



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2017

No. 179

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, November 6, 2017, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2017

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Almighty God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We pray for the gift of wisdom to all with great responsibility in this people's House for the leadership of our Nation.

With the inception of debates and consideration of a tax bill, send Your spirit of honesty, clarity, and respect upon the Members of the people's House. The issue at hand is monumental, and the differences that are apparent will need addressing so that a bill that benefits the Nation might be produced.

May all Members, with Your grace, rise to the importance of this great challenge with integrity and professional excellence.

May all their efforts in the days and weeks to come redound to the benefit of all Americans, and inspire all to proclaim 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. HULTGREN. 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. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. HARTZLER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF GIVING BACK TO McHENRY COUNTY

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate 50 years of community service rendered by the United Way of Greater McHenry County.

Members of the community came together in the fall of 1966, with the primary purpose of raising funds in order to help deserving organizations achieve their goals.

In that first year alone, United Way raised more than \$21,000. This money went to funding organizations such as the Salvation Army and the American Red Cross, which remain faithful partners today.

By 1977, the United Way's importance was rapidly increasing throughout the community, as they created new partnerships with several agencies.

In fact, the United Way of Greater McHenry County became the fastest growing United Way of its size in the country. During their 25th anniversary year, they delivered more than \$1.1 million to local organizations and have continued that record over the years.

I am grateful to celebrate this 50-year milestone with the people of United Way of Greater McHenry County as they continue to help our neighbors help each other.

TAX PLAN

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, yesterday, the Republicans unveiled their tax cuts that they purport to benefit the middle class. Nothing could be further from the truth. Then again, I

□ 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.

H8447

guess it depends upon your definition of middle class.

Eighty percent of the benefits flow to those who earn over \$400,000 a year. Perhaps that is middle class to that side of the aisle.

They repealed the alternative minimum tax. We have only seen one Trump tax return: \$31 million. Eighty percent of his taxes were a result of the alternative minimum tax. That is a middle class tax cut?

Oh, then slashing permanently the corporate rate to 43 percent, that is going to really benefit the middle class. They pretend somehow that is going to raise salaries. Give me a break.

Then, under the guise of family farms and small businesses, small businesses and family farms, between \$11 million and \$22 million will no longer pay an inheritance tax. That is middle class?

All of these things are going to drive up the debt by \$2 trillion, which raises interest rates for everybody who has to borrow money to go to college, buy a car, or buy a house.

Oh, and if you want to go to college, you can't deduct your student loan interest anymore.

Adopt a kid? No, we did away with that deduction, too.

This is a ruse by the public. We have to kill this turkey before Thanksgiving.

HONORING WAYNESVILLE HIGH SCHOOL FRESHMAN MENTOR COUNCIL

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize some outstanding high school students from my district in Missouri, who have displayed a deep appreciation and respect for our Armed Forces.

Before the last regular season varsity football home game, members of the Waynesville High School Freshman Mentor Council presented pocket flags to the 763rd Ordnance Company, who will soon be deploying. The students also presented the pocket flags to Waynesville High School's Partners in Education, the 787th Military Police Battalion and 3rd Battalion, 10th Infantry Regiment, to share with deploying soldiers.

The flags are part of the Pocket Flag Project, which provides military personnel on the front lines with personal pocket flags. Waynesville High School freshmen folded the flags and wrote personalized messages to accompany each flag on Patriot Day.

I applaud these students for taking the initiative to honor our men and women in uniform. With young people like these walking down the halls of schools, I am certain America has a bright future.

PROTECT WIND ENERGY INVESTMENT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as time goes on, people are going to have a chance to look at the details of the Republican tax plan. It is clear that the benefits are concentrated to those who need help the least, ignoring those who need help the most, and producing an unaffordable deficit in the future.

But one of the most disturbing elements of this is that the Republican plan would gut the agreement that we negotiated in good faith with the wind energy industry to be able to wean them off tax subsidies. It was phased down in exchange for that certainty. The industry has up to \$50 billion that is at risk by having the Federal Government pull the rug out from underneath them.

We were well on the path towards sustainability with a clean American bill—low carbon energy. It puts at risk 50,000 jobs as a result of the reversal in course, and it raises questions for American business whether or not they can trust the American Congress to keep a deal.

This is an element that must be changed. We must respect the agreement that we made and protect the massive investment in manufacturing and employment.

TAX REFORM ISN'T ABOUT PERCENTAGES, IT IS ABOUT PEOPLE

(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 because, when we talk about the Tax Code, it is easy to get bogged down in numbers. But tax reform isn't about percentages, it is about people.

It is about small-business owners like Sean Register, in Georgia's First Congressional District, who wants to grow his business that has been his passion for much of his life.

Mr. Register is the sole owner of Register International, a shipping business in Bryan County, Georgia: a type of business very important to the Coastal Empire's economy.

Mr. Register worked hard to guide his business through the 2008 financial crisis, but, in the economic downturn, was forced to lay off employees, leaving himself as the only one remaining. Now, he would like to hire employees but needs a little push to be able to afford the extra help.

With our tax reform plan, Mr. Register will have the ability to grow his business and provide much-needed jobs to citizens in the First District.

Tax reform has many faces, more than 300 million, and every single one of them inspires our work in Congress as progrowth tax reform. We will get this done for them.

REPUBLICAN VISION FOR TAX REFORM NOT PRETTY

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Republicans unveiled their vision for tax reform, and it is not pretty.

The proposal raises taxes on the middle class and showers the wealthiest 1 percent of our country with 80 percent of the benefits, at a total cost of \$1.5 trillion charged to our Nation's credit card.

The plan should be called "Hurt the Middle Class Act."

It eliminates personal deductions for medical expenses; it eliminates the deductibility of interest paid on student loans; it eliminates the deductibility of State and local income taxes, again, raising taxes on the middle class; and to add insult to injury, the proposal eliminates the deduction for personal property losses from one natural disaster fire.

Now, in California, we just experienced the worst fires in California's history. Over 14,000 people lost their homes, at a cost of at least \$3 billion. The heck with them.

When policies weaken the middle class, the backbone of our country, they weaken our entire country. The President said tax reform will be the best Christmas present of all, but, for the middle class, this bill will be one lump of coal.

SUPPORTING HEALTHY KIDS

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act.

This important legislation continues much-needed funding for programs like the Children's Health Insurance Program, community health centers, and our rural hospitals.

Community health centers are a critical access point to care, and I have seen firsthand how they bless each person they serve.

In addition to community health centers, my district includes many rural hospitals, which are truly a lifeline for my constituents.

That is why I join my colleagues in letters urging to delay the cuts for the proposed disproportionate share of hospital and community health centers for at least 2 years. And I am happy to see this legislation doing just that.

I won't let Washington forget about the rural communities at the heart of my district. They deserve better.

And guess what? This bill is fully paid for.

While delaying these cuts is a step in the right direction, I will continue to fight for a permanent solution.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Energy and Commerce Committee for their work,

and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

CUTTING TAXES FOR THE SUPERRICH AT THE EXPENSE OF EVERYONE ELSE

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

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the Republican deal to cut taxes for the superrich at the expense of everyone else.

Apparently, Republicans believe the American people are just too distracted to recognize a con game when they see one. But make no mistake, the Republican plan is about giving tax breaks to the largest corporations and the superrich. It is not about the middle class or people who have to go to work every day. If working families had an opportunity to read the fine print, they would see that this bill has nothing to do with them.

Don't be fooled. The money needed to make this plan work has to come from somewhere. It will hurt working Americans and will cause our deficit to explode.

