either you catch it in time or you are a goner. That is why I am so passionate about this.

We would not let people die in our front yards. If we saw somebody who was in danger of losing their life, we wouldn't stand by. Nobody in this body would stand by and say: Sorry, we can't help you. But not providing health insurance to people is a death sentence to 10, 20, 30, 40,000 people.

The Affordable Care Act is now covering something like 25 million people. That is 25,000 lives saved. If we take it away, it will be 25,000 lives lost.

Here's the letter:

I am a Maine woman in my late 30s, who works 2 part-time jobs and also run my own business.

Because we were on [ACA] health insurance that had an affordable deductible, after not feeling well for a while, my husband went to a doctor and had a CT scan of his

lungs. . . . It turned out he had a very rare form of an illness, even though he was only 38 at the time. Had we not had this insurance and such an affordable premium and deductible, he would never have gotten that CT scan done. This insurance saved his life and covered every expense we've had over the last 2 years with multiple stays at MidCoast Hospital and Maine Med, 2 surgeries, pick-lines, medications, therapies, the list goes on. There is no cure for what he has but he's doing better now, thanks to the ACA.

Another person from Maine:

My sisters and I watched my mom die. We were physically in the room when it happened. We cried for probably half an hour straight.

Before the Affordable Care Act, most of her illnesses were considered pre-existing conditions. She survived cancer three times . . . but had to pay exorbitant monthly premiums just to have to pay most of her treatment out of pocket.

He said:

I don't care about the ACA because of some theory or ideology. I watched my mom die, sooner than she needed to, because she couldn't afford to get preventative care early enough. I watched my mom die because market solutions refused to solve her problems. An open insurance market actively refused to compete to cover my mom. The insurance market before the ACA is one of a number of factors that led to my mom's death.

This is a real, physical, immediate memory for me whenever someone talks about healthcare, and it always comes to mind when people talk about it in vague terms and market forces. I am crying even as I write this, and it has been years.

He writes to me:

I am begging you, as a son who watched his mom who was younger than you—

Than me—

die in a hospital because she couldn't afford the care she needed, please protect the Affordable Care Act. Protect it as a legislator, protect it by recognizing how appointments you choose to confirm or deny will affect my family's ability to stay healthy and alive. Through grants and research, you've worked to improve access to health care. Please, protect the ACA.

Another one—one more. This is a letter I received just back in the fall, a little before Christmas:

I have an incurable, generally non-lethal form of bone cancer and have been under treatment for over 12 years. The multiple surgeries [and costs] . . . I cannot afford to pay for ongoing treatment without insurance. I am very pleased the current ACA does not allow for "preexisting disqualification" and I would hate to see that removed. Having this condition is naturally stressful, debilitating and undesired. I do not want or need the added stress of having to worry about the details of coverage.

Additionally I have two boys, aged 23 and 26, both of whom have benefited from remaining on our family insurance policy. That is a great policy and my boys are healthier as a result.

Finally, access to quality health care is and must be a right as it benefits both the individual and society. Health is key to happiness and success and happy successful people pay taxes, support the government, [and] give back to the community.

I understand the debate that surrounded this. I understand the emotion. I understand the pressure that people feel in order to maintain a campaign promise or to meet promises

made over the last several years. But we are not talking about maybe what will happen; we are talking about real cases, real people. I am talking about real people in Maine, in small towns and cities. I am talking about rural hospitals that are on the verge of being rendered financially incapacitated because if this law is repealed, it will take away a significant part of their support. I am talking about seniors having to pay more for drugs. But mostly, I am talking about people's lives.

These cases are people who can give specific examples. There are thousands, tens of thousands, and millions that we can't articulate—people who are saved who don't even know it because they went in to get that checkup, who are saved the stress of wondering how they are going to pay for some kind of treatment.

As a parent, I remember having to stress about whether to take my child to a doctor because I didn't know whether I could afford to pay that bill. Yet we all know that is the proper course. We shouldn't have to make those kinds of choices. We have a vehicle, imperfect as it is. Imperfect as it is, we have a vehicle for providing that care.

Let's slow down. Let's take a breath and say: OK. We talked about repeal, but it isn't really practical. We can't harm that many people. Let's talk about what we are going to replace it with. The idea that we are going to repeal it today and replace it 3 years from now is just cruel. That is what I am hearing from people: Don't put us through that. People who finally got insurance after preexisting conditions, who have insurance and have a condition now—they depend upon that insurance. Let's not make them go through that pressure, the financial anxiety added to the health anxiety. We have an opportunity to rise above politics. This really shouldn't be political or a policy or something that divides us.

There is nobody in this body who wants to see people suffer, who wants to unnecessarily put people through the pressure of both health problems and financial problems. We ought to be able to find a solution. Every other industrialized country in the world has found a solution. It is not like this is some impenetrable box.

I realize that part of the solution has to involve controlling costs and facing the fact that we pay twice as much for health care per capita as anyone else in the world. That is an issue the Affordable Care Act does not sufficiently address, in my view, and we have to talk about that.

In the meantime, let us remember those people who are counting on us for their very lives. That is a commitment I believe we can respect and should meet.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, we are engaged in the first step to debate what is important to virtually every American. What we want to do is to find good ways to reform and replace ObamaCare and then repeal the provisions of it that have damaged so many Americans.

Before we start talking about a big subject, sometimes it helps to ask the question: Exactly what are we talking about? So, very quickly, where do Americans get our health care insurance? It might be interesting to note that 91 percent of us have some sort of health insurance—290 million. We get it from four places, basically. One is Medicare—18 percent of us with insurance. This is not a bill to change Medicare. That is a discussion for another day. So we are talking about these three areas.

One is employers, on the job. Sixty-one percent of us with insurance get it on the job—178 million people.

Medicaid, managed by States, paid for by the Federal and State governments—22 percent of covered Americans there get their insurance through Medicaid.

Then there is the individual market, people who buy it on their own. That includes the exchanges we hear so much about. Here is where all the news is; here is where the turmoil is. That is just 6 percent of everyone who is insured, although that is 18 million Americans. This is information from the U.S. Census.

Who is not insured? That is interesting too. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, there are 27 million people who aren't insured, but 17 million of those are eligible for some help to get insurance and just haven't taken it. Of the 11 million who are not eligible for any help, nearly half of them—5 million—are illegally here. Of the rest, some make too much money to be eligible for assistance, and some dropped through the Medicaid coverage gap. So it is fair to say that 91 percent of us are insured one way or the other. Then, of the 27 million—the 9 percent who are not insured—17 million of those are eligible for some sort of assistance.

How should we approach this? Following the Presidential election, President-Elect Donald Trump said on "60 Minutes" that replacement and repeal of ObamaCare would be done "simultaneously." To me, that means at the same time.

Just today, Speaker of the House PAUL RYAN said that repeal and replacement of ObamaCare would be done concurrently. To me, simultaneously and concurrently mean ObamaCare should finally be repealed only when there are concrete practical reforms in place—that give Americans access to truly affordable health care. Let me say that again: ObamaCare should be repealed, finally, only when there are concrete, practical reforms in place that give Americans access to truly affordable health care.

The American people deserve health care reform that is done in the right way for the right reasons and in the right amount of time. It is not about developing a quick fix. It is about working toward a long-term recovery that works for everyone.

Here is one way to think about what simultaneously or concurrently might mean. I would ask you to think about ObamaCare as if it were a local bridge in, say, South Dakota that is collapsing—because that is just what is happening with ObamaCare. According to the Tennessee Insurance Commission, the ObamaCare insurance market in our State is "very near collapse." Across the country, premiums and copays are up. Employers have cut jobs to afford ObamaCare costs. Medicaid mandates are consuming State budgets. In one-third of America's counties, citizens with Federal subsidies have only a single choice of a company to buy insurance from on an ObamaCare exchange. Without quick action this year, next year, these Americans may have zero choices. Their subsidies may be worth about as much as a bus ticket in a town where no buses run.

If your local bridge in South Dakota or Wyoming or Tennessee were very near collapse, what would you do? I think the first thing you do is to send in a rescue crew to repair it temporarily so no one else is hurt. Then you start building a better bridge—or more accurately, many bridges—as States develop their own plans for providing truly affordable health care to replace the old bridge.

Finally, when the new bridges are finished, you close the old bridge. That is how we propose to proceed: to rescue those trapped in a failing system that is ObamaCare, to replace that system with a functional market or markets, and then repeal ObamaCare for good.

First, we will offer a rescue plan so that the 11 million Americans who buy insurance now on the exchanges can continue to do so while we build a better set of concrete, practical alternatives.

Second, we will build the better systems. Note that I say systems, not one system. If anyone is expecting Senator MCCONNELL to roll a wheelbarrow onto the Senate floor with a great big comprehensive Republican health care plan, they are going to be waiting a long time because we don't believe in that. We don't want to replace a failed ObamaCare Federal system with another failed Federal system.

We want to create many systems across this country, step-by-step, to give Americans more choices of insurance that cost less. We will do this by moving more health care decisions out of Washington and into the hands of State and patients and by reducing harmful taxes. We will do it carefully, step-by-step, so that it is effective.

Finally, we will repeal what remains of the law that did all of this damage and created all of this risk. That is what we will do.

Here is what we will not do. This is not a bill for Medicare reform. That will be handled separately.

Second, you won't be disqualified from getting insurance if you have a preexisting health condition. If you are under the age of 26, you will still be able to be covered under your parents' plan.

That is what, in my opinion, we mean by repeal and replace "simultaneously," as the President-elect said, or "concurrently," as Speaker RYAN said.

Here are three steps we will take beginning immediately. No. 1 is the rescue plan. Six percent of Americans with insurance buy their insurance in this individual market, about two-thirds of those on the ObamaCare exchanges. This is where today's turmoil is. This is where the copays are up, the premiums are up, where insurance companies are pulling out of the markets.

While we build replacements, we want the 11 million Americans who now buy insurance on the exchanges to be able to continue to buy private insurance. This will require Congress and the President to take action before March 1, which is when the insurance companies begin to decide whether they will offer insurance in these markets during 2018.

In general, the goal is to get as close as possible to allowing any State-approved plan to count as health insurance under ObamaCare rules while we are transitioning to new systems. Among the actions that will help are to allow individuals to use their ObamaCare subsidies to purchase State-approved insurance outside the ObamaCare exchanges; to adjust ObamaCare's special enrollment periods; to approve the temporary continuation of cost-sharing subsidies for deductibles and copays; to allow States more flexibility to determine so-called essential health benefits, age rating rules, and small group restrictions; to expand health savings accounts; eventually, to provide tax credits to help lower-income Americans buy insurance; and to repeal the individual mandate when new insurance market rules are in place.

When the new administration rewrites the guidance on ObamaCare section 1332 State innovation waivers to allow for more State flexibility, States will have the authority to further innovate to build more modern health systems.

Now, second is employer insurance. Remember, that is where 61 percent of us get our insurance—on the job. We will repair the damage ObamaCare has done so that employers can offer employees more personalized patient-centered care. We will do that by repealing ObamaCare's employer mandate penalty. We will allow States to determine the so-called essential health benefits and thereby lower costs for small businesses. We will repeal ObamaCare's restrictions on grandfathered health

plans, on wellness benefits, on small group plans, and provide more flexibility for small businesses so they can work together to buy insurance—a proposal for which the Senator from Wyoming has championed for years.

This will mean more State authority, more choices, and lower costs for the 178 million Americans who obtain insurance on the job.

Third is Medicaid. Twenty-two percent of all insured Americans are covered by Medicaid. We will give States more flexibility to offer those 62 million citizens more options by making Federal Medicaid waivers more flexible.

So in summary, we will first send in a rescue crew to repair temporarily a collapsing health care market so no one else is hurt. Second, step-by-step, we will build better systems—that give Americans access to truly affordable health care. We will do this by moving health care decisions out of Washington, DC, and back to States and patients.

Finally, when our reforms become concrete practical alternatives, we will repeal the remaining parts of ObamaCare in order to repair the damage it has caused Americans. This is what I believe we mean when we say ObamaCare should be repealed and replaced simultaneously and concurrently.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, who is also the chairman of the Health Committee—that is, the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—for the succinct speech that he gave. I will be encouraging everybody on both sides of the aisle to read that speech. I know that many were not here to listen. But it is a fault that we have in this Chamber. We often speak to an empty Chamber.

But it is all recorded thanks to the people who do that for a job. You placed that so well that there should not be much doubt about what we are going to try to do. You heard it from the chairman of the Health Committee. He is the one that will be in charge of the health aspects of this.

The Finance Committee is a part of the bill too. But they are in charge of the monetary part of this. But without the health care part, that does not work. I love the way you expressed that in the way of taking care of a collapsed bridge, because I think people across America do realize that the bridge on health care has collapsed and they want to know what we are going to do about it.

You stated that very well. That should relax a lot of people. It probably won't because of the process that we are in, but I certainly hope that it does. So I thank you for your words and your effort and know that it is in good hands as we lead it through this process.

All that this resolution we are doing right now does is set it up so that this can be done. This really does not change any health care at this point. It sets it up so that we can do reconciliation, so that we can repeal what we can, so we can replace what we can, and then we can set up that system of bridges that will get us to the point where all Americans who want insurance can have insurance, but more importantly, so that all Americans can get the health care they need and deserve.

I thank the Senator for his comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, who has spent a great deal of time on this. I like the way he put that because I think what we want to assure people of—at least, I think that is what almost all of us feel—is that this is step 1. It involves reforms, replacing, and repealing—as the President-elect has said, "simultaneously," and as the Speaker has said, "concurrently." It involves not just one big system replaced by another big system. In our view, the one big system needs to be replaced step-by-step by many different systems as we move more decisions to the States.

For example, on employer insurance, or people who get their insurance on the job, we know right now steps that we can take to repeal ObamaCare, which damaged the employer system and which increased costs for employers. I remember sitting around with a group of restaurant company chief executive officers 6 years ago when ObamaCare passed. They pointed out that they were going have to hire fewer people to afford the cost of ObamaCare.

We don't want that to happen. We would like for them to be able to hire more people and to offer more people insurance. How would we do that? Well, if we repeal the Washington rules in an orderly way and transfer back to the States responsibility for regulating most insurance, the insurance commissioners have told us they believe they can do that very well—do it one way in South Dakota, another way in Tennessee, another way in Wyoming, and fit the needs of that community, reduce costs, increase choices, and have truly affordable health care.

So we can repeal those provisions that interfere with employer insurance and make sure that that repeal does not go into effect until South Dakota, Wyoming, Tennessee, and other parts of the market have in place concrete practical alternatives so they go together. But we have to get started. This is step 1.

Now, we can do the same with Medicaid. We have a former Governor of South Dakota in the Chair. Governors spend most of their time trying to figure out how to afford Medicaid. They almost feel that, if Washington would just allow the States to have more

flexibility in terms of how the available money is spent, we could cover more people better, offer more options.

Well, we can do that. But we are not going to do that tomorrow. We will have to sit down with the Governors and say: How do you suggest we do this? Then, as we do that, we can repeal the extensive Federal regulation that creates a jungle of redtape for Medicaid. But it only would take effect as the States tell us that there are concrete practical alternatives in effect. So this is the step-by-step way to go about making those kind of changes.

Finally, as the Senator said, we have to have a rescue team here. I mean, the ObamaCare market is in turmoil. It is only 6 percent of all of those who have insurance, but that is millions of people. If we don't act before March 1 to make sure insurance companies are selling into those markets, we will have many millions of people who will not be able to buy insurance. This will be, as I said, like having a bus ticket in a hometown with no buses running.

So that is really one of the first things we have to do—get that rescue team going. I like the analogy of the collapsing bridge. ObamaCare is collapsing in Tennessee, and I would say it is around the country, if you have one-third of the counties where you can only choose insurance from one company.

So, if a bridge is collapsing, you send in a crew to deal with that emergency so no one else is hurt. Then you start building these new bridges. After a while, in a prudent way, as you build each of those systems, as States build their systems, then you close that old broken-down bridge that was damaging so many people.

So that is an orderly way to go about things. I hope that, over time, we will have bipartisan support for these. We need a consensus. We don't, in the end, want to have just a partisan bill. But we have been acting like the Hatfields and McCoys in West Virginia for 6 years, arguing with each other about ObamaCare—Republicans and Democrats.

So it may take a little while to get there. But we can start, and we are starting under the leadership of Senator ENZI. Then, we will move concurrently and simultaneously to reform, replace, and repeal ObamaCare so that Americans have access to truly affordable insurance. By the time we get to that, I am hopeful that we will begin to have a consensus within this body that involves Democrats and Republicans both.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I only need to add one footnote to that fantastic summary; that is, that the Senator from Tennessee is the chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. For years we heard about the difficulties with No Child Left Behind. There were a lot of efforts to build a different bridge, and they never got completed within the timeframe that was necessary, even though

both sides recognized there was a problem.

The Senator from Tennessee undertook that, got bipartisan solutions on it, and put forward a bill that did kind of what we are talking about with ObamaCare. It sent it back to the States. It got rid of the national school boards, and that passed, I think, with 88 votes in the Senate. That is very bipartisan. That is the kind of an effort he puts forth. You can tell from the comments he has made about what we need to do that he has that well in mind, and I am certain some from the other side will join us to make sure we can get that done as well.

I thank the Senator, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I rise to express my strong opposition to partisan attempts to engage in a fast-track process to take health insurance away from hundreds of thousands of individuals in my State and millions across our country. In Michigan alone, 887,000 people are in jeopardy of losing their health coverage if Republicans have their way and repeal the Affordable Care Act without a replacement. Important protections for people with preexisting conditions will disappear. Not only will they lose them but so will their spouses and children.

We will be repealing reforms that have benefitted seniors and saved more than 5 million beneficiaries an average of over \$1,000 in drug costs in 2015. Repealing the Affordable Care Act will significantly increase drug costs for those seniors and threaten long-term solvency for Medicare. Republicans are rushing a process that increases Medicare costs for seniors and weakens the program for future generations. Our Nation's seniors have worked hard their entire lives, and they deserve our best efforts to ensure they can depend on Medicare to help them enjoy a dignified and secure retirement.

Over 1 million seniors are enrolled in Medicare in Michigan, and they deserve a health care program that will cover the costs of prescription drugs and other health care services they need. Since 1965, Medicare has done a tremendous job of giving seniors the care they need, and we should be working to strengthen this successful program, not putting it at risk.

Let's be clear. Reforms in the ACA extend the solvency of Medicare by over a decade. Let me say that again. It extends the solvency of Medicare for over a decade.