The strength of our country requires investing in people: so our children can have a better future, so their parents can have better jobs, so small businesses can thrive, and so seniors can retire with dignity. That is the America that we want, and that is the American promise we must keep.

ENSURING THE HEALTH OF OUR NATION'S CHILDREN

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, Congress enacted with strong, bipartisan support the Children's Health Insurance Program.

It fulfilled one of the highest responsibilities we have, which is to ensure the health and well-being of our Nation's children. Children without health insurance are less healthy, they go to the emergency room for chronic conditions like asthma and diabetes, and they do worse in school.

The program is extremely successful, increasing insurance coverage for children to 95 percent nationwide. Because of this, 138,000 Maryland children—and more than 8 million around the country—have received routine checkups, vaccinations, sick visits, prescriptions, dental and vision care, and emergency services.

We should not only reauthorize CHIP but work together to ensure every child in America has insurance.

Instead, the Republican Party is breaking the history of bipartisanship that CHIP has long enjoyed. Republicans are forcing us to choose between insuring kids and taking away coverage from 700,000 low-income Ameri-

cans, raising premiums on seniors, and cutting the Prevention and Public Health Fund.

Mr. Speaker, let's stop playing politics with the healthcare of our children.

□ 0915

COMMUNITY HEALTH AND MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS IMPROVE OUR NATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 601, I call up the bill (H.R. 3922) to extend funding for certain public health programs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). Pursuant to House Resolution 601, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce printed in the bill, the amendment printed in part A of House Report 115-382, modified by the amendment printed in part B of the report, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3922

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 "Continuing Community Health And Medical Professional Programs to Improve Our Nation, Increase National Gains, and Help Ensure Access for Little Ones, Toddlers, and Hopeful Youth by Keeping Insurance Delivery Stable Act of 2017" or the "CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act".

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

DIVISION A—CHAMPION ACT

Sec. 100. Short title.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS

Sec. 101. Extension for community health centers, the National Health Service Corps, and teaching health centers that operate GME programs.

Sec. 102. Extension for special diabetes programs.

Sec. 103. Extension for family-to-family health information centers.

Sec. 104. Youth empowerment program; personal responsibility education.

TITLE II—OFFSETS

Sec. 201. Providing for qualified health plan grace period requirements for issuer receipt of advance payments of cost-sharing reductions and premium tax credits that are more consistent with State law grace period requirements.

Sec. 202. Prevention and Public Health Fund.

DIVISION B—HEALTHY KIDS ACT

Sec. 300. Short title.

TITLE I—CHIP EXTENSION AND OTHER MEDICAID AND CHIP PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Five-year funding extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 302. Extension of certain programs and demonstration projects.

Sec. 303. Extension of outreach and enrollment program.

Sec. 304. Extension and reduction of additional Federal financial participation for CHIP.

Sec. 305. Modifying reductions in Medicaid DSH allotments.

Sec. 306. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands Medicaid payments.

TITLE II—OFFSETS

Sec. 401. Medicaid third party liability provisions.

Sec. 402. Treatment of lottery winnings and other lump-sum income for purposes of income eligibility under Medicaid.

Sec. 403. Adjustments to Medicare Part B and Part D premium subsidies for higher income individuals.

DIVISION A—CHAMPION ACT

SEC. 100. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the "Community Health And Medical Professionals Improve Our Nation Act of 2017" or the "CHAMPION Act".

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. EXTENSION FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS, THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS, AND TEACHING HEALTH CENTERS THAT OPERATE GME PROGRAMS.

(a) COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS FUNDING.—Section 10503(b)(1)(E) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b-2(b)(1)(E)) is amended by striking "2017" and inserting "2019".

(b) OTHER COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS PROVISIONS.—Section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii), by striking "abuse" and inserting "use disorder";

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(A), by striking "abuse" and inserting "use disorder";

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (B) through (D);

(B) by striking "(1) IN GENERAL" and all that follows through "The Secretary" and inserting the following:

"(1) CENTERS.—The Secretary"; and

(C) in paragraph (1), as amended, by redesignating clauses (i) through (v) as subparagraphs (A) through (E) and moving the margin of each of such redesignated subparagraph 2 ems to the left;

(4) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

"(d) IMPROVING QUALITY OF CARE.—

"(1) SUPPLEMENTAL AWARDS.—The Secretary may award supplemental grant funds to health centers funded under this section to implement evidence-based models for increasing access to high-quality primary care services, which may include models related to—

"(A) improving the delivery of care for individuals with multiple chronic conditions;

"(B) workforce configuration;

"(C) reducing the cost of care;

"(D) enhancing care coordination;

"(E) expanding the use of telehealth and technology-enabled collaborative learning and capacity building models;

"(F) care integration, including integration of behavioral health, mental health, or substance use disorder services; and

"(G) addressing emerging public health or substance use disorder issues to meet the

health needs of the population served by the health center.

“(2) **SUSTAINABILITY.**—In making supplemental awards under this subsection, the Secretary may consider whether the health center involved has submitted a plan for continuing the activities funded under this subsection after supplemental funding is expended.

“(3) **SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.**—The Secretary may give special consideration to applications for supplemental funding under this subsection that seek to address significant barriers to access to care in areas with a greater shortage of health care providers and health services relative to the national average.”;

(5) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “2 years” and inserting “1 year”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary shall not make a grant under this paragraph unless the applicant provides assurances to the Secretary that within 120 days of receiving grant funding for the operation of the health center, the applicant will submit, for approval by the Secretary, an implementation plan to meet the requirements of subsection (k)(3). The Secretary may extend such 120-day period for achieving compliance upon a demonstration of good cause by the health center.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “AND PLANS”;

(ii) by striking “or plan (as described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (c)(1))”;

(iii) by striking “or plan, including the purchase” and inserting the following: “including—

“(i) the purchase”;

(iv) by inserting “, which may include data and information systems” after “of equipment”;

(v) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(vi) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) the provision of training and technical assistance; and

“(iii) other activities that—

“(I) reduce costs associated with the provision of health services;

“(II) improve access to, and availability of, health services provided to individuals served by the centers;

“(III) enhance the quality and coordination of health services; or

“(IV) improve the health status of communities.”;

(6) in subsection (e)(5)(B)—

(A) in the heading of subparagraph (B), by striking “AND PLANS”;

(B) by striking “and subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (c)(1) to a health center or to a network or plan” and inserting “to a health center or to a network”;

(7) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

“(6) **NEW ACCESS POINTS AND EXPANDED SERVICES.**—

“(A) **APPROVAL OF NEW ACCESS POINTS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may approve applications for grants under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) to establish new delivery sites.

“(ii) **SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.**—In carrying out clause (i), the Secretary may give special consideration to applicants that have demonstrated the new delivery site will be located within a sparsely populated area, or an area which has a level of unmet need that is higher relative to other applicants.

“(iii) **CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS.**—In carrying out clause (i), the Secretary shall approve applications for grants in such a manner that the ratio of the medically un-

derserved populations in rural areas which may be expected to use the services provided by the applicants involved to the medically underserved populations in urban areas which may be expected to use the services provided by the applicants is not less than two to three or greater than three to two.

“(iv) **SERVICE AREA OVERLAP.**—If in carrying out clause (i) the applicant proposes to serve an area that is currently served by another health center funded under this section, the Secretary may consider whether the award of funding to an additional health center in the area can be justified based on the unmet need for additional services within the catchment area.

“(B) **APPROVAL OF EXPANDED SERVICE APPLICATIONS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may approve applications for grants under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) to expand the capacity of the applicant to provide required primary health services described in subsection (b)(1) or additional health services described in subsection (b)(2).

“(ii) **PRIORITY EXPANSION PROJECTS.**—In carrying out clause (i), the Secretary may give special consideration to expanded service applications that seek to address emerging public health or behavioral health, mental health, or substance abuse issues through increasing the availability of additional health services described in subsection (b)(2) in an area in which there are significant barriers to accessing care.

“(iii) **CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS.**—In carrying out clause (i), the Secretary shall approve applications for grants in such a manner that the ratio of the medically underserved populations in rural areas which may be expected to use the services provided by the applicants involved to the medically underserved populations in urban areas which may be expected to use the services provided by such applicants is not less than two to three or greater than three to two.”;

(8) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “and children and youth at risk of homelessness” and inserting “, children and youth at risk of homelessness, homeless veterans, and veterans at risk of homelessness”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (B);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “ABUSE” and inserting “USE DISORDER”; and

(II) by striking “abuse” and inserting “use disorder”;

(9) in subsection (k)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “UNMET” before “NEED”;

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or subsection (e)(6)” after “subsection (e)(1)”;

(iii) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “unmet” before “need for health services”;

(iv) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(v) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(vi) by adding after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) in the case of an application for a grant pursuant to subsection (e)(6), a demonstration that the applicant has consulted with appropriate State and local government agencies, and health care providers regarding the need for the health services to be provided at the proposed delivery site.”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or subsection (e)(6)” after “subsection (e)(1)(B)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “in the catchment area of the center” and inserting “, including other health care providers that provide care within the catchment area, local hospitals, and specialty providers in the catchment area of the center, to provide access to services not available through the health center and to reduce the non-urgent use of hospital emergency departments”;

(iii) in subparagraph (H)(ii), by inserting “who shall be directly employed by the center” after “approves the selection of a director for the center”;

(iv) in subparagraph (L), by striking “and” at the end;

(v) in subparagraph (M), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(vi) by inserting after subparagraph (M), the following:

“(N) the center has written policies and procedures in place to ensure the appropriate use of Federal funds in compliance with applicable Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award.”; and

(C) by striking paragraph (4);

(10) in subsection (1), by adding at the end the following: “Funds expended to carry out activities under this subsection and operational support activities under subsection (m) shall not exceed 3 percent of the amount appropriated for this section for the fiscal year involved.”;

(11) in subsection (q)(4), by adding at the end the following: “A waiver provided by the Secretary under this paragraph may not remain in effect for more than 1 year and may not be extended after such period. An entity may not receive more than one waiver under this paragraph in consecutive years.”;

(12) in subsection (r)(3)—

(A) by striking “appropriate committees of Congress a report concerning the distribution of funds under this section” and inserting the following: “Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report including, at a minimum—

“(A) the distribution of funds for carrying out this section”;

(B) by striking “populations. Such report shall include an assessment” and inserting the following: “populations;

“(B) an assessment”;

(C) by striking “and the rationale for any substantial changes in the distribution of funds.” and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the distribution of awards and funding for new or expanded services in each of rural areas and urban areas;

“(D) the distribution of awards and funding for establishing new access points, and the number of new access points created;

“(E) the amount of unexpended funding for loan guarantees and loan guarantee authority under title XVI;

“(F) the rationale for any substantial changes in the distribution of funds;

“(G) the rate of closures for health centers and access points;

“(H) the number and reason for any grants awarded pursuant to subsection (e)(1)(B); and

“(I) the number and reason for any waivers provided pursuant to subsection (q)(4).”;

(13) in subsection (r), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) **FUNDING FOR PARTICIPATION OF HEALTH CENTERS IN ALL OF US RESEARCH PROGRAM.**—In addition to any amounts made available pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, section 402A of this Act, or section 10503 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care

Act, there is authorized to be appropriated, and there is appropriated, out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Secretary \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2018 to support the participation of health centers in the All of Us Research Program under the Precision Medicine Initiative under section 498E of this Act.”; and

(14) by striking subsection (s).

(c) NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS.—Section 10503(b)(2)(E) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b-2(b)(2)(E)) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”.

(d) TEACHING HEALTH CENTERS THAT OPERATE GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.—

(1) PAYMENTS.—Subsection (a) of section 340H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) PAYMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (h)(2), the Secretary shall make payments under this section for direct expenses and indirect expenses to qualified teaching health centers that are listed as sponsoring institutions by the relevant accrediting body for, as appropriate—

“(A) maintenance of existing approved graduate medical residency training programs;

“(B) expansion of existing approved graduate medical residency training programs; and

“(C) establishment of new approved graduate medical residency training programs.

“(2) PRIORITY.—In making payments pursuant to paragraph (1)(C), the Secretary shall give priority to qualified teaching health centers that—

“(A) serve a health professional shortage area with a designation in effect under section 332 or a medically underserved community (as defined in section 799B); or

“(B) are located in a rural area (as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act).”.

(2) FUNDING.—Subsection (g) of section 340H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h) is amended—

(A) by striking “To carry out” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To carry out”;

(B) by striking “and \$15,000,000 for the first quarter of fiscal year 2018” and inserting “and \$126,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, to remain available until expended”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Of the amount made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary may not use more than 5 percent of such amount for the expenses of administering this section.”.

(3) ANNUAL REPORTING.—Subsection (h)(1) of section 340H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (H); and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) The number of patients treated by residents described in paragraph (4).

“(E) The number of visits by patients treated by residents described in paragraph (4).

“(F) Of the number of residents described in paragraph (4) who completed their residency training at the end of such residency academic year, the number and percentage of such residents entering primary care practice (meaning any of the areas of practice listed in the definition of a primary care residency program in section 749A).

“(G) Of the number of residents described in paragraph (4) who completed their residency training at the end of such residency

academic year, the number and percentage of such residents who entered practice at a health care facility—

“(i) primarily serving a health professional shortage area with a designation in effect under section 332 or a medically underserved community (as defined in section 799B); or

“(ii) located in a rural area (as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act).”.

(4) REPORT ON TRAINING COSTS.—Not later than March 31, 2019, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Congress a report on the direct graduate expenses of approved graduate medical residency training programs, and the indirect expenses associated with the additional costs of teaching residents, of qualified teaching health centers (as such terms are used or defined in section 340H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h)).

(5) DEFINITION.—Subsection (j) of section 340H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) NEW APPROVED GRADUATE MEDICAL RESIDENCY TRAINING PROGRAM.—The term ‘new approved graduate medical residency training program’ means an approved graduate medical residency training program for which the sponsoring qualified teaching health center has not received a payment under this section for a previous fiscal year (other than pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(C)).”.

(6) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Subsection (f) of section 340H (42 U.S.C. 256h) is amended by striking “hospital” each place it appears and inserting “teaching health center”.

(7) PAYMENTS FOR PREVIOUS FISCAL YEARS.—The provisions of section 340H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply with respect to payments under such section for fiscal years before fiscal year 2018.

(e) APPLICATION.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section for fiscal year 2018 or 2019 are subject to the requirements contained in Public Law 115–31 for funds for programs authorized under sections 330 through 340 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b–256).

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3014(h) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “, as amended by section 221 of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015.”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by inserting “and section 101(e) of the Community Health and Medical Professionals Improve Our Nation Act of 2017” after “section 221(c) of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

SEC. 102. EXTENSION FOR SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAMS.

(a) SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAM FOR TYPE I DIABETES.—Section 330B(b)(2)(C) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-2(b)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”.

(b) SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUALS.—Subparagraph (D) of section 330C(c)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-3(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) \$150,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019.”.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION FOR FAMILY-TO-FAMILY HEALTH INFORMATION CENTERS.