Given these challenges, we have to ask: Why are we rushing to dismantle these reforms?

We are rushing a process that will ultimately hurt the Medicare Program, our Nation's seniors, and so many others.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle suggest that we can simply keep or quickly reinstate the popular parts of this law, such as preventing discrimination based on preexisting conditions, allowing children to stay on their parents' coverage until they are 26, and helping seniors afford their prescriptions. I would pose this simple question to any of my colleagues advocating for repeal: What comes next? Show us your plan. Just show us your plan.

Former Governor Cuomo of New York famously said: "You can campaign in poetry, but govern in prose." We are now facing a majority that campaigned on a bumper sticker and is trying to govern with an IOU. Enacting a repeal of the ACA that takes effect at some undetermined point in the future will create chaos in our insurance markets. Health care reform is not a stand-alone program that can be removed overnight without creating widespread ramifications for our economy.

Yesterday, I attended the North American International Auto Show in Detroit. As a Michigander, I am always thinking about cars. Let me suggest an analogy. Many Republicans in Congress talk about the ACA like it is some sort of after-market addition on a car—a flashy rear spoiler, perhaps, or new rims that can just be unbolted and removed. Well, the ACA is actually like the antilock brakes that keep a driver from getting into an accident in the first place and the airbags that deploy to protect everyone inside when the worst happens.

I agree that our health care system needs a tuneup, but we cannot start ripping out safety features without a plan to help keep us safe on the road. We need to fix the Affordable Care Act. We need to do more for small business owners who want to do right by their employees and provide them with quality, affordable health care coverage.

I have offered and supported several proposals to fix the Affordable Care Act, including measures to help our Nation's small businesses. I am ready to work with my colleagues across the aisle to improve this law. However, repealing the ACA without showing the American people their plan for replacement is quite simply irresponsible.

I understand Americans want to see positive changes to the Affordable Care Act, and I agree with them. We should be working together to enact bipartisan improvements through regular order, not fast-tracking repeal. The fact is that most Americans do not want to have this law repealed entirely. In the New York Times, a woman named Patricia Meadows from Macomb County, MI, who voted for President-Elect Trump, stated that she

hoped that President-Elect Trump would not repeal the Affordable Care Act. Ms. Meadows revealed that, because of the Affordable Care Act, her daughter was able to obtain insurance coverage for just \$50 a month.

Another constituent from my State, Ben Irwin, revealed to CNN that the Affordable Care Act allowed him to take his dream job at a small firm that didn't provide health insurance. Because of the ACA, Ben was able to get private insurance at an affordable cost. Without the ACA, he would have been forced to work at a larger company just to have access to affordable health care.

Ben's story is not unique. I heard from countless entrepreneurs that the Affordable Care Act ended job lock and has enabled them to start their own businesses and pursue careers and dreams they otherwise would not be able to pursue.

I heard from a constituent in Saline, MI, who contacted my office to say that the ACA provided her with the coverage she needed to fight her son's aggressive cancer. This same woman later discovered during her first appointment, after gaining her own ACA coverage, that she, too, had cancer. The ACA gave her and her son the coverage they needed to fight their cancer without fear of being kicked off of their insurance plan.

I have also heard from a father in Traverse City, MI. He contacted my office to say that the expanded health coverage under the ACA literally saved his son's life. Before the ACA, his son only had access to emergency room care. His father often wondered: Why is it that I had to wait until my son tried to kill himself before I could get help? Now, due to the ACA, this father and his son have the health coverage they need to appropriately treat his son's mental illness.

These stories are just a fraction of the thousands upon thousands of stories my staff and I have heard about how the ACA has positively impacted people's lives.

I am asking my colleagues to just take a moment and think about the individuals they will be hurting. We are talking about mothers and fathers, children, seniors, and even our Nation's veterans.

As a former lieutenant commander in the U.S. Navy Reserve, I understand the tremendous sacrifice our men and women in uniform undertake to defend our freedom. I believe we have a duty to honor their service to the best of our ability, both during and after service.

Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, hundreds of thousands of uninsured veterans have gained insurance coverage. Between 2013 and 2015, when key provisions of the Affordable Care Act were implemented, such as the Medicaid expansion and the private exchange, the number of uninsured veterans decreased by 42 percent. Uninsured rates for spouses of veterans and their dependents have decreased as

well. These veterans represent a small fraction of the individuals this fast-track process will hurt.

I have proposed an amendment that will simply require Republicans to show us their plan for providing these veterans the health care benefits they deserve before they vote to repeal the ACA and take it away. Every American deserves to know what will happen to their health benefits before Republicans vote to take them away. Please, just show us your plan.

But our Nation's veterans, who have risked their lives and health to keep us safe, should have the right of knowing how Republicans will ensure that veterans who gained health care coverage following enactment of the ACA do not lose their coverage.

The damage of repealing the ACA stretches beyond affected individuals and families. It will disrupt hospitals and businesses and create tremendous economic uncertainty.

Hospitals in my State, especially rural facilities, are absolutely terrified about what the ACA repeal means for them and their ability to stay open and to serve patients in their community. Executives from two hospitals in the rural Upper Peninsula of Michigan have told my office about how coverage expansions under ACA have allowed many critical access hospitals in Michigan's rural communities to afford their operations for the first time ever. If the ACA is repealed, they tell me that these critical access hospitals will be forced to close—forcing residents in rural communities to drive over 2 hours to seek hospital care.

A recent report by the Urban Institute predicts that if the ACA is repealed without replacement, uncompensated care costs sought from hospitals and doctors will reach \$1.7 trillion over the next 10 years. This will bankrupt many of our Nation's hospitals, killing jobs, and severely limiting access for their patients. We can and must do better.

We owe the American people a better health care system and not a bigger deficit. Unfortunately, that is exactly what we are going to be getting under repeal. This budget resolution before us would increase annual deficits by upwards of \$1 trillion. It will add more than \$9 trillion to the Federal debt over 10 years, leaving our entire economy on shaky ground, while ripping health care from millions of Americans.

In their rush to repeal the ACA and fulfill years of campaign promises, I am concerned my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have not fully considered the far-reaching ramifications their actions might have. They have refused to slow this process down and fully think through the actions they are about to take.

A University of Michigan study published in the *New England Journal of Medicine* just last week found that Medicaid expansion in my State alone generates at least 30,000 jobs every

year. In addition, a recent study by the nonpartisan and independent Commonwealth Fund found that the ACA repeal could lead to significant economic disruption and substantial job losses in every State, including over 100,000 private sector jobs in Michigan and 2.6 million jobs around our Nation.

By any and all means, the level of uncertainty repealing the ACA will create is bad business practice, and I assure my colleagues that it is very bad for business. We owe it to our constituents to do our homework, to govern with facts, and to be informed.

Republicans have refused to listen to health care experts who tell them that enacting a repeal of the ACA will cause insurance premiums to skyrocket. Republicans have refused to listen to economists when they tell them this will spike our national debt and lead to substantial job losses. Republicans have refused to listen when the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has told them that repealing the Affordable Care Act will cause millions of Americans to lose their health coverage. And Republicans have refused to listen when actuaries state that the ACA repeal will weaken Medicare and increase drug costs for seniors.

Republicans have refused to listen when Democrats have simply asked them to slow down, come to the table, and work in a bipartisan way to find solutions to make the health care system work even better. Instead, Republicans have opted to move full steam ahead with this process that will certainly make America sick again.

Why move forward with this fast-track process to repeal the Affordable Care Act? Why repeal all of the great things that Americans appreciate about the Affordable Care Act instead of just making it better?

Republicans are trying to take us backwards. They are moving ahead with a dangerous process that will hurt working-class Americans, hurt seniors, and hurt our Nation's most vulnerable, while providing a huge payout for wealthy Americans and special interests.

Republicans are voting to give billions in tax breaks to corporations and the wealthy and raising taxes on the rest of us.

The nonpartisan Tax Policy Center estimates that the top 1 percent of earners would get an average tax cut of about \$33,000 and individuals in the top one-tenth of 1 percent would get an average tax cut of about \$197,000. If you are not in this group of American earners, then tough luck. This legislation will not help you.

We need to get serious, put politics aside, and do what is best for the American people. This fast track repeal of the Affordable Care Act is not the answer.

I stand ready and willing to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make our Nation's health care system better. We cannot simply repeal this law and leave the American people with another empty IOU.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BEARS EARS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on December 28, 2016, President Obama designated the Bears Ears National Monument in Southern Utah, and I wish to commend him on protecting these important lands. This designation is an important step forward in the conservation of some of southern Utah's important national treasures.

The 1.35-million acre monument, which spans from forested mesas to redrock canyons and plateaus, will protect the region's abundant cultural resources, including well-preserved cliff dwellings, rock and art panels, artifacts, and Native American burials.

The Bears Ears National Monument, which derives its name from twin buttes that lie at the heart of the majestic Cedar Mesa, was requested by a coalition of five Native American tribes that united to protect a landscape revered in their shared histories and cultures. The Hopi Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, and the Ute Indian Tribe have all passed through the area at some time, leaving behind scores of fragile dwellings, pottery, petroglyphs, and pictographs. The Bears Ears region is a living natural and cultural landscape, where the people of these tribes still use the lands to collect herbs and medicines and pass their stories to the next generation.

I have fought to protect this area's resources through the America's Red Rock Wilderness Act, a bill I have introduced every Congress since 1997. My bill would safeguard 9.2 million acres of wilderness in Utah—some of the last great wild places in the lower 48 States.

Historically, national monuments have been the first step in protecting some of our most beloved public lands—the Grand Canyon, the Grand Tetons, and indeed, four of Utah's five national parks. Not only do these monuments help preserve precious habitat, landscapes, and history, they create jobs and invigorate nearby communities.

President Obama's decision to protect the Bears Ears came after significant public input in Utah, with the administration holding multiple listening sessions. Those sessions made clear that even diverse stakeholders agreed the Bears Ears is special and needs to be protected. It is the right decision for the present, and it is the right decision for the future.

Republican President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Antiquities Act into law in 1906, and a review of its history and its controversy showed that, time and again, the temporary anger over designated lands was overshadowed by the long-term benefits to our Nation. Teddy Roosevelt said it best, "Of all the questions which can come before this nation, short of the actual preservation of its existence in a great war, there is none which compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us."

I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating the Bears Ears National Monument and defending it and the Antiquities Act that made it possible.

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN BECOMING RANKING MEMBER OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, the Senate Judiciary Committee convenes for the first time in the 115th Congress, and we mark an historic moment in the committee's 200-year history. Last week, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN was named the committee's ranking member, the first time in American history that a woman has served in this capacity. It is striking that 352 Members have served on the committee, and only six of those—all Democrats—have been women. Three of those six women are proudly serving on this important committee today: Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and Senator HIRONO, whom we welcome back to the committee.

Senator FEINSTEIN has long been a leading voice on this committee. I have enjoyed working with her on countless issues ranging from national security to immigration reform to Supreme Court nominations. Senator FEINSTEIN has broken down barriers throughout her career, and her new role as ranking member of the Judiciary Committee is only the latest example. As the committee grapples with some of the most pressing issues facing our country, we will all be counting on Ranking Member FEINSTEIN's leadership. We should all congratulate her on this historic moment.

REMEMBERING DR. PIERS SELLERS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on December 23, 2016, the world lost a true hero.

Dr. Piers Sellers was a scientist and an astronaut, having flown three times

on the space shuttle. On his first mission, he flew aboard the Space Shuttle Atlantis to the International Space Station, where he completed nearly 20 hours of space walks outfitting and assembling the orbiting outpost.

Several years later, following the tragic loss of the Space Shuttle Columbia, Piers returned to space and to the International Space Station aboard Discovery, carrying out the second of two test flights NASA needed to test critical on-orbit inspection and repair procedures resulting from the Columbia accident investigation.

On his third and final mission, he once more flew aboard Atlantis to the ISS. On this mission, he served as the robotics officer, again playing a key role in assembling and outfitting the space station.

His career as an astronaut exploring the frontier of space is by itself sufficient to justify Piers' status as a national hero; yet his service as an astronaut and explorer is a small subset of the contributions Piers made to our country and to our entire civilization.

Piers was a renowned climate scientist, specializing in using computer modeling and space-based observations to understand and predict the dynamics of our changing planet. He was also a brilliant communicator, whether testifying at a Commerce Committee field hearing in Miami about the impending dangers of sea level rise or standing in front of NASA's "hyperwall" video system narrating stunning and informative visualizations of the massive data sets that embody the "vital signs" of planet Earth. Countless policymakers, industry leaders, and even other scientists owe much of their understanding of the complex interactions of Earth's systems and of the alarming and undeniable signs that our civilization's carbon emissions are warming the planet to Piers.

Yet Piers' most heroic deed may be the decision he made shortly after being diagnosed with stage IV pancreatic cancer. He simply decided to keep going to work. To those that knew Piers, this was no surprise. A three-time shuttle astronaut and very capable manager, scientist, and engineer, Piers no doubt had many lucrative offers for employment following his final shuttle flight in 2010. Instead he chose to remain a civil servant scientist at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center because he felt that was where he could contribute most to the future of our home planet. A few years later, when Piers received the devastating news that he had not long to live, he chose to spend his remaining time continuing his work at NASA and communicating climate science to the public in the calm and charming manner that was uniquely his.

In a short video Piers recorded shortly before his death, despite his body having been ravaged by cancer and surely knowing that he had very little time left, he appeared as cheerful and hopeful as ever. In the video, he said

“to reach a safer future, we will need the resources of everybody here. The scientists, the policy makers, and the industrialists, all working together towards a common goal. And that goal is a planet that can continue to support life, including all of us.”

These words are even more powerful knowing that they came from a man who contributed the most precious resource available to him—the small number of days he had remaining in his life—toward the common goal he speaks of.

We would do well to follow the advice of Piers and to follow his heroic example.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 302. An act to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

H.R. 304. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services.

H.R. 309. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with a complex metabolic or autoimmune disease, a disease resulting from insulin deficiency or insulin resistance, or complications caused by such a disease, and for other purposes.

H.R. 315. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to distribute maternity care health professionals to health professional shortage areas identified as in need of maternity care health services.

H.R. 353. An act to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 302. An act to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 304. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 309. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with a complex metabolic or autoimmune disease, a disease resulting from insulin deficiency or insulin resistance, or complications caused by such a disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 315. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to distribute maternity

care health professionals to health professional shortage areas identified as in need of maternity care health services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-273. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Propiconazole; Extension of Pesticide Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions” (FRL No. 9956-54) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-274. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Methyl Isobutyrate and Isobutyl Isobutyrate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 9955-82) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-275. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Isobutyl acetate and isobutyric acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 9950-40) received during adjournment of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-276. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Butanedioic acid, 2-methylene-, telomer with sodium phosphinate (1:1), acidified, potassium salts; Tolerance Exemption” (FRL No. 9954-53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-277. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Acequinocyl; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9956-85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-278. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Tetraconazole; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9955-74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-279. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal years 2006 through 2010 Air Force Operations and Maintenance funds, and was assigned case number 12-01; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-280. A communication from the Executive Secretary, Board of Actuaries, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the 2016 Report of the Department of Defense (DoD) Board of Actuaries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-281. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Commerce Control List: Updates Based on the 2015 and 2016 Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) Plenary Meetings; Conforming Changes and Corrections to Certain Nuclear Nonproliferation (NP) Controls” (RIN0694-AH20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-282. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Alaska; Subsistence Collections” (RIN1024-AE28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 30, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-283. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “State of Kentucky Underground Injection Control (UIC) Class II Program; Withdrawal of Primacy Approval” (FRL No. 9925747-OW) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-284. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “State of Kentucky Underground Injection Control (UIC) Class II Program; Primacy Approval” (FRL No. 9957-48-OW) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-285. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extension of Deadline for Action on the November 2016 Section 126 Petition From Maryland” (FRL No. 9957-29-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-286. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extension of Deadline for Action on the November 2016 Section 126 Petition From Delaware” (FRL No. 9957-28-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-287. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Clean Water Act Methods Update Rule for the Analysis of Effluent” (FRL No. 9957-24-OW) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-288. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, South Coast Air Quality Management District” (FRL No. 9955-94-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in

the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-289. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of California Air Plan Revisions, Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District” (FRL No. 9955-62-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-290. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality and Nonattainment New Source Review; Infrastructure State Implementation Plan Requirements” (FRL No. 9957-08-Region 2) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-291. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS” (FRL No. 9957-16-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-292. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; KY; RACM Determination for the KY Portion of the Louisville Area 1997 Annual PM_{2.5}” (FRL No. 9957-39-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-293. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Volatile Organic Compounds Definition” (FRL No. 9955-89-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-294. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Procedures for Testing and Monitoring Sources of Air Pollutants” (FRL No. 9957-52-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-295. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to National Emission Standards for Radon Emissions from Operating Mill Tailings” (FRL No. 9957-54-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-296. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revision to the Near-road NO₂ Min-

imum Monitoring Requirements” ((RIN2060-AS71) (FRL No. 9957-78-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-297. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Partial Approval and Partial Disapproval of Attainment Plan for the Idaho Portion of the Logan, Utah/Idaho PM_{2.5} Non-attainment Area” (FRL No. 9957-16-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-298. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties, Issuance of Compliance or Corrective Action Orders, and the Revocation/Termination or Suspension of Permits; Procedures for Decisionmaking” (FRL No. 9956-53-OARM) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-299. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of Arizona Air Plan Revisions; Ajo and Morenci, Arizona; Second 10-Year Sulfur Dioxide Maintenance Plans and Technical Corrections” (FRL No. 9957-64-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-300. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Clean Air Act Infrastructure State and Federal Implementation Plans” (FRL No. 9957-27-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-301. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Louisiana; State Boards” (FRL No. 9956-45-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-302. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Redesignation of the Cleveland, Ohio Area to Attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard” (FRL No. 9957-80-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 28, 2016; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-303. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Uniform National Discharge Standards for Vessels of the Armed Forces—Phase II Batch One” ((RIN2040-AD39) (FRL No. 9957-85-OW)) received in the Office of the