Section 501(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 701(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) in clause (v), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (vi), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vii) \$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019.”;

(2) in paragraph (3)(C), by inserting before the period the following: “, and with respect to fiscal years 2018 and 2019, such centers shall also be developed in all territories and at least one such center shall be developed for Indian tribes”; and

(3) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

“(5) For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘Indian tribe’ has the meaning given such term in section 4 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1603);

“(B) the term ‘State’ means each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia; and

“(C) the term ‘territory’ means Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.”.

SEC. 104. YOUTH EMPOWERMENT PROGRAM; PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY EDUCATION.

(a) YOUTH EMPOWERMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 510 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 710) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 510. YOUTH EMPOWERMENT PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) ALLOTMENTS TO STATES.—For the purpose described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall, for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, allot to each State which has transmitted an application for the fiscal year under section 505(a) an amount equal to the product of—

“(A) the amount appropriated pursuant to subsection (e)(1) for the fiscal year, minus the amount reserved under subsection (e)(2) for the fiscal year; and

“(B) the proportion that the number of low-income children in the State bears to the total of such numbers of children for all the States.

“(2) OTHER ALLOTMENTS.—

“(A) OTHER ENTITIES.—For the purpose described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall, for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, for any State which has not transmitted an application for the fiscal year under section 505(a), allot to one or more entities in the State the amount that would have been allotted to the State under paragraph (1) if the State had submitted such an application.

“(B) PROCESS.—The Secretary shall select the recipients of allotments under subparagraph (A) by means of a competitive grant process under which—

“(i) not later than 30 days after the deadline for the State involved to submit an application for the fiscal year under section 505(a), the Secretary publishes a notice soliciting grant applications; and

“(ii) not later than 120 days after such deadline, all such applications must be submitted.

“(b) PURPOSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for research under paragraph (5) and information collection and reporting under paragraph (6), the purpose of an allotment under subsection (a) to a State (or to another entity in the State pursuant to subsection (a)(2)) is to enable the State or other entity to implement education exclusively on sexual risk avoidance (meaning voluntarily refraining from sexual activity).

“(2) REQUIRED COMPONENTS.—Education on sexual risk avoidance pursuant to an allotment under this section shall—

“(A) ensure that the unambiguous and primary emphasis and context for each topic

described in paragraph (3) is a message to youth that normalizes the optimal health behavior of avoiding nonmarital sexual activity;

“(B) be medically accurate and complete;

“(C) be age-appropriate; and

“(D) be based on adolescent learning and developmental theories for the age group receiving the education.

“(3) TOPICS.—Education on sexual risk avoidance pursuant to an allotment under this section shall address each of the following topics:

“(A) The holistic individual and societal benefits associated with personal responsibility, self-regulation, goal setting, healthy decisionmaking, and a focus on the future.

“(B) The advantage of refraining from nonmarital sexual activity in order to improve the future prospects and physical and emotional health of youth.

“(C) The increased likelihood of avoiding poverty when youth attain self-sufficiency and emotional maturity before engaging in sexual activity.

“(D) The foundational components of healthy relationships and their impact on the formation of healthy marriages and safe and stable families.

“(E) How other youth risk behaviors, such as drug and alcohol usage, increase the risk for teen sex.

“(F) How to resist and avoid, and receive help regarding, sexual coercion and dating violence, recognizing that even with consent teen sex remains a youth risk behavior.

“(4) CONTRACEPTION.—Education on sexual risk avoidance pursuant to an allotment under this section shall ensure that—

“(A) any information provided on contraception is medically accurate and ensures that students understand that contraception offers physical risk reduction, but not risk elimination; and

“(B) the education does not include demonstrations, simulations, or distribution of contraceptive devices.

“(5) RESEARCH.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State or other entity receiving an allotment pursuant to subsection (a) may use up to 20 percent of such allotment to build the evidence base for sexual risk avoidance education by conducting or supporting research.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Any research conducted or supported pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be—

“(i) rigorous;

“(ii) evidence-based; and

“(iii) designed and conducted by independent researchers who have experience in conducting and publishing research in peer-reviewed outlets.

“(6) INFORMATION COLLECTION AND REPORTING.—A State or other entity receiving an allotment pursuant to subsection (a) shall, as specified by the Secretary—

“(A) collect information on the programs and activities funded through the allotment; and

“(B) submit reports to the Secretary on the data from such programs and activities.

“(c) NATIONAL EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) in consultation with appropriate State and local agencies, conduct one or more rigorous evaluations of the education funded through this section and associated data; and

“(B) submit a report to the Congress on the results of such evaluations, together with a summary of the information collected pursuant to subsection (b)(6).

“(2) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the evaluations required by paragraph (1), including the establishment of evaluation methodologies, the Secretary shall consult with relevant stakeholders.

“(d) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—

“(1) Sections 503, 507, and 508 apply to allotments under subsection (a) to the same extent and in the same manner as such sections apply to allotments under section 502(c).

“(2) Sections 505 and 506 apply to allotments under subsection (a) to the extent determined by the Secretary to be appropriate.

“(e) FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To carry out this section, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

“(2) RESERVATION.—The Secretary shall reserve, for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, not more than 20 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for administering the program under this section, including the conducting of national evaluations and the provision of technical assistance to the recipients of allotments.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection takes effect on October 1, 2017.

(b) PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY EDUCATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 513 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 713) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”; and

(B) in subsection (a)(4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “2017” each place it appears and inserting “2019”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “3-YEAR GRANTS” and inserting “COMPETITIVE PREP GRANTS”; and

(II) in clause (i), by striking “solicit applications to award 3-year grants in each of fiscal years 2012 through 2017” and inserting “continue through fiscal year 2019 grants awarded for any of fiscal years 2015 through 2017”;

(C) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting after “youth with HIV/AIDS,” the following: “victims of human trafficking.”; and

(D) in subsection (f), by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection take effect on October 1, 2017.

TITLE II—OFFSETS

SEC. 201. PROVIDING FOR QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN GRACE PERIOD REQUIREMENTS FOR ISSUER RECEIPT OF ADVANCE PAYMENTS OF COST-SHARING REDUCTIONS AND PREMIUM TAX CREDITS THAT ARE MORE CONSISTENT WITH STATE LAW GRACE PERIOD REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1412(c) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18082(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)(iv)(II), by striking “a 3-month grace period” and inserting “a grace period specified in subparagraph (C)”;

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(C) GRACE PERIOD SPECIFIED.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(iv)(II), the grace period specified in this subparagraph is—

“(i) for plan years beginning before January 1, 2018, a 3-month grace period; and

“(ii) for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2018—

“(I) in the case of an Exchange operating in a State that has a State law grace period in place, such State law grace period; and

“(II) in the case of an Exchange operating in a State that does not have a State law grace period in place, a 1-month grace period.

“(D) STATE LAW GRACE PERIOD.—For purposes of subparagraph (C), the term ‘State

law grace period’ means, with respect to a State, a grace period for nonpayment of premiums before discontinuing coverage that is applicable under the State law to health insurance coverage offered in the individual market of the State.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The requirements of paragraph (2)(B)(iv) apply to an issuer of a qualified health plan receiving an advanced payment under this paragraph in the same manner and to the same extent that such requirements apply to an issuer of a qualified health plan receiving an advanced payment under paragraph (2)(A).”.

(b) REPORT ON ALIGNING GRACE PERIODS FOR MEDICAID, MEDICARE, AND EXCHANGE PLANS.—Not later than two years after the date of full implementation of subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) the effects on consumers of aligning grace periods applied under the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act, under the Medicare program under parts C and D of title XVIII of such Act, and under qualified health plans offered on an Exchange established under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, including the extent to which such an alignment of grace periods may help to avoid enrollment status confusion for individuals under such Medicaid program, Medicare program, and qualified health plans; and

(2) the extent to which such an alignment of grace periods may reduce fraud, waste, and abuse under the Medicaid program.

SEC. 202. PREVENTION AND PUBLIC HEALTH FUND.

Section 4002(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u–11(b)) is amended by striking paragraphs (3) through (8) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(3) for fiscal year 2018, \$900,000,000;

“(4) for fiscal year 2019, \$500,000,000;

“(5) for fiscal year 2020, \$500,000,000;

“(6) for fiscal year 2021, \$500,000,000;

“(7) for fiscal year 2022, \$500,000,000;

“(8) for fiscal year 2023, \$500,000,000;

“(9) for fiscal year 2024, \$500,000,000;

“(10) for fiscal year 2025, \$750,000,000;

“(11) for fiscal year 2026, \$1,000,000,000; and

“(12) for fiscal year 2027 and each fiscal year thereafter, \$2,000,000,000.”.

DIVISION B—HEALTHY KIDS ACT

SEC. 300. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Helping Ensure Access for Little Ones, Toddlers, and Hopeful Youth by Keeping Insurance Delivery Stable Act of 2017” or the “HEALTHY KIDS Act”.

TITLE I—CHIP EXTENSION AND OTHER MEDICAID AND CHIP PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. FIVE-YEAR FUNDING EXTENSION OF THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) APPROPRIATION; TOTAL ALLOTMENT.—Section 2104(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (19), by striking “and”;

(2) in paragraph (20), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(21) for fiscal year 2018, \$21,500,000,000;

“(22) for fiscal year 2019, \$22,600,000,000;

“(23) for fiscal year 2020, \$23,700,000,000;

“(24) for fiscal year 2021, \$24,800,000,000; and

“(25) for fiscal year 2022, for purposes of making 2 semi-annual allotments—

“(A) \$2,850,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2021, and ending on March 31, 2022; and

“(B) \$2,850,000,000 for the period beginning on April 1, 2022, and ending on September 30, 2022.”.

(b) ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2104(m) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(m)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “THROUGH 2016” and inserting “THROUGH 2022”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “(19)” and inserting “(24)”; and

(II) in clause (ii), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting “(other than fiscal year 2022)” after “even-numbered fiscal year”; and

(III) in clause (ii)(I), by inserting “(or, in the case of fiscal year 2018, under paragraph (4))” after “clause (i)”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking “(or (4))” and inserting “(4), or (10)”; and

(ii) by striking “or 2017” and inserting “, 2017, or 2022”; and

(C) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “(or, in the case of fiscal year 2018, by not later than the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of the HEALTHY KIDS Act)” after “before the August 31 preceding the beginning of the fiscal year”; and

(iii) in the matter following subparagraph (B), by striking “or fiscal year 2016” and inserting “fiscal year 2016, fiscal year 2018, fiscal year 2020, or fiscal year 2022”; and

(D) in paragraph (9)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “FISCAL YEARS 2015 AND 2017” and inserting “CERTAIN FISCAL YEARS”; and

(ii) by striking “(or (4))” and inserting “, (4), or (10)”; and

(iii) by striking “or fiscal year 2017” and inserting “, 2017, or 2022”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(10) FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022.—

“(A) FIRST HALF.—Subject to paragraphs (5) and (7), from the amount made available under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (25) of subsection (a) for the semi-annual period described in such subparagraph, increased by the amount of the appropriation for such period under section 301(b)(3) of the HEALTHY KIDS Act, the Secretary shall compute a State allotment for each State (including the District of Columbia and each commonwealth and territory) for such semi-annual period in an amount equal to the first half ratio (described in subparagraph (D)) of the amount described in subparagraph (C).

“(B) SECOND HALF.—Subject to paragraphs (5) and (7), from the amount made available under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (25) of subsection (a) for the semi-annual period described in such subparagraph, the Secretary shall compute a State allotment for each State (including the District of Columbia and each commonwealth and territory) for such semi-annual period in an amount equal to the amount made available under such subparagraph, multiplied by the ratio of—

“(i) the amount of the allotment to such State under subparagraph (A); to

“(ii) the total of the amount of all of the allotments made available under such subparagraph.

“(C) FULL YEAR AMOUNT BASED ON GROWTH FACTOR UPDATED AMOUNT.—The amount described in this subparagraph for a State is equal to the sum of—

“(i) the amount of the State allotment for fiscal year 2021 determined under paragraph (2)(B)(i); and

“(ii) the amount of any payments made to the State under subsection (n) for fiscal year 2021,

multiplied by the allotment increase factor under paragraph (6) for fiscal year 2022.

“(D) FIRST HALF RATIO.—The first half ratio described in this subparagraph is the ratio of—

“(i) the sum of—

“(I) the amount made available under subsection (a)(25)(A); and

“(II) the amount of the appropriation for such period under section 301(b)(3) of the HEALTHY KIDS Act; to

“(ii) the sum of—

“(I) the amount described in clause (i); and

“(II) the amount made available under subsection (a)(25)(B).”.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 2104(m)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(m)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “the allotment increase factor under paragraph (5)” each place it appears and inserting “the allotment increase factor under paragraph (6)”.

(3) ONE-TIME APPROPRIATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022.—There is appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$20,200,000,000 to accompany the allotment made for the period beginning on October 1, 2021, and ending on March 31, 2022, under paragraph (25)(A) of section 2104(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(a)) (as added by subsection (a)(3)), to remain available until expended. Such amount shall be used to provide allotments to States under paragraph (10) of section 2104(m) of such Act (as added by subsection (b)(1)(E)) for the first 6 months of fiscal year 2022 in the same manner as allotments are provided under subsection (a)(25)(A) of such section 2104 and subject to the same terms and conditions as apply to the allotments provided from such subsection (a)(25)(A).

(c) EXTENSION OF THE CHILD ENROLLMENT CONTINGENCY FUND.—Section 2104(n) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(n)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(i) by striking “2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2016” and inserting “2010 through 2014, 2016, and 2018 through 2021”; and

(ii) by striking “fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal years 2015, 2017, and 2022”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2016” and inserting “2010 through 2014, 2016, and 2018 through 2021”; and

(ii) by striking “fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal years 2015, 2017, and 2022”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “or a semi-annual allotment period for fiscal year 2015 or 2017” and inserting “or in any of fiscal years 2018 through 2021 (or a semi-annual allotment period for fiscal year 2015, 2017, or 2022)”.

(d) EXTENSION OF QUALIFYING STATES OPTION.—Section 2105(g)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(g)(4)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “THROUGH 2017” and inserting “THROUGH 2022”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”.

(e) EXTENSION OF EXPRESS LANE ELIGIBILITY OPTION.—Section 1902(e)(13)(I) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(e)(13)(I)) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”.

(f) ASSURANCE OF AFFORDABILITY STANDARD FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2105(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(d)(3)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “UNTIL OCTOBER 1, 2019” and inserting “THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2022”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(i) by striking “2019” and inserting “2022”; and

(ii) by striking “The preceding sentence shall not be construed as preventing a State during such period” and inserting “During the period that begins on October 1, 2019, and ends on September 30, 2022, the preceding sentence shall only apply with respect to children in families whose income does not exceed 300 percent of the poverty line (as defined in section 2110(c)(5)) applicable to a family of the size involved. The preceding sentences shall not be construed as preventing a State during any such periods”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1902(gg)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(gg)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “UNTIL OCTOBER 1, 2019” and inserting “THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2022”; and

(B) by striking “September 30, 2019,” and inserting “September 30, 2022 (but during the period that begins on October 1, 2019, and ends on September 30, 2022, only with respect to children in families whose income does not exceed 300 percent of the poverty line (as defined in section 2110(c)(5)) applicable to a family of the size involved)”.