President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-304. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to the Guideline on Air Quality Models: Enhancements to the AERMOD Dispersion Modeling System and Incorporation of Approaches to Address Ozone and Fine Particulate Matter” ((RIN2060-AS54) (FRL No. 9956-23-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-305. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants” ((RIN2040-AS90) (FRL No. 9958-01-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-306. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Determination of Nonattainment and Reclassification of the Houston-Galveston-Brazoria 2008 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area; Texas; Correction” (FRL No. 9957-57-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-307. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Electronic Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements for New Source Performance Standards” ((RIN2060-AP63) (FRL No. 9957-67-OAR)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-308. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Chemical Substances When Manufactured or Processed as Nanoscale Materials; TSCA Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements” ((RIN2070-AJ54) (FRL No. 9957-81)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-309. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Control of Air Pollution from Visible Emissions and Particulate Matter” (FRL No. 9956-55-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-310. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard” (FRL No. 9957-93-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-311. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; TN Infrastructure

Requirements for the 2010 NO₂ NAAQS” (FRL No. 9957–90–Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-312. A communication from the Legal Counsel, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, received in the office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-313. A communication from the Deputy Director, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “340B Drug Pricing Program Ceiling Price and Manufacturer Civil Monetary Penalties Regulation” (RIN0906-AA89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-314. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Education Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-315. A communication from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Financial Report for the Office of Government Ethics for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-316. A communication from the Senior Manager, Equal Opportunity Compliance, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Authority’s fiscal year 2015 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-317. A communication from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Board’s fiscal year 2016 Performance and Accountability Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-318. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to recommendations for improvements to the Congressional Accountability Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-319. A communication from the Vice President (Acting) for Congressional and Public Affairs, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation’s Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-320. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report on the Continuing Need for Authorized Bankruptcy Judgeships”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-321. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revision of Import and Export Requirements for Controlled Substances, Listed Chemicals, and Tableting and Encapsulating Machines, Including Changes To Implement the International Trade Data System (ITDS); Revision of Reporting Requirements for Domestic Transactions in Listed Chemicals and Tableting and Encapsulating Machines; and Technical Amendments” ((RIN1117-AB41)

(Docket No. DEA-403)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-322. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of Furanyl Fentanyl Into Schedule I” (Docket No. DEA-448) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-323. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of a New Drug Code for Marijuana Extract” ((RIN1117-AB33) (Docket No. DEA-342)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-324. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of U-47700 Into Schedule I” (Docket No. DEA-440) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-325. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to violations of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal year 2007 Operations and Maintenance, Army, and was assigned case number 16-05; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-326. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Addition of Certain Persons and Revisions to Entries on the Entity List; and Removal of a Person from the Entity List” (RIN0694-AH23) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-327. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Community Reinvestment Act Regulations” (RIN7100-AE64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-328. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Burma: Amendment of the Export Administration Regulations Consistent with an Executive Order that Terminated U.S. Government’s Sanctions” (RIN0694-AH18) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-329. A communication from the Chairwoman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s fiscal year 2016 Agency Financial Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-330. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-537, “Access to Emergency Epinephrine in Schools Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2016”; to the Com-

mittee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-331. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-538, “Kennedy Street, N.W., Economic Development and Small Business Revitalization Advisory Committee Establishment Act of 2016”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-332. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-539, “Commission on Climate Change and Resiliency Establishment Act of 2016”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-333. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-540, “Substance Abuse and Opioid Overdose Prevention Amendment Act of 2016”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-334. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-541, “Driver’s License Fair Access and Equality Amendment Act of 2016”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-335. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-542, “Statute of Limitations Clarifying Amendment Act of 2016”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-336. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-543, “Electronic Cigarette Parity Amendment Act of 2016”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-337. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-544, “Fiscal Year 2017 Budget Support Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2016”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-338. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-545, “Prohibition Against Selling Tobacco Products to Individuals Under 21 Amendment Act of 2016”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-339. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-546, “Department of Motor Vehicles Reform Amendment Act of 2016”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-340. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-547, “International Registration Plan Amendment Act of 2016”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-341. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-548, “Sporting Events Tobacco Products Restriction Amendment Act of 2016”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-342. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-549, “Improving Access to Identity Documents Amendment Act of

2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-343. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-552, "Enhanced Penalties for Distracted Driving Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-344. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-553, "Rent Control Hardship Petition Limitation Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-345. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-554, "Commemorative Flag Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-346. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-555, "Adult Protective Services Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-347. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-556, "Vacant Property Enforcement Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-348. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-557, "Feminine Hygiene and Diaper Sales Tax Exemption Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-349. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-558, "Charitable Solicitations Relief Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-350. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-559, "Department of Motor Vehicles Extension of Deadlines Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-351. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-560, "Food, Environmental, and Economic Development in the District of Columbia Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-352. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-561, "Extension of Time to Dispose of the Stevens School Temporary Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-353. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-562, "Revised Wage Theft Prevention Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-354. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-563, "Public School Nurse Assignment Temporary Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-355. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-564, "Automatic Voter Registration Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-356. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-565, "Medical Marijuana Omnibus Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-357. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-566, "Residential Lease Clarification Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-358. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-567, "Relocation Expenses Recoupment and Lien Authority Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-359. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-568, "Strengthening Youth Services and Rehabilitation Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-360. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-569, "Specialty License Plate Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-361. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-570, "Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs Community Partnership Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-362. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-571, "Student Loan Ombudsman Establishment and Servicing Regulation Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-363. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-577, "Death with Dignity Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-364. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-578, "Sale of Synthetic Drugs Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-365. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-579, "Georgia Avenue Retail Priority Area Temporary Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-366. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-580, "Foster Parents Statement of Rights and Responsibilities Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-367. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Colum-

bia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-581, "Protecting Students Digital Privacy Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-368. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-582, "Planning Actively for Comprehensive Education Facilities Amendment Act of 2016"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-369. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Fair Opportunity Complaints on GSA Contracts" (RIN3090-AJ79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-370. A communication from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the gift of a Learning Center and other physical improvements for the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Museum in Grand Rapids, Michigan; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-371. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules of Practice and Procedure" (RIN3064-AE52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-372. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Availability of Information Under the Freedom of Information Act" (RIN1557-AE12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-373. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Receiverships for Uninsured National Banks" (RIN1557-AE07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-374. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist of the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Industrial and Commercial Metals" (RIN1557-AD93) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-375. A communication from the Paralegal, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform" (RIN2132-AB28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-376. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule

entitled “Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform” (RIN2125-AF68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 4, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-377. A communication from the Administrator of the Specialty Crops Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to Inspection Application Requirements” (Docket No. AMS-SC-16-0063) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-378. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “DoD Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Program” (RIN0790-AI24) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-379. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Department of Defense Personnel Security Program Regulation” (RIN0790-AJ55) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2017; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-380. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Compressors” (RIN1904-AD43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-381. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps” (RIN1904-AD71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-382. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Fossil Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve for calendar year 2014; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-383. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Medical Malpractice: Evidence on Reform Alternatives and Claims Involving Elderly Patients”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-384. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendments To Streamline Importation of Distilled Spirits, Wine, Beer, Malt Beverages, Tobacco Products, Processes Tobacco, and Cigarette Papers and Tubes and Facilitate Use of the International Trade Data System” (RIN1513-AC15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 6, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-385. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of the

Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report to Congress: Improving Medicare Post-Acute Care Transformation (IMPACT) Act of 2014 Strategic Plan for Accessing Race and Ethnicity Data”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-386. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “2017 Section 1274A CPI Adjustments” (Rev. Rul. 2016-30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-387. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Syndicated Conservation Easement Transactions” (Notice 2017-10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-388. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Section 831(b) Micro-Captive Transactions” (Notice 2017-08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-389. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Maintaining certification as a certified professional employer organization” (Rev. Proc. 2017-14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-390. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Updated FFI Agreement” (Rev. Proc. 2017-16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-391. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Qualified Intermediary Agreement” (Rev. Proc. 2017-15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-392. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revenue Procedure 2017-14” (Rev. Proc. 2017-14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-393. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revenue Procedure 2017-5” (Rev. Proc. 2017-5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-394. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revenue Procedure 2017-3” (Rev. Proc. 2017-3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-395. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the

Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Definitions and Reporting Requirements for Shareholders of Passive Foreign Investment Companies” ((RIN1545-BK66) (TD 9806)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 5, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-396. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulations Regarding Withholding of Tax on Certain U.S. Source Income Paid to Foreign Persons, Information Reporting and Backup Withholding on Payments Made to Certain U.S. Persons, and Portfolio Interest Treatment” ((RIN1545-BL17 and RIN1545-BN74) (TD 9808)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-397. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulations Relating to Information Reporting by Foreign Financial Institutions and Withholding on Certain Payments to Foreign Financial Institutions and Other Foreign Entities” ((RIN1545-BL72 and RIN1545-BN79) (TD 9809)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. CAPITO:

S. 76. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional new markets tax credits for distressed coal communities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 77. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to repeal the forfeiture rule for peanuts under the nonrecourse marketing assistance loan program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 78. A bill to provide for reimbursement for the use of modern travel services by Federal employees traveling on official Government business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 79. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to identify security vulnerabilities of certain entities in the energy sector; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 80. A bill to protect the right of individuals to bear arms at water resources development projects; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 81. A bill to establish an advisory office within the Bureau of Consumer Protection of the Federal Trade Commission to prevent fraud targeting seniors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 82. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 83. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to support entrepreneurial programs for women; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 84. A bill to provide for an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 85. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 86. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to modify the termination date for the Veterans' Choice Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BLUNT, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 87. A bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 88. A bill to ensure appropriate spectrum planning and interagency coordination to support the Internet of Things; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 89. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to exempt old vessels that only operate within inland waterways from the fire-retardant materials requirement if the owners of such vessels make annual structural alterations to at least 10 percent of the areas of the vessels that are not constructed of fire-retardant materials and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 90. A bill to survey the gradient boundary along the Red River in the States of Oklahoma and Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 91. A bill 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, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 92. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to allow for the per-

sonal importation of safe and affordable drugs from approved pharmacies in Canada; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 93. A bill to allow women greater access to safe and effective contraception; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COTTON, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. Res. 9. A resolution honoring in praise and remembrance the extraordinary life, steady leadership, and remarkable, 70-year reign of King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 10. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the trafficking of illicit fentanyl into the United States from Mexico and China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. BROWN):

S. Res. 11. A resolution encouraging the development of best business practices to fully utilize the potential of the United States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 17

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 17, a bill to ensure the Government Accountability Office has adequate access to information.

S. 27

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 27, a bill to establish an independent commission to examine and report on the facts regarding the extent of Russian official and unofficial cyber operations and other attempts to interfere in the 2016 United States national election, and for other purposes.

S. 36

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 36, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for extensions of detention of certain aliens ordered removed, and for other purposes.

S. 53

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 53, a bill to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and

Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 63

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 63, a bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 74

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 74, a bill to improve the ability of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Coast Guard, and coastal States to sustain healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems by maintaining and sustaining their capabilities relating to oil spill preparedness, prevention, response, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 6, a resolution objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 and to all efforts that undermine direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians for a secure and peaceful settlement.

AMENDMENT NO. 2

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 9

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 9 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 17

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 17 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 19

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr.

NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 19 proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 26

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 26 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 27

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 27 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 28

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 28 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 29

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 29 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 30

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 30 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 31

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 31 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate bud-

etary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 32

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 32 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 33

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 33 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 34

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 34 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 35

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 35 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 36

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 36 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 37

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 37 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017

and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 49

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 49 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 54

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 54 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 82. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am reintroducing the Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act with Senator BLUMENTHAL. This legislation would end special tax exemptions for huge CEO bonuses by closing a glaring loophole that allows publicly traded corporations to deduct the cost of multimillion-dollar bonuses from their corporate tax bills. If executives perform, companies may compensate them however they wish, but U.S. taxpayers shouldn't have to subsidize these massive bonuses.

Under current tax law, when a publicly traded corporation calculates its taxable income, it is generally permitted to deduct the cost of compensation from its revenues, with limits up to \$1 million for some of the firm's most senior executives. However, a loophole relating to performance-based compensation has allowed many public corporations to avoid such limits and freely deduct excessive executive compensation. To illustrate how this loophole works, if a CEO receives \$1 million in cash compensation and \$14 million in performance-based compensation in a given year, the public corporation's taxable income would decline by \$15 million. With the current corporate tax rate at 35 percent, the corporation in this case would receive a tax giveaway of \$5.25 million.

The Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act puts an

end to that giveaway and limits public corporations to a single \$1 million per employee deduction as was originally intended. Using the same example above, a profitable public corporation could deduct \$1 million of the CEO's \$15 million compensation package but could not claim a deduction on the remaining \$14 million. So instead of claiming \$5.25 million in Federal subsidies for the CEO's pay, this public corporation will be contributing \$4.9 million toward improving our roads, our schools, and our military—costs that middle-class families are already underwriting.

Indeed, over a 10-year window, the Joint Committee on Taxation, in their most recent assessment, estimated that closing this loophole would save U.S. taxpayers over \$50 billion.

Specifically, our legislation first applies section 162(m) of the Tax Code to all employees of publicly traded corporations so that all compensation is subject to a deductibility cap of \$1 million. Publicly traded corporations would still be permitted to pay their executives as much as they desire, but compensation above and beyond \$1 million would no longer be subsidized by other hard-working taxpayers through our Tax Code.

Second, our bill removes the exemption for performance-based compensation, which currently permits compensation deductions above and beyond \$1 million when executives have met performance benchmarks set by the corporation's board of directors. As a result, publicly traded corporations would still be able to incentivize their executives, but all such incentives would be subject to a corporate deductibility cap of \$1 million.

Finally, our legislation makes a technical correction to ensure that all publicly traded corporations that are required to provide quarterly and annual reports to their investors under Securities and Exchange Commission rules and regulations are subject to section 162(m). Currently, this section of the Tax Code only covers some publicly traded corporations who are required to provide these periodic reports to their shareholders. Discouraging extravagant compensation packages shouldn't turn on whether a publicly traded corporation falls into one SEC reporting requirement or another, and our bill closes this technical loophole.

Even our President-elect has acknowledged the problem of excessive CEO pay. When asked about this issue on CBS's "Face the Nation" on September 13, 2015, then-Presidential Candidate Trump said, "Well, it does bug me. It's very hard if you have a free enterprise system to do anything about that. The boards of companies are supposed to do it. But I know companies very well. And the CEO puts in all his friends. And so you will take a company like, I could say Macy's or many other companies, where they put in their friends as head of the company, and they get whatever they want, be-

cause the friends love sitting on the board. So that's a system that we have. And it's a shame and it's disgraceful. And, sometimes, the boards rule. But I would say it's probably less than 10 percent. And you see these guys making these enormous amounts of money. It's a total and complete joke."

Our legislation tackles this issue head on by ending the public subsidy of excessive CEO compensation, derailing the lavish tax breaks that exclusively benefit public corporations. This is simply a matter of fairness, ensuring that corporations—and not hard-working taxpayers who face their own challenges in this economy—are paying for the multimillion-dollar bonuses they have decided to dole out to their CEOs.

We need to prioritize tax breaks that grow our economy and strengthen the middle class. This bill would eliminate some of the inequity in the Tax Code. Again, companies are free to pay their executives as much as they want, but the American taxpayer shouldn't help foot the bill for a CEO's multimillion-dollar bonus.

I thank Public Citizen, Americans for Financial Reform, the AFL-CIO, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and MIT professor Simon Johnson for their support. I also want to thank Senator BLUMENTHAL for working with me on this issue, and I urge our colleagues to join us in cosponsoring this legislation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 90. A bill to survey the gradient boundary along the Red River in the States of Oklahoma and Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 90

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Red River Gradient Boundary Survey Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **AFFECTED AREA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term "affected area" means land along the approximately 116-mile stretch of the Red River, from its confluence with the north fork of the Red River on the West to the 98th meridian on the east.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term "affected area" does not include the portion of the Red River within the boundary depicted on the survey prepared by the Bureau of Land Management entitled "Township 5 South, Range 14 West, of the Indian Meridian, Oklahoma, Dependent Resurvey and Survey" and dated February 28, 2006.

(2) **GRADIENT BOUNDARY SURVEY METHOD.**—The term "gradient boundary survey method" means the measurement technique used to locate the South Bank boundary line in accordance with the methodology established in *Oklahoma v. Texas*, 261 U.S. 340 (1923) (recognizing that the boundary line

along the Red River is subject to change due to erosion and accretion).

(3) **LANDOWNER.**—The term "landowner" means any individual, group, association, corporation, federally recognized Indian tribe or member of such an Indian tribe, or other private or governmental legal entity that owns an interest in land in the affected area.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(5) **SOUTH BANK.**—The term "South Bank" means the water-washed and relatively permanent elevation or acclivity (commonly known as a "cut bank") along the southerly or right side of the Red River that—

(A) separates the bed of that river from the adjacent upland, whether valley or hill; and

(B) usually serves, as specified in the fifth paragraph of *Oklahoma v. Texas*, 261 U.S. 340 (1923)—

(i) to confine the waters within the bed; and

(ii) to preserve the course of the river.

(6) **SOUTH BANK BOUNDARY LINE.**—The term "South Bank boundary line" means the boundary, with respect to title and ownership, between the States of Oklahoma and Texas identified through the gradient boundary survey method that does not impact or alter the permanent political boundary line between the States along the Red River, as outlined under article II, section B of the Red River Boundary Compact enacted by the States and consented to by Congress pursuant to Public Law 106-288 (114 Stat. 919).

SEC. 3. SURVEY OF SOUTH BANK BOUNDARY LINE.

(a) **SURVEY REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall commission a survey to identify the South Bank boundary line in the affected area.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The survey shall—

(A) adhere to the gradient boundary survey method;

(B) span the length of the affected area;

(C) be conducted by surveyors that are—

(i) licensed and qualified to conduct official gradient boundary surveys; and

(ii) selected jointly by and operating under the direction of—

(I) the Texas General Land Office, in consultation with each affected federally recognized Indian tribe; and

(II) the Oklahoma Commissioners of the Land Office, in consultation with the attorney general of the State of Oklahoma and each affected federally recognized Indian tribe; and

(D) be completed not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **APPROVAL.**—

(1) **STATE APPROVAL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the survey under subsection (a)(1) is completed, the Secretary shall submit the survey for approval to—

(i) the Texas General Land Office, in consultation with each affected federally recognized Indian tribe; and

(ii) the Oklahoma Commissioners of the Land Office, in consultation with the attorney general of the State of Oklahoma and each affected federally recognized Indian tribe.

(B) **TIMING OF APPROVAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of receipt of the survey under subparagraph (A), the Texas General Land Office, in consultation with each affected federally recognized Indian tribe, and the Oklahoma Commissioners of the Land Office, in consultation with the attorney general of the State of Oklahoma and each affected federally recognized Indian tribe, shall determine whether to approve the survey.

(C) SURVEYS OF INDIVIDUAL PARCELS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Surveys of individual parcels in the affected area shall be conducted in accordance with this section.

(ii) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL.—A survey of an individual parcel conducted under clause (i) shall be approved or disapproved, on an individual basis, by the Texas General Land Office, in consultation with each affected federally recognized Indian tribe, and the Oklahoma Commissioners of the Land Office, in consultation with the attorney general of the State of Oklahoma and each affected federally recognized Indian tribe, by not later than 60 days after the date of receipt of the survey.

(2) NO FEDERAL APPROVAL REQUIRED.—The survey conducted under subsection (a)(1), and any survey of an individual parcel described in paragraph (1)(C), shall not be submitted to the Secretary for approval.

(c) NOTICES.—

(1) SECRETARY.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which a survey for an individual parcel is approved by the Texas General Land Office and the Oklahoma Commissioners of the Land Office, in consultation with the attorney general of the State of Oklahoma, under subsection (b)(1)(C), the heads of those offices shall submit to the Secretary—

(A) a notice of the approval of the survey; and

(B) a copy of—

(i) the survey; and

(ii) any field notes relating to the individual parcel.

(2) ADJACENT LANDOWNERS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary receives a notice relating to an individual parcel under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall provide to each landowner of land adjacent to the individual parcel—

(A) a notice of the approval of the survey; and

(B) a copy of—

(i) the survey; and

(ii) any field notes relating to the individual parcel.

SEC. 4. EFFECT OF ACT.

Nothing in this Act—

(1) modifies any interest of the State of Oklahoma or Texas, or the sovereignty, property, or trust rights of any federally recognized Indian tribe, relating to land located north of the South Bank boundary line, as established by the survey;

(2) modifies any land patented under the Act of December 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 1069, chapter 47; 43 U.S.C. 1068) (commonly known as the “Color of Title Act”), before the date of enactment of this Act;

(3) modifies or supersedes the Red River Boundary Compact enacted by the States of Oklahoma and Texas and consented to by Congress pursuant to Public Law 106-288 (114 Stat. 919);

(4) creates or reinstates any Indian reservation or any portion of such a reservation; or

(5) alters any valid right of the State of Oklahoma or the Kiowa, Comanche, or Apache Indian tribes to the mineral interest trust fund established under the Act of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740, chapter 572).

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this Act \$1,000,000.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 9—HONORING IN PRAISE AND REMEMBRANCE THE EXTRAORDINARY LIFE, STEADY LEADERSHIP, AND REMARKABLE, 70-YEAR REIGN OF KING BHUMIBOL ADULYADEJ OF THAILAND

Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COTTON, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. GARDNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 9

Whereas His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej enjoyed a special relationship with the United States, having been born in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1927 while his father was completing his medical studies at Harvard University;

Whereas King Bhumibol Adulyadej ascended to the throne on June 9, 1946, and celebrated his 70th year as King of Thailand in 2016;

Whereas, at the time of his death, King Bhumibol Adulyadej was the longest-serving head of state in the world and the longest-reigning monarch in the history of Thailand;

Whereas His Majesty dedicated his life to the well-being of the Thai people and the sustainable development of Thailand;

Whereas His Majesty led by example and virtue with the interest of the people at heart, earning His Majesty the deep reverence of the Thai people and the respect of people around the world;

Whereas His Majesty reached out to the poorest and most vulnerable people of Thailand, regardless of their status, ethnicity, or religion, listened to their problems, and empowered them to take their lives into their own hands;

Whereas, in 2006, His Majesty received the first United Nations Human Development Award, recognizing him as the “Development King” for the extraordinary contribution of His Majesty to human development;

Whereas His Majesty was recognized internationally in the areas of intellectual property, innovation, and creativity, and in 2009, the World Intellectual Property Organization presented His Majesty with the Global Leadership Award;

Whereas His Majesty was an anchor of peace and stability for Thailand during the turbulent decades of the Cold War;

Whereas His Majesty was always a trusted friend of the United States in advancing a strong and enduring alliance and partnership between the United States and Thailand;

Whereas His Majesty addressed a joint session of Congress on June 29, 1960, during which His Majesty reaffirmed the strong friendship and goodwill between the United States and Thailand;

Whereas the United States and Thailand remain strong security allies, as memorialized in the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (commonly known as the “Manila Pact of 1954”) and later expanded under the Thanat-Rusk Communique of 1962;

Whereas, for decades, Thailand has hosted the annual Cobra Gold military exercises, the largest multilateral exercises in Asia, to improve regional defense cooperation;

Whereas Thailand has allowed the Armed Forces of the United States to use the Utapao Air Base to coordinate international humanitarian relief efforts;

Whereas President George W. Bush designated Thailand as a major non-NATO ally on December 30, 2003;

Whereas close cooperation and mutual sacrifices in the face of common threats have bound the United States and Thailand together and established a firm foundation for the advancement of a mutually beneficial relationship; and

Whereas, on October 13, 2016, at the age of 88, His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej passed away, leaving behind a lasting legacy for Thailand: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the extraordinary life, steady leadership, and remarkable, 70-year reign of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej of Thailand;

(2) extends our deepest sympathies to the members of the Royal Family and to the people of Thailand in their bereavement;

(3) celebrates the alliance and friendship between Thailand and the United States that reflects common interests, a 183-year diplomatic history, and a multifaceted partnership that has contributed to peace, stability, and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region;

(4) congratulates His Majesty King Maha Vajiralongkorn on his accession to the throne; and

(5) building on the strong foundation of alliance nurtured during the reign of the father of His Majesty King Maha Vajiralongkorn, looks forward to deepening the bonds of friendship between Thailand and the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 10—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE TRAFFICKING OF ILLICIT FENTANYL INTO THE UNITED STATES FROM MEXICO AND CHINA

Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 10

Whereas the United States continues to experience a prescription opioid and heroin overdose epidemic that claimed almost 30,000 lives in 2014;

Whereas fentanyl is a synthetic opioid and the euphoric effects of fentanyl are sometimes indistinguishable from the euphoric effects of heroin or morphine;

Whereas the effect of fentanyl can be up to 50 times stronger than heroin and 100 times stronger than morphine;

Whereas although pharmaceutical fentanyl can be diverted for misuse, most fentanyl deaths are believed to be linked to illicitly manufactured fentanyl and illicit versions of chemically similar compounds known as fentanyl analogs (collectively referred to in this preamble as “illicit fentanyl”);

Whereas illicit fentanyl is potentially lethal even if only a very small quantity is ingested or inhaled;

Whereas across the United States, illicit fentanyl use and related deaths are rising at alarming rates;

Whereas illicit fentanyl is cheaper to manufacture than heroin and the sale of illicit fentanyl is highly profitable for drug dealers;

Whereas illicit fentanyl is sold for its heroin-like effects and illicit fentanyl is often mixed with heroin, cocaine, or methamphetamine as a combination product, with or without the knowledge of the user;

Whereas illicit fentanyl is often produced to physically resemble other opioid pain medicines, such as oxycodone, which sell for high amounts on the street;

Whereas drug users often overdose on illicit fentanyl because users are unaware that they are ingesting illicit fentanyl and do not

anticipate the toxicity and potential lethality of illicit fentanyl;

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, between 2013 and 2014, the death rate from overdoses caused by synthetic opioids, including illicit fentanyl and synthetic opioid pain relievers other than methadone, increased 80 percent;

Whereas, in 2015, the Drug Enforcement Administration (referred to in this preamble as the “DEA”) issued a National Drug Threat Assessment Summary, which found that Mexican transnational criminal organizations are—

(1) one of the greatest criminal drug threats to the United States; and

(2) poly-drug organizations that use established transportation routes and distribution networks to traffic heroin, methamphetamine, cocaine, and marijuana throughout the United States;

Whereas, in 2016, the DEA issued a National Heroin Threat Assessment Summary, which found that “starting in late 2013, several states reported spikes in overdose deaths due to fentanyl and its analog acetyl-fentanyl”;

Whereas the 2016 National Heroin Threat Assessment Summary found that—

(1) Mexican drug traffickers are expanding their operations to gain a larger share of eastern United States heroin markets; and

(2) the availability of heroin is increasing throughout the United States;

Whereas between 2013 and 2014, there were more than 700 fentanyl-related deaths in the United States;

Whereas the number of deaths attributable to illicit fentanyl may be significantly underreported because—

(1) coroners and medical examiners do not test, or lack the resources to test, routinely for fentanyl;

(2) crime laboratories lack the resources to test routinely for fentanyl; and

(3) illicit fentanyl deaths may erroneously be attributed to heroin;

Whereas, in March 2015, the DEA issued a nationwide alert on illicit fentanyl as a threat to health and public safety;

Whereas illicit fentanyl has the potential to endanger public health workers, first responders, and law enforcement personnel who may unwittingly come into contact with illicit fentanyl by accidentally inhaling airborne powder;

Whereas, according to the DEA—

(1) Mexico is the primary source for illicit fentanyl trafficked into the United States; and

(2) distributors in China are the source of the fentanyl analogs and the precursor chemicals to manufacture fentanyl analogs that are found in Mexico and Canada;

Whereas fentanyl produced illicitly in Mexico is—

(1) smuggled across the southwest border of the United States, or delivered through mail and express consignment couriers; and

(2) often mixed with heroin or diluents in the United States and then distributed in the same United States markets in which white powder heroin is distributed; and

Whereas United States law enforcement officials have recently seen—

(1) an influx of illicit fentanyl into the United States directly from China;

(2) shipments of the equipment to manufacture illicit fentanyl, such as pill presses; and

(3) some illicit fentanyl products being smuggled into the United States across the northern border with Canada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the use of illicit fentanyl in the United States and the resulting overdose deaths are a public health crisis;

(2) the trafficking of illicit fentanyl into the United States, especially the trafficking of illicit fentanyl by transnational criminal organizations, is a problem that requires close cooperation between the United States Government and the Governments of Mexico and China;

(3) the United States Government and the Governments of Mexico and China have a shared interest in, and responsibility for, stopping the production of illicit fentanyl and its trafficking into the United States;

(4) the United States should—

(A) support efforts by the Governments of Mexico and China to stop the production of illicit fentanyl and its trafficking into the United States; and

(B) take further measures to reduce and prevent heroin and fentanyl consumption through—

(i) enhanced enforcement to reduce the illegal supply; and

(ii) increased use of evidence-based prevention, treatment, and recovery services; and

(5) the United States Government, including the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, should use the broad diplomatic and law enforcement resources of the United States, in partnership with the Governments of Mexico and China, to stop the production of illicit fentanyl and its trafficking into the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 11—ENCOURAGING THE DEVELOPMENT OF BEST BUSINESS PRACTICES TO FULLY UTILIZE THE POTENTIAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. BROWN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 11

Whereas the Rooney Rule, formulated by Daniel Rooney, chairman of the Pittsburgh Steelers football team in the National Football League (referred to in this preamble as the “NFL”), requires each NFL team with a job opening for a coach or general manager position to interview at least 1 minority candidate for that position;

Whereas the Rooney Rule has been successful in increasing minority representation in higher leadership positions in professional football, as shown by the fact that, in the 80 years between the hiring of Fritz Pollard as coach of the Akron Pros and the implementation of the Rooney Rule in 2003, only 7 minority head coaches were hired but, since 2003, 15 minority head coaches have been hired;

Whereas the Rooney Rule has demonstrated that once highly qualified and highly skilled diversity candidates are given exposure during the hiring process, the abilities of those diversity candidates can be better utilized;

Whereas the RLJ Rule, formulated by Robert L. Johnson, founder of Black Entertainment Television (commonly known as “BET”) and The RLJ Companies, and based on the Rooney Rule from the NFL, similarly encourages companies to voluntarily establish a best practices policy to identify minority candidates and minority vendors by implementing a plan to interview—

(1) not fewer than 2 qualified minority candidates for each managerial opening at the director level and above; and

(2) not fewer than 2 qualified minority-owned businesses before approving a vendor contract;

Whereas, according to Crist-Kolder Associates, as cited in the Wall Street Journal, at the top 668 companies in the United States, less than 10 percent of Chief Financial Officers are African-American, Hispanic, or of Asian descent;

Whereas underrepresented groups contain members with the necessary abilities, experience, and qualifications for any position available;

Whereas business practices such as the Rooney Rule or the RLJ Rule are neither employment quotas nor Federal law but rather voluntary initiatives instituted by willing entities to provide the human resources necessary to ensure success;

Whereas experience has shown that people of all genders, colors, and physical abilities can achieve excellence;

Whereas the increased involvement of underrepresented workers would improve the economy of the United States and the experience of the people of the United States; and

Whereas ensuring the increased exposure, and resulting increased advancement, of diverse and qualified candidates would result in gains by all people of the United States through stronger economic opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate encourages each corporate, academic, and social entity, regardless of size or field of operation, to—

(1) develop an internal rule modeled after a successful business practice, such as the Rooney Rule or RLJ Rule, and, in accordance with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), adapt that rule to specifications that will best fit the procedures of the individual entity; and

(2) institute the individualized rule described in paragraph (1) to ensure that the entity will always consider candidates from underrepresented populations before making a final decision with respect to selecting a business vendor or filling a leadership position.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 56. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 57. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 58. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 59. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 60. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 61. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 62. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 63. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KING, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 64. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BENNET, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 65. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 66. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 67. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 68. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 69. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 70. Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 71. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 72. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 73. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 74. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 75. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 76. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 77. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 78. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 79. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 80. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 81. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 82. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 83. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 84. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 85. Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 86. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARPER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KING, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 87. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KAINE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KING, Mr. NELSON, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 88. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 89. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 90. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 91. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 92. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 93. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. CARPER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 94. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 95. Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 96. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 97. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 98. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 99. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 100. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 101. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 102. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 103. Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 104. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 105. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 106. Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 107. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 108. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 109. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 110. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 56. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. **DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRESERVING AND EXTENDING MATERNAL, INFANT, AND CHILD HEALTH THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preserving and extending maternal, infant, and child health through the Department of Health and Human Services by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 57. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. **DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to maintaining, preserving, sustaining, and expanding the National Health Service Corps program, which may include increasing the number of clinicians fulfilling a service obligation in exchange for scholarship or loan repayment, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 58. Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the

appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. **DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO COVERAGE OF CERTAIN FALL PREVENTION SERVICES UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring coverage of certain fall prevention services under the Medicare program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 59. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. **DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER HEALTH CARE COVERAGE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the provision of health care for mental health and substance use disorders by ensuring that such care is included as essential health benefits and providing Federal parity protections for mental health and substance use disorders by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 60. Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 _____. **POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REDUCE HEALTH INSURANCE ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY FOR INDIVIDUALS BASED ON THEIR OCCUPATION.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment report that would reduce health insurance access and affordability for individuals based on their occupation, unless legislation is enacted to provide comparable benefits and protections for such individuals.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate

only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 61. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 _____. **POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD MAKE PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AND CHRONIC CONDITIONS SICK AGAIN.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) limit, reduce, or eliminate access to care for anyone with a pre-existing condition, such as a disability or chronic condition, as provided under section 2704 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-3), as amended by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148);

(2) place a lifetime or annual cap on health insurance coverage for an individual with a disability or a chronic condition, as provided under section 2711 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-11), as amended by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; or

(3) allow a health plan or a provider to discriminate on the basis of an applicant's physical health, mental health, or disability status to increase the cost of care, provide for fewer benefits, or in any way decrease access to health care as afforded under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 62. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 _____. **POINT OF ORDER AGAINST AN INCREASE IN THE DEFICIT.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution reported pursuant to section 2001 or 2002, or an amendment to, motion on, conference report on, or amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit, as calculated under subsection (b), in any of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

(b) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and shall be calculated without regard to any adjustment made under section 3001 or 3002.

(c) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 63. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KING, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REDUCE ACCESS TO SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND RECOVERY SERVICES AND WORSEN THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce the expansion of access to substance use disorder prevention, treatment, and recovery services established through the expansion of the Medicaid program under section XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) and the consumer protections in the health insurance market, including protections for individuals with pre-existing conditions, the establishment of mental health and substance use disorder services as essential health benefits, the requirement that preventive services such as substance use disorder screenings be covered without cost-sharing at the point of service, and the expansion of mental health parity and addiction equity law to cover health plans in the individual market, and in so doing, worsen the opioid epidemic.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 64. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms.

HEITKAMP, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BENNET, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD FINANCIALLY HARM RURAL HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS BY REDUCING THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN RURAL COMMUNITIES WITH ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report if the Congressional Budget Office has determined that it would—

(1) cause an increase in the rate of uninsured individuals and families in rural communities by an amount sufficient to substantially weaken the financial viability of rural hospitals (including small hospitals), clinics (including community health centers), or other health care providers; or

(2) reduce Federal funds upon which rural hospitals and community health centers rely.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 65. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REDUCE BLACK LUNG BENEFITS FOR MINERS DISABLED BY BLACK LUNG DISEASE AND THEIR SURVIVORS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would eliminate or weaken the amendments to the Black Lung Benefits Act (30 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) made by section 1556 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), which—

(1) require the presumption of total disability or death caused by pneumoconiosis for coal miners who worked for at least 15 years in underground mining and who suffer or suffered from a totally disabling respiratory impairment; and

(2) provide automatic entitlement for eligible survivors of miners who were themselves entitled to receive benefits as a result of a lifetime claim.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 66. Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CUTTING LONG-TERM SERVICES AND SUPPORTS FOR SENIORS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cut long term services and supports for seniors, including nursing home care and home and community-based care, under the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 67. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ELIMINATE OR REDUCE ACCESS TO PREVENTIVE SERVICES THAT ARE CURRENTLY OFFERED WITHOUT COPAYMENT OR COST-SHARING UNDER THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would eliminate or reduce access to preventive services that are currently offered without copayment or cost-sharing under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), including blood pressure screening, colorectal screening, breast cancer screening, cervical cancer screening, and domestic and interpersonal violence screening and counseling.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 68. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ELIMINATE OR REDUCE THE CONSUMER PROTECTIONS PROVIDED BY THE PATIENT'S BILL OF RIGHTS UNDER THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would eliminate or reduce the consumer protections provided by the Patient's Bill of Rights under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), including the ban on health plans discriminating against adults and children with pre-existing conditions, dropping coverage, limiting coverage under a health plan, limiting choice of doctors, or restricting emergency room care; the guarantee of a health plan enrollee's right to appeal; coverage of young adults under their parents' health plans; and coverage under a health plan of preventive care with no cost.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 69. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT REDUCES ACCESS TO, OR RESULTS IN THE CLOSING OF, RURAL HOSPITALS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that reduces Medicare or private health insurance payments under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to rural hospitals that could lead to a reduction in health care services provided or the closure of a rural or critical access hospital.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 70. Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PHYSICIAN AND NURSE SHORTAGES IN RURAL AND UNDERSERVED AREAS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that reduces access to primary medical care, dental, and mental health services in areas designated as Health Professional Shortage Areas or Medically Underserved Areas or Populations, including the repeal of provisions in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that—

(1) expand the number of National Health Service Corps providers trained to provide health care services in shortage areas through the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program; or

(2) encourage provider training specifically in rural areas.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 71. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. . . . SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT MEDICAID IS ONE OF OUR NATION'S MOST IMPORTANT POVERTY-REDUCING PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) In 2015, more than 60,000,000 Americans relied on Medicaid for comprehensive, affordable health care coverage.