(g) CHIP LOOK-ALIKE PLANS.—

(1) BLENDING RISK POOLS.—Section 2107 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397gg) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) USE OF BLENDED RISK POOLS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title (or any other provision of Federal law) shall be construed as preventing a State from considering children enrolled in a qualified CHIP look-alike program and children enrolled in a State child health plan under this title (or a waiver of such plan) as members of a single risk pool.

“(2) QUALIFIED CHIP LOOK-ALIKE PROGRAM.—In this subsection, the term ‘qualified CHIP look-alike program’ means a State program—

“(A) under which children who are under the age of 19 and are not eligible to receive medical assistance under title XIX or child health assistance under this title may purchase coverage through the State that provides benefits that are at least identical to the benefits provided under the State child health plan under this title (or a waiver of such plan); and

“(B) that is funded exclusively through non-Federal funds, including funds received by the State in the form of premiums for the purchase of such coverage.”.

(2) COVERAGE RULE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 5000A(f)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended in subparagraph (A)(iii), by inserting “or under a qualified CHIP look-alike program (as defined in section 2107(g) of the Social Security Act)” before the comma at the end.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2017.

SEC. 302. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) CHILDHOOD OBESITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—Section 1139A(e)(8) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-9a(e)(8)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and \$10,000,000” and inserting “, \$10,000,000”; and

(2) by inserting after “2017” the following: “, and \$25,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2022”.

(b) PEDIATRIC QUALITY MEASURES PROGRAM.—Section 1139A(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-9a(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Out of any” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Out of any”;

(2) by striking “there is appropriated for each” and inserting “there is appropriated—“(A) for each”;

(3) by striking “, and there is appropriated for the period” and inserting “;“(B) for the period”;

(4) by striking “. Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.” and inserting “; and”;

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, \$75,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out this section (other than subsections (e), (f), and (g)).

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.”.

SEC. 303. EXTENSION OF OUTREACH AND ENROLLMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2113 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397mm) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking “and \$40,000,000” and inserting “, \$40,000,000”; and

(B) by inserting after “2017” the following: “, and \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2022”.

(b) MAKING ORGANIZATIONS THAT USE PARENT MENTORS ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE GRANTS.—Section 2113(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397mm(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(E), by striking “or community-based doula programs” and inserting “, community-based doula programs, or parent mentors”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) PARENT MENTOR.—The term ‘parent mentor’ means an individual who—

“(A) is a parent or guardian of at least one child who is an eligible child under this title or title XIX; and

“(B) is trained to assist families with children who have no health insurance coverage with respect to improving the social determinants of the health of such children, including by providing—

“(i) education about health insurance coverage, including, with respect to obtaining such coverage, eligibility criteria and application and renewal processes;

“(ii) assistance with completing and submitting applications for health insurance coverage;

“(iii) a liaison between families and representatives of State plans under title XIX or State child health plans under this title;

“(iv) guidance on identifying medical and dental homes and community pharmacies for children; and

“(v) assistance and referrals to successfully address social determinants of children’s health, including poverty, food insufficiency, and housing.”.

(c) EXCLUSION FROM MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Section 1902(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(e)) is amended—

(1) in the first paragraph (14), relating to income determined using modified adjusted gross income, by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(J) EXCLUSION OF PARENT MENTOR COMPENSATION FROM INCOME DETERMINATION.—Any nominal amount received by an individual as compensation, including a stipend, for participation as a parent mentor (as defined in paragraph (5) of section 2113(f)) in an activity or program funded through a grant under such section shall be disregarded for purposes of determining the income eligibility of such individual for medical assistance under the State plan or any waiver of such plan.”; and

(2) by striking “(14) EXCLUSION” and inserting “(15) EXCLUSION”.

SEC. 304. EXTENSION AND REDUCTION OF ADDITIONAL FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION FOR CHIP.

Section 2105(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(b)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting “and during the period that begins on October 1, 2019, and ends on September 30, 2020, the enhanced FMAP determined for a State for a fiscal year (or for any portion of a fiscal year occurring during such period) shall be increased by 11.5 percentage points” after “23 percentage points.”.

SEC. 305. MODIFYING REDUCTIONS IN MEDICAID DSH ALLOTMENTS.

Section 1923(f)(7)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-4(f)(7)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “2018” and inserting “2020”; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking subclauses (I) through (VIII) and inserting the following:

“(I) \$4,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

“(II) \$8,000,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.”.

SEC. 306. PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS MEDICAID PAYMENTS.

(a) INCREASED CAP.—Section 1108(g) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1308(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “(or, with respect to fiscal years 2018 and 2019, increased by such percentage increase plus one percentage point)” after “beginning of the fiscal year”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “(or, with respect to fiscal years 2018 and 2019, increased by such percentage increase plus one percentage point)” after “percentage increase referred to in subparagraph (A)”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B), (C), (D), (E), and (F)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(C) The amount of the increase otherwise provided under subparagraph (A) for Puerto Rico shall be further increased by \$880,000,000.

“(D)(i) For the period beginning October 1, 2017, and ending December 31, 2019, the amount of the increase otherwise provided under subparagraph (A) for Puerto Rico shall be further increased by \$120,000,000 if the Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico established under section 101 of the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act (48 U.S.C. 2121) certifies by a majority vote that Puerto Rico has taken reasonable and appropriate steps during such period to—

“(I) reduce fraud, waste, and abuse under the program under title XIX;

“(II) implement strategies to reduce unnecessary, inefficient, or excessive spending under title XIX;

“(III) improve the use and availability of Medicaid data for program operation and oversight; and

“(IV) improve the quality of care and patient experience for individuals enrolled under the program under title XIX.

“(ii) As a condition of any additional increase pursuant to clause (i), not later than October 1, 2018, Puerto Rico shall submit to the Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico a report regarding steps taken to achieve each of the goals described in subclauses (I) through (IV) of clause (i).

“(E) Payments under section 1903(a)(8) for a quarter of a fiscal year shall not be taken into account in applying subsection (f) (as

increased in accordance with this paragraph and paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4)) to Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands for such fiscal year.

“(F)(i) For the period beginning October 1, 2017, and ending December 31, 2019, the amount of the increase otherwise provided under subparagraph (A) for the Virgin Islands shall be further increased by an amount equal to the per capita equivalent of the total amount of the increase provided for Puerto Rico under subparagraphs (C) and (D) for such period.

“(ii) For purposes of clause (i), the term ‘per capita equivalent’ means the ratio of—

“(I) the population of the Virgin Islands, as determined by the most recent census estimate released by the Bureau of the Census before September 4, 2017; to

“(II) the population of Puerto Rico, as so determined.”.

(b) FEDERAL MATCH FOR MEDICAL PERSONNEL AND FRAUD REDUCTION.—Section 1903(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting “subject to paragraph (8),” before “an amount”; and

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “subject to paragraph (8),” before “75 per centum”; and

(B) by striking at the end “plus”; and

(3) in paragraph (7), by striking at the end the period and inserting “; plus”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) for quarters during the period beginning January 1, 2018, and ending December 31, 2019, paragraphs (2)(A) and (6) shall apply with respect to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as if—

“(A) the reference to ‘75 per centum’ in paragraph (2)(A) were a reference to ‘90 per centum’; and

“(B) the reference to ‘75 per centum’ in paragraph (6)(B) were a reference to ‘90 per centum’.”.