(2) According to the Journal of Health Economics, in 2010, Medicaid helped to keep at least 2,600,000 Americans, including adults with disabilities, the elderly, children, and racial and ethnic minorities, out of poverty.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Medicaid is one of our Nation's most important poverty-reducing programs; and

(2) the Medicaid expansion under the Affordable Care Act has expanded coverage to millions of Americans, which not only ensures that more people have access to quality, affordable health care, but improves Americans' financial security.

SA 72. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary

levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REDUCE COVERAGE FOR CHILDREN WITH AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDERS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce coverage for children with Autism Spectrum Disorders by—

(1) block granting or imposing per capita caps on State Medicaid programs; and

(2) repealing the financial assistance available to families to purchase coverage on the health insurance marketplace created under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 73. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . . . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT STATE MEDICAID PROGRAMS' PAYMENT POLICIES ARE ALIGNED WITH THEIR PERIODICITY SCHEDULES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that the payment policies of State Medicaid programs are aligned with the periodicity schedules of such programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 74. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCING CHILDREN'S ACCESS TO THE EARLY AND PERIODIC SCREENING, DIAGNOSTIC, AND TREATMENT BENEFIT UNDER THE MEDICAID PROGRAM.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce children's

access to the Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment benefit under the Medicaid program by block granting or imposing per capita caps on State Medicaid programs.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 75. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST DECREASING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE BY IMPOSING UNREASONABLE WORK REQUIREMENTS ON MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would decrease access to health care by imposing unreasonable work requirements on Medicaid beneficiaries, especially those beneficiaries struggling with mental health conditions, substance abuse issues, and homelessness.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 76. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST HARMING HOSPITALS AND CLINICS BY REPEALING THE MEDICAID EXPANSION AND THE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE OFFERED ON THE HEALTH INSURANCE MARKETPLACE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would harm hospitals and clinics, particularly those in underserved areas, by repealing or cutting Federal financial assistance for the Medicaid expansion and for the financial assistance offered on the health insurance marketplace.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall

be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 77. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING PREMIUM COSTS ON THE HEALTH INSURANCE MARKETPLACE BY REPEALING THE MEDICAID EXPANSION UNDER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase premium costs on the health insurance marketplace by repealing the Medicaid expansion under the Affordable Care Act which has lowered premiums costs on the health insurance marketplace by 7 percent in States that have expanded Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 78. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN CHILD TRAUMA PREVENTION, SCREENING, AND SUPPORT SERVICES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding for Federal investments in the prevention, screening, and support (including treatment) for children and youth who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma, which may include the early identification, screening, and expeditious referral to appropriate support services (including treatment) of children and youth, or the implementation of trauma-informed training, workforce capacity, and interventions by appropriate providers and in settings that may come into contact with children and youth who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legisla-

tion would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 79. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING STEADY, PREDICTABLE GROWTH FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting at least 5 percent real growth (above inflation) to medical research conducted by each of the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Defense Health Program, and the Medical and Prosthetics Research Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 80. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD RESULT IN A REDUCTION OF FUNDING FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH AGENCIES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would result in a reduction of funding for the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Defense Health Program, or the Medical and Prosthetics Research Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 81. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S.

Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. DON'T MAKE YOUNG PEOPLE SICK AGAIN.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would make young people sick again.

(b) LEGISLATION THAT MAKES YOUNG PEOPLE SICK AGAIN.—For the purposes of subsection (a), the term “would make young people sick again” with respect to legislation refers to any provision of a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, that would—

(1) reduce the number of young Americans enrolled in public or private health insurance coverage, as determined based on the March 2016 updated baseline budget projections by the Congressional Budget Office;

(2) weaken dependent coverage of children to continue until the child turns 26 years of age as afforded to them under Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148);

(3) weaken access to care by increasing premiums or total out of pocket costs for young Americans with private insurance.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 82. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. DON'T MAKE WOMEN SICK AGAIN.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that makes women sick again by eliminating or reducing access to women's health care, including decreases in access to, or coverage of, reproductive health care services including contraceptive counseling, birth control, and maternity care, and primary and preventive health care as afforded to them under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148).

(b) LEGISLATION THAT MAKES WOMEN SICK AGAIN.—For the purposes of subsection (a), the term “makes women sick again” with respect to legislation refers to any provision of a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, that would—

(1) allow insurance companies to discriminate against women by—

(A) charging women higher premiums for health care based on their gender;

(B) allowing pregnancy to be used as a pre-existing condition by which to deny women coverage;

(C) permitting discrimination against providers who provide reproductive health care benefits or services to women; or

(D) otherwise discriminating against women based on their gender;

(2) reduce the number of women enrolled in health insurance coverage, as certified by the Congressional Budget Office; or

(3) eliminate, or reduce the scope or scale of, the benefits women would have received pursuant to the requirements under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) and the amendments made to that title.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 83. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ELIMINATING OR REDUCING FEDERAL FUNDING TO STATES UNDER THE MEDICAID EXPANSION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would eliminate or reduce funding to States available under law in effect on the date of the adoption of this section to provide comprehensive, affordable health care to low-income Americans by eliminating or reducing the availability of Federal financial assistance to States available under section 1905(y)(1) or 1905(z)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(y)(1), 1396d(z)(2)) or other means, unless the Director of the Congressional Budget Office certifies that the legislation would not—

(1) increase the number of uninsured Americans;

(2) decrease Medicaid enrollment in States that have opted to expand eligibility for medical assistance under that program for low-income, non-elderly individuals under the eligibility option established by the Affordable Care Act under section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII));

(3) reduce the likelihood that any State that, as of the date of the adoption of this section, has not opted to expand Medicaid under the eligibility option established by

the Affordable Care Act under section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII)) would opt to use that eligibility option to expand eligibility for medical assistance under that program for low-income, non-elderly individuals; and

(4) increase the State share of Medicaid spending under that eligibility option.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 84. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REMOVING THE MEDICAID IMD EXCLUSION AND INCREASING FUNDING FOR FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN MENTAL HEALTH AND SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER TREATMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding for Federal investments in mental health and substance use disorder treatment, including for the Medicaid expansion population, and which may include allowing Federal funding for services provided under State Medicaid plans to treat individuals with substance use disorders in institutions for mental diseases, notwithstanding the limitation of subdivision (B) following paragraph (29) of section 1905(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(a)), or supporting workforce and infrastructure capacity to treat individuals suffering from mental illness or substance use disorders, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 85. Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD WORSEN THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC BY REDUCING ACCESS TO MEDICATION ASSISTED TREATMENT FOR SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill,

joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce access to medication assisted treatment for substance use disorders, including opioid addiction, by making changes to the policies enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act unless the Congressional Budget Office certifies that such changes would not—

(1) reduce or limit Federal funding for medical assistance provided by States to low-income, non-elderly individuals under the Medicaid eligibility option established by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act under section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII)) or result in fewer individuals receiving such assistance under such option (including the 1,600,000 Americans with substance use disorders who currently receive such assistance and were uninsured prior to the establishment of such option);

(2) reduce the expansion of coverage resulting from the individual market consumer protections of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, including protections for individuals with pre-existing conditions, the establishment of behavioral health as an essential health benefit, the expansion of mental health parity and addiction equity law to the individual market, and coverage of preventive services without cost-sharing;

(3) reduce the number of Americans enrolled in public or private health insurance coverage, as determined based on the March 2016 updated baseline budget projections by the Congressional Budget Office;

(4) increase health insurance premiums or out-of-pocket costs for Americans with private health insurance coverage; or

(5) reduce the scope and scale of benefits covered by private health insurance plans pursuant to the requirements of title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the amendments made by that title.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 86. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARPER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KING, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:
SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD UNDERMINE ACCESS TO COMPREHENSIVE, AFFORDABLE HEALTH COVERAGE FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that makes changes to the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. et seq.), the Children's Health Insurance Program under title XXI (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.), or Federal re-

quirements for private health insurance coverage unless the Congressional Budget Office certifies that such changes would not result in lower coverage rates, reduced benefits, or decreased affordability for children receiving coverage through the Medicaid Program, the Children's Health Insurance Program, or the private insurance markets established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 87. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. Kaine, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KING, Mr. NELSON, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:
SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE FOR VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing health care access for veterans, which may include legislation that authorizes the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain major medical facility leases of the Department of Veterans Affairs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 88. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:
SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION AFFECTING MEDICARE HOSPITAL INSURANCE SOLVENCY.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or joint resolution reported pursuant to section 2001 or 2002, or an amendment to, motion on, conference report on, or amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution that—

(1) reduces the actuarial balance by at least 0.01 percent of the present value of future taxable payroll of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund established under section 1817(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i(a)) for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to sec-

tion 1817(b)) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i(b)); or

(2) would cause a decrease in Medicare Federal Hospital Insurance surpluses or an increase in Medicare Federal Hospital Insurance deficits relative to the levels set forth in the applicable resolution for the first fiscal year or for the total of that fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years for which allocations are provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)).

(b) **MEDICARE LEVELS.**—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), Medicare Federal Hospital Insurance surpluses equal the excess of Federal Hospital Insurance income over Federal Hospital Insurance outlays in a fiscal year or years with such an excess and Federal Hospital Insurance deficits equal the excess of Federal Hospital Insurance outlays over Federal Hospital Insurance income in a fiscal year or years with such an excess.

(c) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 89. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:
SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD RESULT IN A REDUCTION OF THE COVERAGE OF OBESITY REDUCTION COUNSELING UNDER MEDICAID OR PRIVATE INSURANCE PLANS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would result in a reduction in the coverage of obesity reduction counseling services under the Medicaid program or private insurance plans.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 90. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:
SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD RESULT IN A REDUCTION IN TOBACCO CESSATION COVERAGE UNDER MEDICAID OR PRIVATE INSURANCE PLANS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Tobacco use is the leading cause of preventable deaths in the United States.

(2) Each year, tobacco use leads to \$170,000,000,000 in healthcare spending on illness caused by tobacco use and \$150,000,000,000 in lost productivity.

(3) Tobacco use is more than twice as common among the overall Medicaid population (including individuals covered under the Medicaid expansion added by the Affordable Care Act) than among individuals with private insurance coverage.

(4) The Affordable Care Act—

(A) requires that State Medicaid plans cover tobacco cessation services for pregnant women and individuals covered under the Medicaid expansion with no cost-sharing;

(B) requires that private health insurance plans cover tobacco cessation products and services without cost-sharing; and

(C) prohibits the exclusion of tobacco cessation drugs from coverage under Medicaid.

(5) Expanded coverage for tobacco cessation leads to better health outcomes and lower health costs.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would result in a reduction in the coverage of items and services related to the cessation of tobacco under the Medicaid program or private insurance plans.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (b) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

SA 91. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CHANGES TO THE ACA.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that make changes to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act without obtaining a budget score by the Congressional Budget Office (based on annual projections, a 10-year projection, and a 30-year projection) that includes the estimated effect of the legislation on the number of uninsured individuals (broken down by economic subgroup and State), the effect of such legislation on average premiums (broken down by marketplace and employer sponsored insurance), and the effect of such legislation on uncompensated care costs (broken down by State, projected for both providers and State government spending).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 92. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN LEGISLATION RELATING TO MEDICAL CARE.

(a) COST ESTIMATE.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would make changes to the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act unless a cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office is made available to the Senate prior to consideration of such legislation that includes the estimated effect of such legislation on both current and future Medicare beneficiary out-of-pocket expenses, including premiums and cost-sharing, over the next 30 years.

(b) BENEFICIARY OUT-OF-POCKET EXPENSES.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase Medicare beneficiary out-of-pocket expenses under the Medicare program, including premiums and cost-sharing, as determined by the Congressional Budget Office in the cost estimate described in subsection (a) with respect to such legislation.

SA 93. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. CARPER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REDUCE AMERICANS' ACCESS TO HIGH QUALITY MATERNITY CARE COVERAGE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that, according to the Congressional Budget Office, would reduce the number of Americans with insurance coverage of maternity care and childbirth as afforded in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 94. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCING OR ELIMINATING ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH CARE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that the Director of the Congressional Budget Office determines would reduce access to mental health care and services or reduce the number of individuals with mental illness enrolled in insurance coverage, relative to the Congressional Budget Office's March 2016 updated baseline, by means such as—

(1) eliminating or reducing Federal financial assistance currently available to States under section 1905(y)(1) or 1905(z)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(y)(1), 1396d(z)(2)) or otherwise eliminating or reducing mental health protections established by the Affordable Care Act, including the addition of mental health services to the list of services covered under section 1937(b)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u-7(b)(5)); or

(2) reducing the affordability of coverage established by the Affordable Care Act's consumer protections, including—

(A) the expansion of mental health parity and addiction equity law to individual health insurance coverage;

(B) the prohibition on discriminating against enrollees with pre-existing conditions such as mental illness;

(C) coverage of preventive services like depression screenings without cost-sharing; and

(D) the establishment of mental health services as an essential health benefit.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 95. Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PENALIZE STATES FOR IMPROVING CONTINUITY BETWEEN CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH SYSTEMS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would penalize States for improving the continuity of care between the criminal justice and public health systems, including by ensuring that individuals who are enrolled in a State Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) have their enrollment in such program suspended, but not terminated, in the event that they are incarcerated, or by providing for the automatic

enrollment of eligible individuals in a State Medicaid program upon their release from incarceration.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 96. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE THE MEDICARE PART B PREMIUM.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase the Medicare part B premium for Medicare beneficiaries, as determined by the Congressional Budget Office.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 97. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING DRUG PRICING TRANSPARENCY FOR CONSUMERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving drug pricing transparency for consumers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 98. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary

levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT FAILS TO ENSURE THE SAME PATIENT BILL OF RIGHTS THAT CONSUMERS HAVE TODAY.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would fail to ensure that consumers have the same patient bill of rights as they have on the date of such consideration. Such patient bill of rights includes the rights of consumers under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (111-148) to—

- (1) appeal health plan decisions;
- (2) maintain health coverage without fear of an arbitrary rescission by their insurance company;
- (3) choose a doctor;
- (4) fair treatment of emergency care;
- (5) health insurance coverage without annual or lifetime limits on essential health benefits; and
- (6) enhanced access to preventive services.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 99. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT INCREASES UNCOMPENSATED CARE COSTS FOR HOSPITALS.

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase uncompensated care costs for hospitals.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 100. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY CHANGES TO MEDICARE, MEDICAID, OR THE PREMIUM TAX CREDITS PROVIDED BY THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT THAT WOULD WEAKEN AND REDUCE INVESTMENTS IN HEALTH CARE DELIVERY SYSTEM REFORMS THAT IMPROVE PATIENT HEALTH AND REDUCE COSTS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Affordable Care Act is moving the health care system of the United States from a fee-for-service system that frequently incentivizes the overutilization of health care services and wasteful health care spending to a value- and performance-based health care system that promotes patient-centered and team-based care to keep Americans as healthy as possible, improve health outcomes, and lower health care costs.

(2) Because of the investments in health care delivery system reforms made by the Affordable Care Act, a third of Medicare payments to health care providers are now based on the overall quality of patient care and health outcomes achieved by such providers.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would change the Medicare program, the Medicaid program, or the premium tax credits provided by the Affordable Care Act in a manner that would result in hospitals, health care centers, and physicians and other health care providers reducing their investments in health care delivery system reforms that improve patient health outcomes and reduce costs.

(c) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (b) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

SA 101. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT THE TOP 15 PERCENT SICKEST MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES WITH CHRONIC CONDITIONS HAVE ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACCOUNTABLE CARE ORGANIZATIONS OR OTHER INNOVATIVE MEDICARE PILOT PROGRAMS, INCLUDING PATIENT-CENTERED MEDICAL HOMES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that the top 15 percent sickest Medicare beneficiaries with chronic conditions have access to Medicare accountable care organizations or other innovative Medicare pilot programs, including patient-centered medical homes, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through

2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 102. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT REDUCES PRICE TRANSPARENCY FOR CONSUMERS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that removes price transparency of health care services or price comparisons that enable consumers to have greater knowledge in making health care decisions, including requirements set forth by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 103. Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 . . . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AUTHORIZING CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR HEALTH CARE UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO RETAIN SUCH ELIGIBILITY UNTIL AGE 26.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting children who are eligible to receive health care furnished under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, including by allowing such children to retain such eligibility until age 26, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2017 through 2026.

SA 104. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary

levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD WEAKEN THE ABILITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO DIRECTLY FURNISH HEALTH CARE TO VETERANS.

It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that authorizes funding for non-Department of Veterans Affairs-provided care, funded by the Department of Veterans Affairs, which would reduce the availability of services directly provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, including primary health care, mental health care, rural health care, and prosthetic care.

SA 105. Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD EXTEND THE CHOICE PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS WITHOUT ADDRESSING PROBLEMS WITH THE THIRD PARTY ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM.

It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that extends the sunset date of the Choice Program under section 101 of the Veterans, Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146; 38 U.S.C. 1701 note) unless the Secretary of Veterans Affairs certifies that problems relating to the third party administration of the program have been addressed or the legislation extending the sunset includes provisions addressing such problems.

SA 106. Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 45, line 15, strike “January 27” and insert “March 3”.

SA 107. Mr. HEINRICH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT TAXES THE HEALTH BENEFITS OF HARD-WORKING AMERICANS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that directly or indirectly taxes the health benefits of hard-working Americans.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 108. Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CUTTING FEDERAL FUNDING TO MEDICAID EXPANSION STATES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce the Federal funding received by States for the provision of medical assistance under State Medicaid programs under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) to low-income, non-elderly individuals under the eligibility option established by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act under section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII)).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 109. Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ELIMINATING OR REDUCING FEDERAL PAYMENTS RECEIVED BY AN INDIAN HEALTH PROGRAM OR BY AN URBAN INDIAN ORGANIZATION UNDER MEDICAID FOR SERVICES PROVIDED TO INDIANS AND ALASKAN NATIVES WHO ARE ELIGIBLE FOR BENEFITS UNDER THAT PROGRAM.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment,

amendment between the Houses, or conference report that the Director of the Congressional Budget Office determines would eliminate or reduce, relative to the Congressional Budget Office's March 2016 updated baseline, Federal payments received by an Indian health program or by an urban Indian organization under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) for services provided to Indians and Alaskan Natives who are eligible for benefits under such title.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

SA 110. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST THE SALE OF FEDERAL LAND TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEFICIT.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide for the sale of any Federal land (other than as part of a program that acquires land that is of comparable value or contains exceptional resources or that is conducted under the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act (43 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.)) that uses the proceeds of the sale to reduce the Federal deficit.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I have five requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 10, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland

Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 10, 2017, at 3:30 p.m.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 10, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in room SR-325 of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Attorney General Nomination."

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 10, 2017, at 1 p.m. in room SD-106 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on January 10, 2017, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, "Backpage.com's Knowing Facilitation of Online Sex Trafficking."

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that Matthew Taylor, a congressional fellow in Senator COCHRAN's office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 115th Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mara Greenberg, a detailee on the Senate Judiciary Committee, and Zachary Blau, a fellow on the Senate Judiciary Committee, be granted Senate floor privileges for the duration of the 115th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Elizabeth Joseph, a health policy fellow in Senator COCHRAN's office be granted floor privileges through July 31, 2017.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY,
JANUARY 11, 2017**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Wednesday, January 11; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 3, with 3 hours of debate remaining on

the resolution for the majority and 3 hours for the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator BROWN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of the quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, skyrocketing drug prices are crippling far too many American families. The Kaiser Family Foundation found that nearly 8 in 10 Americans believe the cost of their prescription drugs is too high and that Congress should work to lower the price of medication that people need.

This should be our top health priority for 2017, lowering drug costs for families, not taking health care away from Americans with no plan to replace it. Think about that. This Congress is hell-bent on, instead of attacking one of the major causes of health care inflation—and we have done a good job the last 10 years, by and large, of keeping prices from going much higher than they would have otherwise. Keep that in mind while we hear the generally specious arguments against the Affordable Care Act. Instead of doing that, the majority party has fallen all over itself to try to take away health insurance from 900,000 people in my State; taking away from 1 million seniors the Medicare consumer protections and Medicare services of preventive care, such as osteoporosis screening, diabetes screening, physicals, all that the doctors order; taking away from 100,000 young people the ability to stay on their parents' health care plan; and stripping from virtually all Ohio citizens the consumer protections of denying people coverage because of previous conditions, cutting people off their insurance policy because they happen to get too sick and might have cost the insurance companies too much money.

This health care coverage that has saved 24,000 American lives each year since 2014, just think what could happen if we took away their health care coverage.

Instead, lowering drug prices should be something we can come together on.

Americans of all political parties and Americans who don't even bother voting are all facing skyrocketing pharmacy bills. There are concrete actions we can take right now to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

Senator FRANKEN and I led 18 of our colleagues in outlining 5 of them in a letter to the President-elect in December, including putting an end to abusive price gouging, requiring more transparency from drug companies, boosting competition and innovation in the market, and allowing the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate better prices for seniors. That is what we do with the Veterans' Administration. The VA, on behalf of 7 million veterans, negotiates directly with the drug companies to get a significantly better price for the cost of drugs—saves taxpayers, saves veterans. Medicare should do the same thing.

Senator KLOBUCHAR and I worked with several colleagues to reintroduce the Medicare Prescription Drug Price Negotiation Act. Negotiating better prices for seniors will save significant taxpayer dollars.

Instead of focusing on the priorities that the vast majority of Americans agree on, Congress and President-Elect Trump are working to throw 30 million Americans and some 900,000 Ohioans off their health insurance with no plans to replace it. It is reckless and dangerous. It will cause premiums to skyrocket. It will cause costs to go up for everyone. Do you know what it does? It gives a \$30 billion tax break to drugs companies and tens of billions of dollars in tax cuts to the richest Americans.

On the one hand, Congress will not do anything about drug prices because the pharmaceutical industry, frankly, gave too much money to far too many of my colleagues. On the other hand, this same Congress is going to strip away health care and consumer protections to seniors on Medicare and people of all

ages and at the same time give a tax break to the drug companies. We must fight against these attempts to decrease coverage and increase costs for working families.

Whether you support the Affordable Care Act or not, we all agree you can't ask people to change horses midstream without giving them a second horse.

Last week, I spoke with one of my constituents, Kathy, who wrote to my office last November with the heart-breaking story of her husband Lee. He is fighting stage IV cancer. Before 2010, insurance companies denied Kathy and her family the family coverage she needed because her husband's cancer was a preexisting condition. Thankfully, the Affordable Care Act stopped insurance companies from abusive practices like this. It allowed Kathy's family to buy health insurance through the marketplace, helping them afford the care he needs to fight this devastating disease. Still, like so many Ohio families, Kathy continues to struggle to afford the prescription medicines she and her husband need. She fears what will happen when a family like hers is simply kicked off their insurance.

Imagine 900,000 Ohioans with insurance and, like that—because of partisan politics here, because so many of my colleagues ran for President, in some cases, or ran for the Senate or ran for the House by saying they are going to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, and they are going to get rid of it and not replace it for a couple of years maybe.

Governor Kasich, Republican Governor in my State—also in the Presidential race with my friend in the Presiding Officer's chair—has said to the Senate and House, to Ohio's Republican Members: Don't cancel the Affordable Care Act. Don't throw people off insurance unless you are going to replace it with something right now

that will take care of those people; 700,000 people on Medicaid expansion, another 200,000 people, 26-year-olds, on their parents' plan, people on the exchanges, people getting insurance in other ways.

When I was talking to Kathy the other day, she was choked up talking about the stress and heartache dealing with a loved one with cancer, how she can't even bear the thought of adding more insurance worries on top of that. I was speaking to a hospital administrator today at one of Ohio's great hospitals. He said he thinks what this Republican Congress is going to do in the Affordable Care Act is morally reprehensible. He said: How do I explain to people right in the middle of their treatment that we can't do it anymore? Because we will not have the resources if the Affordable Care Act is repealed and the insurance is canceled and the Medicaid expansion is gone and hospitals can't take care of everybody like they are pretty much now. How do I explain to somebody right in the middle of cancer treatment, right in the middle of another kind of long-term or short-term illness that their insurance has been cut off?

Instead of kicking people off their insurance with no plan to replace it and handing billions of dollars in tax breaks to the drug companies, let us make our first priority lowering drug costs for the people whom we say we are serving.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:30 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 11, 2017, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE 2017 CONGRESS-BUNDESTAG/BUNDESRAT EXCHANGE

HON. PAUL D. RYAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since 1983, the U.S. Congress and the German Bundestag and Bundesrat have conducted an annual exchange program for staff members from both countries. The program gives professional staff the opportunity to observe and learn about each other's political institutions and interact on issues of mutual interest.

A staff delegation from the U.S. Congress will be selected to visit Germany for ten days from Friday, May 26–Sunday, June 4, 2017. During this ten day exchange, the delegation will attend meetings with Bundestag/Bundesrat Members, Bundestag and Bundesrat party staff members, and representatives of numerous political, business, academic, and media agencies.

A comparable delegation of German staff members will visit the United States for ten days Saturday, April 29–Sunday May 7, 2017. They will attend similar meetings here in Washington.

The Congress-Bundestag/Bundesrat Exchange is highly regarded in Germany and the United States, and is one of several exchange programs sponsored by public and private institutions in the United States and Germany to foster better understanding of the politics and policies of both countries. This exchange is funded by the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

The U.S. delegation should consist of experienced and accomplished Hill staff who can contribute to the success of the exchange on both sides of the Atlantic. The Bundestag reciprocates by sending senior staff professionals to the United States.

Applicants should have a demonstrable interest in events in Europe. Applicants need not be working in the field of foreign affairs, although such a background can be helpful. The composite U.S. delegation should exhibit a range of expertise in issues of mutual concern to the United States and Germany such as, but not limited to, trade, security, the environment, economic development, health care, and other social policy issues. This year's delegation should be familiar with transatlantic relations within the context of recent world events.

Please note that the U.S. participants are expected to plan and implement the meetings and program for the Bundestag/Bundesrat staff members when they visit the United States.

Participants are selected by a committee composed of personnel from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State and past participants of the exchange.

Members of the House and Senate who would like a member of their staff to apply for

participation in this year's program should direct them to submit a resume and cover letter in which they state their qualifications, the contributions they can make to a successful program and some assurances of their ability to participate during the time stated.

Applications should be sent to the Office of Interparliamentary Affairs, HC-4, the Capitol, by 5 p.m. on Tuesday, February 28, 2017.

IMPROVING ACCESS TO MATERNITY CARE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 2017

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 315, the bipartisan Improving Access to Maternity Care Act which I was pleased to introduce with Representative BURGESS.

Today, millions of expectant mothers in rural and underserved areas in our country face lengthy wait times and have to travel long distances to receive maternity care. Without adequate care, they are at increased risk for complications and their newborns are at higher risk to endure health problems. Access to maternal health care professionals including OB-GYNs and midwives is a critical component of consistent, high-quality maternal health care from conception through birth.

In my home state of California there are only 4,856 OB-GYNs according to the Pew Charitable Trust, for almost 40 million residents, a shortage which can result in dangerous health risks and long-term consequences for new mothers and their babies.

I'm proud to support H.R. 315, which takes an important first step toward meeting the growing need for maternal health care professionals across our country. By directing the collection of data about current access to maternity care, this legislation will identify the geographic regions of our country that face shortages in maternal health care professionals and will eventually result in the distribution of maternal health care professionals, including doctors and midwives to areas of the country where the full scope of their medical practice can be utilized and where they are needed most. This bill makes important progress toward ensuring that all Americans, expectant and new mothers have access to the healthcare they need and deserve.

EDWARD C. McNAMARA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Edward C. McNamara for

his many years of outstanding service with the National Ski Patrol.

The National Ski Patrol (NSP), the largest winter rescue organization, is a federally chartered nonprofit membership association dedicated to serving the public and the mountain recreation industry. For 75 years, the NSP has been on the forefront of safety and emergency care education programs.

Ed McNamara, a retired U.S. Army National Guard Colonel, has served on federal, state and local emergency medical and Homeland Security advisory committees. He is a nationally registered Paramedic and has been deployed with federal disaster medical teams responding to national emergencies.

Ed began his tenure with the NSP in 1979 when he became a patroller with the Watatic Mountain Ski Patrol in Ashby, Massachusetts. Over the years, Ed has held several leadership positions including Outdoor Emergency Care Instructor, National Outdoor Emergency Care Director and Board Chair of the National Ski Patrol. He recently received the prestigious Minnie Dole award. This award is one of NSP's most rarely given awards, which recognizes those exceptional few patrollers who exemplify the long-term dedication, devotion, and self-sacrifice of the founder of the NSP, Charles Minot "Minnie" Dole.

Ed has worked passionately over the years to improve outdoor safety care which is reflected in his exemplary contributions as Chief Editor of the Outdoor Emergency Care Manual 5th Edition. This teaching manual provides a road map for national practices and procedures for outdoor safety care.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Edward McNamara for his dedication to the continuing education and safety of the snow sport industry.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the birth of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and reflect on his life and work, we are reminded of the challenges that democracy poses to us and the delicate nature of liberty. Dr. King's life and, unfortunately, his untimely death, remind us that we must continually work to secure and protect our freedoms. In his courage to act, his willingness to meet challenges, and his ability to achieve, Dr. King embodied all that is good and true in the battle for liberty.

The spirit of Dr. King lives on in the citizens of communities throughout our nation. It lives on in the people whose actions reflect the spirit of resolve and achievement that will help move our country into the future. I am honored to rise today to recognize several individuals from Indiana's First Congressional District who

• 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.

will be recognized during the 38th Annual Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Breakfast on Saturday, January 14, 2017, at the Genesis Convention Center in Gary, Indiana. The Gary Frontiers Service Club, which was founded in 1952, sponsors this annual breakfast.

The Gary Frontiers Service Club will pay tribute to local individuals who have for decades selflessly contributed to improving the quality of life for the people of Gary. This year, Denise C. Dillard and Deacon James Holloway will be honored with the prestigious Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Drum Major Award. Additionally, several individuals will be recognized as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Marchers at this year's breakfast including Vanessa Allen Ed.D., Natalie Ammons, WD Brewer, Patricia Owens-Lee, Reverend R. Jerry Prothro, and Kerry Rice Sr. In addition, Dorothy R. Leavell, editor and publisher of *The Gary Crusader*, will be the recipient of the 2017 Gary Frontiers Gratitude Award.

Though very different in nature, the achievements of each of these individuals reflect many of the same attributes that Dr. King possessed, as well as the values he advocated. Like Dr. King, these individuals saw challenges and faced them with unwavering strength and determination. Each one of the honored guests' greatness has been found in their willingness to serve with "a heart full of grace and a soul generated by love." They set goals and work selflessly to make them a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I invite you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending these honorees, as well as the Gary Frontiers Service Club officers, President Oliver J. Gilliam, Vice President James Piggee, Recording Secretary Linnal Ford, Financial Secretary Melvin Ward, and Treasurer/Seventh District Director Floyd Donaldson, along with Clorius L. Lay, who has served as Breakfast Chairman for sixteen years, and all other members of the service club for their initiative, determination, and dedication to serving the people of Northwest Indiana.

INTRODUCING THE IRAQ AND SYRIA GENOCIDE EMERGENCY RELIEF AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2017

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce that my friend ANNA ESHOO and I today introduced the Iraq and Syria Genocide Emergency Relief and Accountability Act of 2017 (H.R. 390).

H.R. 390 would require the State Department and U.S. Agency for International Development to identify the urgent humanitarian needs of Christians and other genocide survivors from religious minority communities and to start supporting some of the entities effectively aiding them on-the-ground.

This bill is urgently needed because Christian survivors of the ISIS genocide are facing an emergency. Just before Christmas, I went to Erbil in the Kurdistan region of Iraq to meet with these survivors. They told me the United States had abandoned them. I saw first-hand how the Obama administration has failed to help them.

I was in Erbil at the personal invitation of the Chaldean Catholic Archbishop of Erbil, Bashar Warda. More than 70,000 Christians—10,500 families—who escaped from ISIS have relied on the Archdiocese of Erbil for food, shelter, and medical care to survive. Yet the Obama administration and United Nations have refused to give a single dollar to the Archdiocese to help them. They have been kept alive only because of the generosity of organizations like the Knights of Columbus and Aid to the Church in Need. However, the needs are so great that the Archdiocese is chronically in crisis mode, unsure whether it will soon run out of resources to sustain these Christians.

The winter temperatures are freezing and the risk of related illness is high. Iraq's Christian population is less than 250,000, down from up to 1.4 million in 2002, down from 500,000 in 2013 just before ISIS began targeting Christians for genocide.

Having fled ISIS, these Christians may have to flee their homelands. Perhaps they will take the little money they have left, and pay smugglers to get them to Europe. They would risk becoming prisoners of human traffickers or perishing in the Mediterranean Sea, where more than 5,000 refugees and migrants died or went missing in 2016.

For a few of these genocide survivors unable to return home, the only long-term option may be resettlement in a country like the United States as a refugee. Our legislation would create a Priority Two designation that they are of "special humanitarian concern" to the United States. The P-2 designation would ensure that they are able to get an overseas interview with the U.S. government to be considered for the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program without needing a referral from the United Nations, an NGO, or another U.S. government entity. This would not guarantee acceptance and admission and they would have to clear the same security screening as every other Iraqi and Syrian refugee before being admitted. But at least they will be considered.

The other key element of our bill focuses on accountability. It would require the U.S. government to identify and support some entities that are conducting criminal investigations, and collecting evidence, on perpetrators of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes in Iraq and Syria. This evidence is usable in future criminal trials. Until now, the State Department has been considering these crimes merely as human rights violations, rather than as crimes.

Archbishop Warda has put it clearly. "These coming months may well decide the fate of Christianity in Iraq: whether it survives and is given a chance for rebirth; or whether it perishes, existing only as a few scattered museum pieces with caretaker clergy, of interest to tourists and academics perhaps, but without the Christian people who had lived there for two-thousand years."

As the Syriac Archbishop of Mosul, who had to seek refuge in Erbil from ISIS together with his people, told me during my mission, "We pray that President Trump will help us. We are the last people to speak the Aramaic language. Without help, we are finished."

Archbishop Nicodemus had reason to be hopeful. On September 9, 2016, at the Voter Values Summit, then-candidate Trump said, "ISIS is hunting down and exterminating what it calls the Nation of the Cross. ISIS is car-

rying out a genocide against Christians in the Middle East. We cannot let this evil continue."

If our legislation moves quickly onto the floor for a vote and to President Trump for his signature, I am confident that he will sign it and ensure that it is fully implemented. The Christians of the Middle East are counting on us.

Many groups support H.R. 390, including the Knights of Columbus, Family Research Council, In Defense of Christians, 21st Century Wilberforce Initiative, Commission for International Justice and Accountability, HIAS, Aid the Church in Need USA, Open Doors, A Demand for Action, Yezidi Human Rights Organization International, Religious Freedom Institute, Christian Solidarity Worldwide, and Syrian Accountability Project, and Civitas Maxima.

It is also supported by all the former U.S. Ambassadors-at Large for War Crimes, David Scheffer (1997 through 2001), Pierre Prosper (2001 through 2005), Clint Williamson (2006 through 2009), and Stephen Rapp (2009 through 2015), as well as the Founding Chief Prosecutor of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, David Crane, the Director of the Center for Religious Freedom Nina Shea, and the author of *Defying ISIS*, Rev. Johnnie Moore.