TITLE II—OFFSETS

SEC. 401. MEDICAID THIRD PARTY LIABILITY PROVISIONS.

(a) MEDICAID THIRD PARTY LIABILITY.—(1) DELAY OF BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 THIRD PARTY LIABILITY PROVISIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-67; 127 Stat. 1177; 42 U.S.C. 1396a note), as amended by section 211 of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-93; 128 Stat. 1047; 42 U.S.C. 1396a note) and section 220 of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-10), is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE; TREATMENT.—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall take effect on September 30, 2017, and shall apply with respect to any open claims, including claims generated or filed, after such date.

(2) CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITIONS APPLICABLE TO THIRD PARTY LIABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(nn) RESPONSIBLE THIRD PARTY AND HEALTH INSURER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subsection (a)(25) and section 1903(d)(2)(B):

“(1) RESPONSIBLE THIRD PARTY.—The term ‘responsible third party’ means a health insurer, a pharmacy benefit manager to the extent the pharmacy benefit manager provides information under this title for the purpose of coordinating benefits, an accountable care organization under section 1899, or any other party that is, by statute, contract, or agreement, legally responsible for payment of a

claim for a health care item or service. Such term does not include a party if payment by such party has been made or can reasonably be expected to be made under a workmen's compensation law or plan of the United States or a State, or under an automobile or liability insurance policy or plan (including a self-insured plan), or under no fault insurance.

“(2) HEALTH INSURER.—The term ‘health insurer’ means a group health plan, as defined in section 607(1) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, a self-insured plan, a fully-insured plan, a service benefit plan, a medicaid managed care plan under section 1903(m) or 1932, and any other health plan determined appropriate by the Secretary.”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1902(a)(25) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(25)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “third parties” and all that follows through “item or service” and inserting “responsible third parties”;

(ii) in subparagraph (G), by striking “health insurer” and all that follows through “item or service” and inserting “responsible third party”;

(iii) in subparagraph (I), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “health insurers” and all that follows through “item or service” and inserting “responsible third parties”;

(iv) by inserting “responsible” before “third” each place it appears in subparagraphs (A)(i), (A)(ii), (C), (D), and (H).

(3) REMOVAL OF SPECIAL TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TYPES OF CARE AND PAYMENTS UNDER MEDICAID THIRD PARTY LIABILITY RULES.—Section 1902(a)(25) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(25)), as amended by section 202(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (after application of paragraph (1)), is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “prenatal or preventive” and all that follows through “State plan” and inserting “items and services provided under the program required under the State plan pursuant to paragraph (62)”;

(ii) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking “such service” and inserting “such items and services”;

(II) by striking each place it appears “such services” and inserting “such items and services” each such place; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (F).

(4) CLARIFICATION OF ROLE OF HEALTH INSURERS WITH RESPECT TO THIRD PARTY LIABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1902(a)(25) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(25)), as amended by paragraph (3), is further amended by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

“(F) that—

“(i) in the case of a State that provides medical assistance under this title through a contract with a health insurer, such contract shall specify any responsibility of such health insurer (or other entity) with respect to recovery of payment from responsible third parties pursuant to the delegation or transfer by the State to such insurer (or other entity) of a right described in subparagraph (I)(ii); and

“(ii) in the case of a State that under a contract described in clause (i) delegates or transfers to a health insurer (or other entity) a right described in such clause, the State shall provide assurances to the Secretary that the State laws referred to in subparagraph (I), with respect to each responsibility of such health insurer (or other entity) specified under such clause, confer to such

health insurer (or other entity) the authority of the State with respect to the requirements specified in clauses (i) through (iv) of such subparagraph (I);”.

(B) TREATMENT OF COLLECTED AMOUNTS.—Section 1903(d)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(d)(2)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “For purposes of this subparagraph, reimbursements made by a responsible third party to health insurers (as defined in section 1902(nn)) pursuant to section 1902(a)(25)(F)(ii) shall be treated in the same manner as reimbursements made to a State under the previous sentence.”.

(5) INCREASING STATE FLEXIBILITY WITH RESPECT TO THIRD PARTY LIABILITY.—Section 1902(a)(25)(I) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(25)(I)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “medical assistance under the State plan” and inserting “medical assistance under a State plan (or under a waiver of the plan)”;

(B) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

“(ii) accept—

“(I) any State’s right of recovery and the assignment to any State of any right of an individual or other entity to payment from the party for an item or service for which payment has been made under the respective State’s plan (or under a waiver of the plan); and

“(II) as a valid authorization of the responsible third party for the furnishing of an item or service to an individual eligible to receive medical assistance under this title, an authorization made on behalf of such individual under the State plan (or under a waiver of such plan) for the furnishing of such item or service to such individual;”;

(C) in clause (iii)—

(i) by striking “respond to” and inserting “not later than 60 days after receiving”;

(ii) by striking “; and” at the end and inserting “, respond to such inquiry; and”; and

(D) in clause (iv), by inserting “a failure to obtain a prior authorization,” after “claim form.”.

(6) STATE INCENTIVE TO PURSUE THIRD PARTY LIABILITY FOR NEWLY ELIGIBLES.—Section 1903(d)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(d)(2)(B)), as amended by paragraph (4)(B), is further amended by adding at the end the following: “In the case of expenditures for medical assistance provided during 2017 and subsequent years for individuals described in subclause (VIII) of section 1902(a)(10)(A)(i), in determining the amount, if any, of overpayment under this subparagraph with respect to such medical assistance, the Secretary shall apply the Federal medical assistance percentage for the State under section 1905(b), notwithstanding the application of section 1905(y).”.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH THIRD PARTY INSURANCE REPORTING.—Section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(ee) Notwithstanding subsection (b), for any year beginning after 2019, if a State fails to comply with the requirements of section 1902(a)(25) with respect to each calendar quarter in such year, the Secretary may reduce the Federal medical assistance percentage by 0.1 percentage point for calendar quarters in each subsequent year in which the State fails to so comply.”.

(c) APPLICATION TO CHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2107(e)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397gg(e)(1)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (R) as subparagraphs (C) through (S), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) Section 1902(a)(25) (relating to third party liability).”.

(2) MANDATORY REPORTING.—Section 1902(a)(25)(I)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(25)(I)(i)), as amended by subsection (a)(5), is further amended—

(A) by striking “(and, at State option, child)” and inserting “and child”; and

(B) by striking “title XXI” and inserting “title XXI”.

(d) TRAINING ON THIRD PARTY LIABILITY.—Section 1936 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u-6) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(4), by striking “and quality of care” and inserting “, quality of care, and the liability of responsible third parties (as defined in section 1902(nn))”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) THIRD PARTY LIABILITY TRAINING.—

With respect to education or training activities carried out pursuant to subsection (b)(4) with respect to the liability of responsible third parties (as defined in section 1902(nn)) for payment for items and services furnished under State plans (or under waivers of such plans) under this title, the Secretary shall—

“(1) publish (and update on an annual basis) on the public Internet website of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services a dedicated Internet page containing best practices to be used in assessing such liability;

“(2) monitor efforts to assess such liability and analyze the challenges posed by that assessment;

“(3) distribute to State agencies administering the State plan under this title information related to such efforts and challenges; and

“(4) provide guidance to such State agencies with respect to State oversight of efforts under a medicaid managed care plan under section 1903(m) or 1932 to assess such liability.”.