Fifteen of our colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, are original cosponsors of H.R. 390. I call on my other colleagues to cosponsor this bill and help ensure that it gets to the new President as soon as possible so that Christian genocide survivors in Iraq and elsewhere get the help they so desperately need.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I missed roll call vote numbers 24 through 25 on the floor of the House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted yea to both bills.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during the votes held on January 10, 2017, I was inescapably detained and away handling important matters related to my District and the State of Alabama. If I had been present, I would have voted YES on the Velázquez Amendment, YES on the Clay/Waters Amendment, and YES on Final Passage of H.R. 79.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF ROBERT ROSENBAUER ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Robert "Bob" Rosenbauer, a

geochemist who joined the USGS in Menlo Park, California, in 1974. He was part of what was then known as the Branch of Pacific and Arctic Marine Geology. He soon established the USGS rock/water/gas interaction laboratory and worked on theoretical and experimental studies of submarine hydrothermal, volcanic, and geothermal systems for more than 22 years.

In 1996, Bob Rosenbauer developed a laboratory to help understand natural and human-induced stresses on the environment. His diverse research interests include the use of signature lipid biomarkers and stable isotopes to study nearshore ecosystem processes, changes in microbial diversity in marine sediment linked to contaminants, and the paleo-occurrence of hypoxia in deltaic systems.

He led efforts to assess the risk of contaminated floodwater sediment to human and ecosystem health in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and the potential environmental and human-health impacts of the mud volcano in East Java at Sidoarjo. He participated in studies on saline encroachment in the Los Angeles Basin and on hydrocarbon occurrence along the California coast and in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. He led the effort to chemically fingerprint and determine the persistence and degradation pathways of oil from recent spills in San Francisco Bay from the merchant vessel Cosco Busan and in the Gulf of Mexico from the Deepwater Horizon explosion.

Bob Rosenbauer led studies on the experimental investigation, theoretical modeling, and environmental impacts of CO₂ sequestration in geologic formations with colleagues from the national and international scientific community. He is the author or co-author of more than 100 peer-reviewed scientific publications. On September 26, 2011, Bob Rosenbauer was named the new Director of the USGS Pacific Coastal and Marine Science Center (PCMSC) in Santa Cruz, California.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Bob Rosenbauer who has devoted more than four decades of his life to science, improving our understanding of our environment and making our country stronger. After giving his entire career in service to science and our nation, Bob Rosenbauer retired from the United States Geological Survey on January 3, 2017. He will be honored, together with his wife Terri, on January 15, 2017. Let the entire House of Representatives wish him every blessing in his well deserved retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for roll call votes 12 and 15 on Thursday, January 5, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on roll call vote 12 and "yea" on roll call 15.

CELEBRATING THE CRUSADERS OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF MARY HARDIN-BAYLOR

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Crusaders of the University of Mary Hardin-Baylor who capped a perfect season by defeating the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh Titans 10–7 in the Stagg Bowl to claim their first ever DIII Football National Championship. It was a game low on points but high on drama.

While the Stagg Bowl was contested over the span of four quarters, for UMHB it was a championship 19 years in the making. A program built from scratch by Coach Pete Fredeburg nearly two decades ago can now call itself the best in the land.

Anyone who follows sports knows the truth of these three words: defense wins championships. While high scores thrill the casual fan, the art of shutting down an opponent's ability to rack up points is what ultimately allows a team to hoist a championship trophy. The Crusaders' suffocating defense held the Titans to just 215 yards overall and allowed UMHB to control the game. Their relentless playmaking and defensive intensity, honed through seasons of tough practice and a strict commitment to football fundamentals, brought home the title for the Crusaders.

While football is a team sport, there was great play from the Crusaders' star players. Quarterback Blake Jackson, the game's MVP, ended the game with 171 passing yards and 119 rushing yards. Senior linebacker Matt Cody came through in the clutch with a game-sealing interception.

It's no secret that Texans live for football and the University of Mary Hardin-Baylor's commitment to teamwork and tough physical play represent the very best of our beloved sport. I congratulate the Crusaders on their victory in the Stagg Bowl and wish them continued success in seasons to come.

DR. JOHN H. COLEMAN

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. John H. Coleman, a long-time Toledo physician who was dedicated to his community.

Dr. Coleman was renowned for his empathy and giving nature. In every situation, Dr. Coleman's first concern was for others. Friends describe his attitude as always seeking to help others and improve the lives of those he has helped. Dr. Coleman's spirit was an inspiration to those who worked with him in Toledo, where he served as a family physician for many decades. In 1999 Dr. Coleman was awarded Family Physician of the Year by the Ohio Academy of Family Physicians, a testament to his skills as a doctor and also his leadership and stewardship.

Dr. Coleman taught at the former Medical College of Ohio and served on the Lucas

County Children Services and Cordelia Martin Health Center Boards. These positions enabled him to shape the minds and embolden a new generation of physicians who continue to honor him by serving the Toledo community, including Dr. Imran Andrabi, now the president and chief executive of Mercy Health.

It is unsurprising that Dr. Coleman is held in such high esteem by his colleagues. His story is one that cannot be fabricated. Born in August, 1928, Dr. Coleman grew up in segregated Madison, Indiana, the grandson of a slave. At age fifteen he graduated from high school as the class valedictorian. Genius notwithstanding, Dr. Coleman also showed an early desire to serve his community and his country as a Captain in the Army Medical Corps.

Dr. Coleman will be dearly missed for his enduring kindness and dedication to his community. Dr. Coleman will now join his son David, who died in 1977. He is survived by his wife, Joan, children Michael, Jeffrey, and Linda, and eight grandchildren. His legacy will survive him in Toledo, where he has shaped the current medical landscape and done so much for the community at large, and for the African-American community as a path-breaking role model. We offer his family our prayers and hope that they find comfort in the wonderful memories of their beloved husband and father.

HONORING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY
OF MR. HENRY MORGENTHAU, III

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 100th birthday of Mr. Henry Morgenthau, III. Mr. Morgenthau was born at home in New York City on January 11, 1917, to Henry Morgenthau, Jr. and his beloved mother Elinor Fatman.

A man of creativity, and vision, a parent, poet, author, film maker and producer, Mr. Morgenthau found his own success in a family known for its achievements in public service.

In his 20s, Mr. Morgenthau graduated from Princeton University and served his country as a U.S. Army officer, rising to the rank of Captain, and receiving a Bronze Star.

In his 30s, Mr. Morgenthau developed his distinguished career in public broadcasting which lasted into his 60's. He produced an impressive group of documentaries and series, including "The Negro and the American Promise" with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and James Baldwin; and "Prospects of Mankind" with Eleanor Roosevelt. His work won him and Boston's WGBH, national acclaim, including Emmy, Peabody, UPI, and other awards and nominations.

In his 40s, Mr. Morgenthau married Professor Ruth Schachter, a refugee of the Holocaust who became an advisor to Presidents, a world renowned Africa expert, a champion of the underdeveloped world, and a trailblazer for women, among her many significant accomplishments. Together, Henry and Ruth have three children, Sarah, Henry (Ben), and Kramer; and six grandchildren Edward, Henry, Mizia, Henry, Mizia, and Osias.

In his 70s, Mr. Morgenthau published "Mostly Morgenthau," a history of an American

family known for its remarkable public service. At the outbreak of World War I, his grandfather, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., served as Woodrow Wilson's U.S. Ambassador to the Sublime Porte (the imperial government of the Ottoman Empire), distinguishing himself in part by his unblinking dispatches about what he described as "a campaign of race extermination" against the Armenians before the term "genocide" had been coined. His father, Henry Morgenthau, Jr., served as Treasury Secretary for eleven years under President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. His brother, Robert Morgenthau, was named U.S. Attorney by President Kennedy, before entering politics as the 1962 Democratic nominee for Governor of NY, and then winning elections to be Manhattan's longest serving District Attorney. Other distinguished members of Mr. Morgenthau's family include his sister Joan Hirschhorn, his first cousin Barbara Tuchman, and his great uncles Governor Herbert Lehman and Chief Judge Irving Lehman of NY.

Mr. Morgenthau, along with his father, grandfather, brother, and sister, has distinguished himself in his dedicated support for American and International Jewry. He and his wife Ruth were named as Harvard Hillel's 2004 Tribute to Excellence Honorees. His wife served on the board of the American Jewish World Service and his brother was a founder of Manhattan's Museum of Jewish Heritage. Henry Morgenthau, Sr. led a major relief effort for the Jews in Palestine before it was Israel. Mr. Morgenthau has also been a great supporter of Armenia and her people.

At 95, Mr. Morgenthau took up poetry as "a celebration of the evening of a long life." He writes: "In these precious days I dress my private demons in these scribbles to come out from behind the shadows that have darkened my long and privileged life."

At 96, Mr. Morgenthau published his first poem, and at 99 his first solo book of poetry was published, "A Sunday in Purgatory." Pulitzer prize winning poet, Peter Balakian, wrote: "Morgenthau's poems are crisp, elegant forays into memory both personal and cultural . . . His surgical examinations of self and his unflinching stare into mortality define the unique and honest voice of this remarkable first book of poems."

A man of elegance, distinction, and sweetness, at 100 Mr. Morgenthau remains alive to the world, eager to create more.

47TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. OBSERVANCE COMMITTEE OF MORRISTOWN, NEW JERSEY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my Colleagues to join me in honoring the Martin Luther King Jr. Observance Committee of Morristown, New Jersey in my Congressional District, which this year is celebrating its 47th Anniversary.

Since 1970, the Committee has been dedicated to promoting the rich legacy of the life and works of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. with the involvement of the Morris County community in its annual commemorative services.

Our community owes a debt of gratitude to Dr. Felicia Jameson, who has officially retired as chairwoman after 30 years of dedicated support of this event. We welcome her successor, the Reverend Dr. David A. Hollowell, and his continuing willingness to contribute.

The observance for 2017 marks the 32nd year that Dr. King's birthday will be commemorated as a national holiday. As an expression of local unity and in recognition of this important event, the Martin Luther King Jr. Observance Committee invites the Morris Clergy Council to join with the committee in sponsoring services on Monday, January 16, 2017.

This year's theme "The Dream at the Crossroads: Empower Love to Overcome," is the true embodiment of Dr. King's philosophy and teachings. From those individuals who spearheaded the initial celebration, the late Rachel Viola Jones and Dr. Jamison, the planning efforts have broadened to include members of the Morris Area Clergy Council, with representatives from all major faiths. In addition to the two founders, other volunteers who assisted in the early years included Emma L. Martin, George Dorsey, William "Jack" Harris, Reginald and Emanuelle Smith, Flora Webb, Norman Jean Matthews, Woody Huff, Elizabeth Lubar, Cecelia Dowdy, Rabbi Z. David Levy, and the Rev. Charles Marks.

The core planning committee is continuing to carry on the tradition of excellence for this great program and has grown to include many dedicated volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the Martin Luther King Observance Committee will continue, in the years ahead, to promote the cause of equality and opportunities for all people to pursue productive, fulfilling lives.

I ask you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Observance Committee as they celebrate decades of valuable service to our community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify my position for the record on roll call votes cast on January 9, 2017 and January 3, 2017.

On Roll Call Vote Number 25, on consideration of H.R. 304 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "Yea."

On Roll Call Vote Number 24, on consideration of H.R. 315 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "Yea."

On Roll Call Vote Number 3, on consideration of H. Res. 5 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "No."

IN RECOGNITION OF AMBASSADOR KAIRAT UMAROV

HON. DANA ROHRBACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Kairat Umarov of Kazakhstan has faith-

fully served in Washington, D.C. for the past four years. His steady leadership and commitment to building the relationship between our two countries has resulted in stronger ties and raised the profile of Kazakhstan and President Nazarbayev in the West. As he now prepares to complete his time as Ambassador, I wish to mark the occasion by recognizing his many achievements and extending my personal thanks to him.

The United States and Kazakhstan share a strategic partnership and a shared interest in preventing nuclear proliferation. Ambassador Umarov has fostered a close working relationship between our government and the Kazakh Embassy which has been a key ingredient for many positive steps. Although he will soon depart Washington, I must mention the Ambassador's significant contributions to the EXPO 2017 event which will take place later this year in Kazakhstan.

Over the course of Ambassador Umarov's time in Washington, I can attest that he is the consummate diplomat, always gracious, even in trying circumstances. While I am sad that his term in our nation's capital has finished he leaves behind a record of improved relations, not only between governments, but between the people of Kazakhstan and the United States.

Lastly, the Ambassador will celebrate his birthday on January 12th and I wish him the very happiest of celebrations.

HONORING THE CAREER OF MR. HUBERT WALSH

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career and achievements of Mr. Hubert "Hub" Walsh, outgoing chairman of the Merced County Board of Supervisors and longtime servant to the people of Merced. Mr. Walsh has been an eminent figure in Merced politics for many years, occupying various elected positions at the city and county levels. His unflinching drive to serve the people of Merced in all available capacities has cemented his legacy as a leader, public figure, and role model in the community.

Mr. Walsh arrived in Merced in 1967 with his mother, father, brother, and sister after spending much of his life moving from community to community due to his father's career in the Air Force. Mr. Walsh graduated from Merced High School in 1968, and moved on to attain his associate degree from Merced College in 1970. He transferred to the University of California, Berkeley shortly thereafter, and received his Bachelor of Arts in Psychology and Sociology in 1973. Mr. Walsh made the decision to serve his country in the United States Army after graduation, spending the greater portion of his tour of duty in Ft. Lewis, Washington, where he was able to concurrently earn a master's degree in Social Science from Pacific Lutheran University. After his service in the Army, Mr. Walsh married his college sweetheart, Rita Arzamendi, with whom he had two children, Melissa and Travis. Mr. Walsh then earned a Master's in Business Administration from California State University, Stanislaus, all the while remaining active in his church and community.

Mr. Walsh spent over thirty years working in the Merced County Human Services Agency in various positions, which allowed him to affect a great deal of positive change throughout the city and county of Merced. Mr. Walsh has been involved in a breadth of public service organizations, playing the role of administrator and advocate for countless causes and groups throughout Merced, ranging from Parks and Recreation to drug abuse prevention programs. Mr. Walsh's decision to run for Merced City Council in 1995 would foster his long, fruitful career as an elected representative. After serving two terms on the City Council, Mr. Walsh was elected Mayor of Merced in 2001, where he served two terms before winning his election bid for a seat on the Merced County Board of Supervisors. During his time as a Councilman, Mayor, and Supervisor, Mr. Walsh's efforts to reinforce and transform the image of Merced have been immeasurably beneficial for the many people he has served. Mr. Walsh has routinely demonstrated to his colleagues and constituency that no issue is too big or small to tackle. This credence has earned Merced a litany of achievements thanks in large part to Mr. Walsh's efforts.

Although Mr. Walsh's retirement finds us with a heavy heart, there is no doubt that he will remain an active member of his community. Mr. Walsh's passion for public service runs beyond the positions that he has held, but is evidenced throughout his whole career and adult life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the remarkable career and achievements of Mr. Hubert Walsh. His tenure in public service will be appreciated for years to come.

TRIBUTE TO HONOR THE LIFE OF
ALBERT J. NADER

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Albert J. Nader, who passed away on December 22, 2016, in Palm Springs, California, at the age of 84. He is survived by his wife Gemma Allen Nader, his children Page and Jason, his step-children Bridget and Sean, and six grandchildren.

Albert Nader was the son of the late Joshua Nader, an Assyrian immigrant from Iran, and Olga. He was exceedingly proud to be a native Chicagoan and of Assyrian heritage. He grew up near Wrigley Field and attended Blaine Elementary School and Lake View High School where he played baseball and basketball. He graduated from DePaul University and served as a First Lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps. After his service to our country, he went on to work for Sears, Montgomery Ward, and Rand McNally developing films, globes, maps, and textbooks for libraries and schools, and founded the highly successful ad agency, Nader-Lief.

In 1978, against the advice of his wife and other friends, Albert Nader took his innovative vision to help people collect videos and created Questar to produce, acquire and distribute video programs. Questar offered viewers videos covering a wide variety of topics, including nature, cooking, and history. Albert

Nader found inspiration for programs to create or distribute everywhere he went, including church and family vacations. He guided his groundbreaking vision through changing technology and today his programs are streaming online.

Albert was a force of nature, always bursting with ideas, implementing them and advancing the causes he believed in. He was a faith-filled man, a long-time supporter of Moody Church, and proud of his Assyrian heritage. Most recently, he was raising funds for Assyrians caught in the wars in Iraq and Syria. He was a man who loved his family and was devoted to his church, his community and his country. Because of all he did in living a worthy life, our country has been bettered immeasurably. Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in expressing our collective sympathy to Albert Nader's wife and family on the loss of a great and good man, Albert J. Nader.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SCOTT PERRY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was absent due to illness. However, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 24 and YEA on Roll Call No. 25.

RECOGNIZING JULIAN SCADDEN

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize a truly great citizen of Aurora, Colorado, Julian Scadden. Julian selflessly volunteers countless hours in a program known as the 'VA's Compassion Corps.' Those in the Compassion Corps spend time with veterans who have no family or friends to come visit them at VA Hospital Community Living Centers.

Julian works as a full time housekeeper at VA Hospital's Community Living Center, and then will often spend 12 or more hours sitting with veterans afterwards. To say that Julian has a strong commitment to our nation's veterans would be a vast understatement.

A veteran himself, Julian enlisted in the Army in 1967 and served in Vietnam. Today, unfortunately, Julian is the last of what were once 20 members of the 'VA Compassion Corps' volunteers in the Denver area. It is my hope that his example will inspire others to volunteer for the Compassion Corps which fills such a vital role for those military men and women who have served the United States of America.

Thanks to you Julian Scadden.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN J. BENOIT

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Riverside County Su-

pervisor John J. Benoit, who passed away in California on Monday, December 26, 2016. John served the people of Riverside County in many ways throughout his life and he will be deeply missed.

John started his career in public service at the Corona Police Department. From there, he embarked on 29 years of service with the California Highway Patrol, which culminated with his promotion to commander of the CHP's Indio Station. After serving in law enforcement, John became increasingly active in his community. He was elected to the Desert Sands School Board before being elected to the California State Assembly in 2002. John ultimately served three terms in the Assembly during which time he passed significant legislation, including "Aryanna's Law" to enhance the protection of children in daycare centers. In 2009, John was appointed to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors to carry out the remaining term of his friend, Supervisor Roy Wilson, who had passed away. Throughout his life, John was a dedicated, effective and passionate advocate for the Coachella Valley and Riverside County.

As a member of the Coachella Valley community, John served in many service organizations, including as past president of both the United Way of the Desert and Indio Rotary. John was an avid pilot, who often flew himself and other legislators up to Sacramento when the Assembly was in session. John and his wife, Sheryl, were married in 1978, and later celebrated the births of their daughter, Sarah, and son, Ben.

I had the distinct privilege of knowing John for many years. I was proud to call him my friend and I will deeply miss him. I extend my heartfelt condolences to the Benoit family, his friends, as well as his staff and colleagues. Although John may be gone, the many life-changing contributions he made here in Riverside County will have a lasting impact.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for roll call votes on Monday, January 9, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on roll call votes 24 and 25.

HONORING RICHARD NOBLE

HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and life of veteran Richard Noble of the Third Congressional District, and to express my sincerest condolences to his family and loved ones he has left behind, as well as to recognize his steadfast dedication and service to our nation.

Richard Noble was a Vietnam War Veteran who was on his way to a Veteran's Day Ceremony before a tragic accident claimed his life. Brave men like Richard have enabled us to

live our daily lives with the free ideals that our country was founded upon.

It is important that we continue to honor Richard and all veterans and remind ourselves of how precious our freedom is, so that we never take a day for granted.

Mr. Speaker, the people of New Jersey's Third Congressional District are tremendously honored to have had Richard Noble as a selfless and dedicated member of their community and a veteran, who put his life in harm's way to protect and serve country during a time of need. It is with a heavy heart that I commemorate his career and life, and recognize the lasting legacy of that he has left behind, before the United State House of Representatives.

HONORING THE SYLVANIA ORDER
OF THE SISTERS OF ST. FRANCIS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a momentous occasion in the life of the Sylvania congregation of the Sisters of St. Francis. The Sylvania Order of the Sisters of St. Francis celebrated its centennial year in 2016. Our entire community honors the noteworthy contributions of the Franciscan's 100 years of noble service through a celebratory mass.

It was Bishop Joseph Schrembs of the Toledo Catholic Diocese who initially requested religious sisters to teach the children of Polish immigrants in Toledo's Catholic Schools. On December 8, 1916, the Sylvania Franciscans were founded as a province of the Sisters of St. Francis in Rochester, Minnesota. The Sisters were stationed at St. Hedwig School in the North End of Toledo which served as a hub of Polish life in the city. After 89 acres of land was purchased in 1917 through the Rochester community, the Sisters were formally established in Sylvania, Ohio. They were known as the Franciscan Sisters of the Immaculate Conception and were led by Mother Adelaide.

In the century that followed, the Sylvania Franciscans branched out from their original call to teach the city's Polish immigrant children. They began sharing the Franciscan presence in ministries spanning health care, housing, human services and pastoral care, in addition to education. The Sisters' work is carried forth in eight states and the country of Haiti with 150 Sisters serving our human family.

The Sisters' ministries are founded on the "core values of reverence, service, community, stewardship." The Franciscan Sisters are called "like Francis of Assisi to live the Gospel in joyful servanthood among all people. The Sisters of St. Francis of Sylvania, Ohio as messengers of peace, commit themselves to works that reverence human dignity, embrace the poor and marginalize, and respect the gift of all creation." Living Christ's message described in Matthew 25:40 "whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me." The Sylvania Sisters of St. Francis celebrated their centennial year as an integral part of our community. Their imprimatur is seen everywhere, from the

beautiful elegiac campus in Sylvania, to the schools, caring services and hospitals in which they minister, and the Sylvania Franciscan Village which was established to integrate the Sisters' ministries.

In addition to traditional ministries, the Sylvania Sisters of St. Francis are leading efforts toward peace and justice and restoring nature. The Sisters note, "We believe that nature, the arts and culture, and the goodness around us nurture our souls and make us sensitive to Mother Earth and her people." It is that connection that truly defines the Sisters of St. Francis. A walk on the grounds of the Sisters of St. Francis is to behold the beauty of nature in all of its glory, to hear the silence and to feel God's presence everywhere.

From the barracks and strawberry patch Mother Adelaide and the 22 pioneering Sisters first established, the grounds of the Sisters of St. Francis now feature many buildings in which the Sisters live and work, shrines, grottos, a prayer garden, the Portiuncula Chapel and adjacent Lourdes University. Its mission-style buildings showcase stunning mosaics and works of art crafted by the Sisters themselves. It is truly an oasis of peace and tranquility.

St. Francis of Assisi said, "Preach the Gospel at all times and when necessary use words." Throughout their one-hundred-year history the Sylvania Sisters of St. Francis have lived this truth. Their presence and their good works demonstrate Christ's path and God's deep love. As the kind and generous Sisters go forth toward their next centennial, let us be mindful of the history, but with a vision for the future. Our community gratefully and enthusiastically joins with them to celebrate the life of this vital and cherished congregation that is the Sylvania Sisters of St. Francis.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS
OF STATE REPRESENTATIVE
DONALD MOFFITT

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor Illinois State Representative Donald Moffitt for his dedication to public service which has tremendously benefitted the people and State of Illinois. Today commemorates his last day as a Representative in the Illinois General Assembly.

Representative Moffitt from the 74th House District of Illinois has dedicated twenty-three years to tirelessly serving his constituents in the Illinois General Assembly. His years of service have been distinguished by his commitment to providing timely and effective constituent service, a top priority for his office. As a leader of the Republican Party in Illinois, he has cultivated a statewide reputation for his dedication to matters concerning Illinois veteran's affairs, agricultural reform, healthcare, and especially, the public safety of Illinois.

In 2004, he founded the Illinois General Assembly's Fire Caucus, which focuses on promoting the goals of Illinois' fire services. Among its accomplishments is the promotion of funding for Emergency Medical Systems, creating a fire truck loan program, placing sprinkler systems in college and university

housing, and reforming hiring practices of fire departments to ensure greater public safety. He is also credited for requiring school buses to install swinging stop signs to ensure the safety of children crossing the street. His outstanding advocacy on public safety issues has not gone unrecognized as he has received numerous honors, including the "Legislator of the Year" awards credited to him by the Illinois Association for Fire Protection Districts, the Illinois Firefighters Association, and the Northern Illinois Alliance of Fire Protection Districts. Most notably, he recently received the 2016 Northern Alliance of Fire Protection Districts Lifetime Achievement Award.

In addition to his advocacy for public safety, Representative Moffitt has also championed the most important issues facing the healthcare industry. As part of this important work, he sponsored a legislation preventing discrimination of insurance companies based on genetic test results, which would later serve as the paradigm for federal legislation of the same topic. Through his work within the Illinois healthcare field, Representative Moffitt has helped many families receive the necessary care and information that they need.

Representative Moffitt's steadfast work to improve the lives of Illinois' citizens stands as a model for progress to further the greater good and prosperity of the state. He stands as a model for the values and priorities which current—and future—public servants should strive to uphold in order to better our communities. It is an honor to call Representative Moffitt not only a colleague, but a friend of many years. I want to congratulate him on his tireless work to improve public safety and his dedicated service to the State of Illinois.

MAKING AVAILABLE A CLASSIFIED
INTELLIGENCE REPORT TO
MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has voted to make a classified report regarding Russian activities and intentions in the recent U.S. election available for review by all Members of the House.

The classified report is available for review by Members at the offices of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in Room HVC-304 of the Capitol Visitors Center. The committee office will be open during regular business hours for the convenience of any Member who wishes to review the report.

I recommend that Members wishing to review the classified report contact the committee's chief clerk to arrange a time and date for that viewing. This will assure the availability of appropriately cleared committee staff to assist Members who desire assistance during their review of these classified materials.

It is important that Members keep in mind the requirements of clause 13 of House Rule XXIII, which only permits access to classified information by those Members of the House who have signed the oath provided for in the Rules.

In addition, the Committee's rules require that Members agree in writing to a nondisclosure agreement. The agreement indicates that

the Member has been granted access to the classified report and that the Member is familiar with the rules of the House and the Committee with respect to the classified nature of that information and the limitations on the disclosure of that information.

RECOGNIZING DR. BARBARA
SHANNON-BANNISTER

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize the accomplishments of a dear friend of mine, Dr. Barbara Shannon-Bannister, who will be receiving the 'Trailblazer Award' at the 32nd Annual Martin Luther King, Jr. Business Awards.

Dr. Shannon-Bannister has a proven record of dedicated civil service, with a career that has benefitted community relations in Aurora, Colorado since 1987. Dr. Shannon-Bannister's position as Division Chief of Community Relations has given her the opportunity to coordinate social relations throughout Aurora and the great State of Colorado. An advocate for civil rights, Dr. Shannon-Bannister's work has

impacted the lives of underserved, minority youth by providing activities in their neighborhoods.

Additionally, she is President and CEO of a non-profit organization, Grand Design INC. This foundation works to preserve African American culture through community outreach, hosting concerts and visual art performances.

In celebrating the legacy and work of Dr. King, I can think of no one better to receive such a prestigious award. Congratulations to Dr. Shannon-Bannister on this excellent achievement.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN ROTZ

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 10, 2017

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize a local businessman in Virginia's 10th District, John Rotz, who will be retiring and passing along his business to his son Jason. Rotz Pharmacy is a landmark in Winchester and is the only independent pharmacy left in the area. John Rotz has quite the entrepreneurial history and a pharmaceutical background.

Mr. Rotz was the son of a pharmacist and from a young age was passionate about helping others. At the age of 23, while still studying at the Medical College of Virginia, he opened up his first pharmacy in 1976, Barry's Drug Store. Despite his age and lack of resources, Mr. Rotz always maintained a strong work ethic and customer-first attitude and was able to expand to a larger location after only 2 years of operation. This location, which changed to Medical Circle Pharmacy, was open for 26 years before the pharmacy moved to Amherst Street and became Rotz Pharmacy in 2004. Over the years, Mr. Rotz never lost sight of the core values of a family-owned small business, and the store is widely recognized for its traditional feel.

In today's society, family owned small businesses are crucial to the future of our nation. It is families like the Rotz family who help foster strong, local economies by establishing successful business practices that can be carried out for generations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding John Rotz for his dedication to serving our community for so many years. I wish Mr. Rotz the best in retirement and wish Jason all the best in managing the pharmacy.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S181–S221

Measures Introduced: Eighteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 76–93, and S. Res. 9–11. **Pages S204–05**

Measures Considered:

Budget Resolution—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S184–87, S187–99, S220

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 31 yeas to 67 nays (Vote No. 5), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and applicable budget resolutions, with respect to Enzi (for Flake) Amendment No. 52, to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, to reform Medicaid without prioritizing able-bodied adults over the disabled, and to return regulation of insurance to State governments. Subsequently, the point of order that the amendment was in violation of Section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 was sustained, and thus the amendment fell.

Page S191

By 49 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 6), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to Sanders Amendment No. 19, relative to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. Subsequently, the point of order that the amendment was in violation of Section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 was sustained, and thus the amendment fell.

Page S191

A unanimous-consent-time agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the concurrent resolution at approximately 12 noon, on Wednesday, January 11, 2017, with three hours of debate re-

maining on the resolution for the majority, and three hours for the minority. **Page S220**

Messages from the House: **Page S200**

Measures Referred: **Page S200**

Executive Communications: **Pages S200–04**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S205–06**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S206–08**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S209–11**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S220**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S220**

Record Votes: Two record votes were taken today. (Total—6) **Page S191**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon and adjourned at 6:30 p.m., until 12 noon on Wednesday, January 11, 2017. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S. 220)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

CIVILIAN CONTROL OF THE ARMED FORCES

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine civilian control of the Armed Forces, after receiving testimony from Eliot A. Cohen, Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, and Kathleen H. Hicks, Center for Strategic and International Studies International Security Program, both of Washington, D.C.

ONLINE SEX TRAFFICKING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concluded a hearing to examine Backpage.com's facilitation of online sex trafficking, after receiving testimony from Carl Ferrer, Michael Lacey, James Larkin, Elizabeth McDougall, and Andrew Padilla, all of Backpage.com, Dallas, Texas, and other public witnesses.

NOMINATION

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of General John F. Kelly, USMC (Ret.), to be Secretary of Homeland Security, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Carper and McCain, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee began hearings to examine the nomination of Jeff Sessions, of Alabama, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Shelby and Collins, testified and answered questions in his own behalf, but did not complete action thereon.

Hearings recessed subject to the call and will meet again at 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, January 11, 2017.

RUSSIAN INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Russian activities and intentions in recent United States elections, after receiving testimony from James Clapper, Director of National Intelligence; John Brennan, Director, Central Intelligence Agency; Admiral Michael Rogers, USN, Director, National Security Agency, Department of Defense; and James Comey, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

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: 43 public bills, H.R. 388–430; and 8 resolutions, H.J. Res. 26; and H. Res. 36–39, 41–43, were introduced.

Pages H297–99

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H300–01

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 40, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 78) to improve the consideration by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 238) to reauthorize the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, to better protect futures customers, to provide end-users with market certainty, to make basic reforms to ensure transparency and accountability at the Commission, to help farmers, ranchers, and end-users manage risks, to help keep consumer costs low, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–3).

Page H297

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Webster (FL) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H239

Recess: The House recessed at 10:42 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon.

Page H245

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 248 yeas to 162 nays with 3 answering "present", Roll No. 28.

Pages H245, H258

Administration of the Oath of Office: Representative-elect Schrader presented himself in the well of the House and was administered the oath of office by the Speaker.

Pages H245–46

Whole Number of the House: Under clause 5(d) of Rule 20, the Chair announced to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath of office to the Member-elect, the whole number of the House is 435.

Page H246

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 36, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives.

Page H249

Privileged Resolution: The House agreed to H. Res. 37, providing for the attendance of the House at the Inaugural Ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States.

Page H249

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 39, electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives.

Page H259

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Energy Efficient Government Technology Act: H.R. 306, to amend the Energy Independence and

Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information and computing technologies;

Pages H266–68

Small Business Broadband Deployment Act: H.R. 288, to ensure that small business providers of broadband Internet access service can devote resources to broadband deployment rather than compliance with cumbersome regulatory requirements;

Pages H268–70

Inspiring the Next Space Pioneers, Innovators, Researchers, and Explorers (INSPIRE) Women Act: H.R. 321, to inspire women to enter the aerospace field, including science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, through mentorship and outreach;

Pages H270–73

Promoting Women in Entrepreneurship Act: H.R. 255, to authorize the National Science Foundation to support entrepreneurial programs for women;

Pages H273–75

Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2017: H.R. 239, amended, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development;

Pages H275–77

Leveraging Emerging Technologies Act of 2017: H.R. 240, amended, to encourage engagement between the Department of Homeland Security and technology innovators; and

Pages H277–79

Modernizing Government Travel Act: H.R. 274, amended, to provide for reimbursement for the use of modern travel services by Federal employees traveling on official Government business. **Pages H279–80**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:50 p.m. and reconvened at 5:20 p.m. **Page H280**

Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act: The House passed H.R. 79, to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities law, by a yea-and-nay vote of 344 yeas to 73 nays, Roll No. 31. **Pages H259–66, H280–83**

Rejected:

Velázquez amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–2) that sought to require the event sponsor to provide attendees with a written disclosure outlining the nature of the event and the risks of investing in the securities for sale; would also clarify that attendance at an event does not in itself establish a pre-existing relationship for purposes of Rule 506(b) (by a recorded vote of 167 yeas to 249 noes, Roll No. 29); and **Pages H264–65, H280–81**

Clay amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–2) that sought to limit the types of fees “demo day” sponsors can collect and requires an

issuer to be a real business (by a recorded vote of 163 yeas to 253 noes, Roll No. 30). **Pages H265–66, H281–82**

H. Res. 33, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 5) and (H.R. 79) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 233 yeas to 183 noes, Roll No. 27, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 179 nays, Roll No. 26. **Pages H249–58**

Suspension—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measure under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Tested Ability to Leverage Exceptional National Talent Act of 2017: H.R. 39, to amend title 5, United States Code, to codify the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program. **Pages H283–85**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H259, H257–58, H258, H281, H281–82, and H282–83. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Committee Meetings

SEC REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT; COMMODITY END-USER RELIEF ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 78, the “SEC Regulatory Accountability Act”; and H.R. 238, the “Commodity End-User Relief Act”. The committee granted, by voice vote, a structured rule for H.R. 78. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in part A of the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part A of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Additionally, the rule grants a structured rule for H.R. 238. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided

and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for the purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 115–2, and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in part B of the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in part B of the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. In section 3, the rule provides that on any legislative day during the period from January 16, 2017, through January 20, 2017: the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment. In section 4, the rule provides that the Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3. In section 5, the rule provides that it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of January 13, 2017, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV, and that the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section. Testimony was heard from Chairman Conaway and Representatives Wagner and Lucas.

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING; BUSINESS MEETING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held an organizational meeting for the 115th Congress; and a business meeting to consider an ac-

cess request. The committee adopted its rules for the 115th Congress. A motion, pursuant to Committee Rule 14(i), that the Committee call to the attention of the House the Classified Intelligence Community Assessment Regarding Russian Activities and Intentions in the Recent U.S. Election passed. This meeting was closed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D10)

S. 3084, to invest in innovation through research and development, and to improve the competitiveness of the United States. Signed on January 6, 2017. (Public Law 114–329)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Elaine L. Chao, to be Secretary of Transportation, 10:15 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Rex Wayne Tillerson, of Texas, to be Secretary of State, 9 a.m., SD–106.

Full Committee, business meeting to consider S. Res. 6, objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 and to all efforts that undermine direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians for a secure and peaceful settlement, and protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Montenegro (Treaty Doc. 114–12), 6 p.m., S–216, Capitol.

Committee on the Judiciary: to continue hearings to examine the nomination of Jeff Sessions, of Alabama, to be Attorney General, Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SR–325.

House

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, organizational meeting for the 115th Congress, 11 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Wednesday, January 11

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, January 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of S. Con. Res. 3, Budget Resolution. Senate expects to begin votes on or in relation to amendments to the concurrent resolution at approximately 6 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 5—Regulatory Accountability Act of 2017.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Blunt Rochester, Lisa, Del., E42
Boyle, Brendan F., Pa., E40
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E43
Carter, John R., Tex., E41
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E43, E45
Comstock, Barbara, Va., E45

Costa, Jim, Calif., E42
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E39, E40, E43
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E42
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E41, E43
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E41, E44
LaHood, Darin, Ill., E44
MacArthur, Thomas, N.J., E43
Nunes, Devin, Calif., E44

Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E39
Perry, Scott, Pa., E43
Rohrabacher, Dana, Calif., E42
Ryan, Paul D., Wisc., E39
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E41
Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E40
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E40
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E39



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.