(e) DEVELOPMENT OF MODEL UNIFORM FIELDS FOR STATES TO REPORT THIRD PARTY INFORMATION.—Not later than January 1, 2019, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, in consultation with the States, develop and make available to the States a model uniform reporting set of reporting fields and accompanying guidance documentation that States shall use for purposes of—

(1) reporting information to the Secretary within the Transformed Medicaid Statistical Information System (T-MSIS) (or a successor system); and

(2) collecting information that identifies responsible third parties (as defined in subsection (nn) of section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a), as added by subsection (a)(2)(A)) and other relevant information for ascertaining the legal responsibility of such third parties to pay for care and services available under the State plan (or under a waiver of the plan) under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) or under the State child health plan under title XXI of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1397 et seq.).

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section and the amendments made by this section (other than as specified in the preceding provisions of this section) shall take effect on October 1, 2019, and shall apply to medical assistance or child health assistance provided on or after such date.

(2) EXCEPTION IF STATE LEGISLATION REQUIRED.—In the case of a State plan for medical assistance under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), or a State child health plan for child health assistance under title XXI of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.), that the Secretary of

Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirement imposed by the amendments made under this section, such plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such title solely on the basis of its failure to meet this additional requirement before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of such session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

SEC. 402. TREATMENT OF LOTTERY WINNINGS AND OTHER LUMP-SUM INCOME FOR PURPOSES OF INCOME ELIGIBILITY UNDER MEDICAID.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(17), by striking “(e)(14), (e)(14)” and inserting “(e)(14), (e)(15)”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(14), as amended by section 303(c), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(K) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN LOTTERY WINNINGS AND INCOME RECEIVED AS A LUMP SUM.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is the recipient of qualified lottery winnings (pursuant to lotteries occurring on or after January 1, 2018) or qualified lump sum income (received on or after such date) and whose eligibility for medical assistance is determined based on the application of modified adjusted gross income under subparagraph (A), a State shall, in determining such eligibility, include such winnings or income (as applicable) as income received—

“(I) in the month in which such winnings or income (as applicable) is received if the amount of such winnings or income is less than \$80,000;

“(II) over a period of 2 months if the amount of such winnings or income (as applicable) is greater than or equal to \$80,000 but less than \$90,000;

“(III) over a period of 3 months if the amount of such winnings or income (as applicable) is greater than or equal to \$90,000 but less than \$100,000; and

“(IV) over a period of 3 months plus 1 additional month for each increment of \$10,000 of such winnings or income (as applicable) received, not to exceed a period of 120 months (for winnings or income of \$1,260,000 or more), if the amount of such winnings or income is greater than or equal to \$100,000.

“(ii) COUNTING IN EQUAL INSTALLMENTS.—For purposes of subclauses (II), (III), and (IV) of clause (i), winnings or income to which such subclause applies shall be counted in equal monthly installments over the period of months specified under such subclause.

“(iii) HARDSHIP EXEMPTION.—An individual whose income, by application of clause (i), exceeds the applicable eligibility threshold established by the State, shall continue to be eligible for medical assistance to the extent that the State determines, under procedures established by the State (in accordance with standards specified by the Secretary), that the denial of eligibility of the individual would cause an undue medical or financial hardship as determined on the basis of criteria established by the Secretary.

“(iv) NOTIFICATIONS AND ASSISTANCE REQUIRED IN CASE OF LOSS OF ELIGIBILITY.—A State shall, with respect to an individual who loses eligibility for medical assistance under the State plan (or a waiver of such plan) by reason of clause (i)—

“(I) before the date on which the individual loses such eligibility, inform the individual—

“(aa) of the individual’s opportunity to enroll in a qualified health plan offered through an Exchange established under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act during the special enrollment period specified in section 9801(f)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to loss of Medicaid or CHIP coverage); and

“(bb) of the date on which the individual would no longer be considered ineligible by reason of clause (i) to receive medical assistance under the State plan or under any waiver of such plan and be eligible to reapply to receive such medical assistance; and

“(II) provide technical assistance to the individual seeking to enroll in such a qualified health plan.

“(v) QUALIFIED LOTTERY WINNINGS DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘qualified lottery winnings’ means winnings from a sweepstakes, lottery, or pool described in paragraph (3) of section 4402 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or a lottery operated by a multistate or multijurisdictional lottery association, including amounts awarded as a lump sum payment.

“(vi) QUALIFIED LUMP SUM INCOME DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘qualified lump sum income’ means income that is received as a lump sum from one of the following sources:

“(I) Monetary winnings from gambling (as defined by the Secretary and including gambling activities described in section 1955(b)(4) of title 18, United States Code).

“(II) Damages received, whether by suit or agreement and whether as lump sums or as periodic payments (other than monthly payments), on account of causes of action other than causes of action arising from personal physical injuries or physical sickness.

“(III) Income received as liquid assets from the estate (as defined in section 1917(b)(4) of a deceased individual).”

(b) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) INTERCEPTION OF LOTTERY WINNINGS ALLOWED.—Nothing in the amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall be construed as preventing a State from intercepting the State lottery winnings awarded to an individual in the State to recover amounts paid by the State under the State Medicaid plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) for medical assistance furnished to the individual.

(2) APPLICABILITY LIMITED TO ELIGIBILITY OF RECIPIENT OF LOTTERY WINNINGS OR LUMP SUM INCOME.—Nothing in the amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall be construed, with respect to a determination of household income for purposes of a determination of eligibility for medical assistance under the State plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) (or a waiver of such plan) made by applying modified adjusted gross income under subparagraph (A) of section 1902(e)(14) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(e)(14)), as limiting the eligibility for such medical assistance of any individual that is a member of the household other than the individual who received qualified lottery winnings or qualified lump-sum income (as defined in subparagraph (K) of such section 1902(e)(14), as added by subsection (a)(2) of this section).

SEC. 403. ADJUSTMENTS TO MEDICARE PART B AND PART D PREMIUM SUBSIDIES FOR HIGHER INCOME INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1839(i)(3)(C)(i)(II) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395r(i)(3)(C)(i)(II)) is amended, in the table, by striking the last row and inserting the following new rows:

“More than \$160,000 but less than \$500,000 80 percent
At least \$500,000 100 percent.”

(b) JOINT RETURNS.—Section 1839(i)(3)(C)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395r(i)(3)(C)(ii)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: “except, with respect to the dollar amounts applied in the last row of the table under subclause (II) of such clause (and the second dollar amount specified in the second to last row of such table), clause (i) shall be applied by substituting dollar amounts which are 175 percent of such dollar amounts for the calendar year”.

(c) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 1839(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395r(i)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “In the case” and inserting “Subject to subparagraph (C), in the case”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “subparagraph (A)” and inserting “subparagraph (A) or (C)”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) TREATMENT OF ADJUSTMENTS FOR CERTAIN HIGHER INCOME INDIVIDUALS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to each dollar amount in paragraph (3) of \$500,000.

“(ii) ADJUSTMENT BEGINNING 2027.—In the case of any calendar year beginning after 2026, each dollar amount in paragraph (3) of \$500,000 shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(II) the percentage (if any) by which the average of the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers (United States city average) for the 12-month period ending with August of the preceding calendar year exceeds such average for the 12-month period ending with August 2025.”; and

(2) in paragraph (6)(B), by inserting “(other than \$500,000)” after “the dollar amounts”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to consider a very, very important public health bill, H.R. 3922, the CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act. This legislation funds a 5-year extension of the Children’s Health Insurance Program, known as CHIP, along with a 2-year extension of community health centers and numerous other critically important public health programs.

This bill will deliver quality healthcare and peace of mind to millions of Americans. The patients and families helped by this legislation are our neighbors and our friends. More than 8 million children receive CHIP-funded coverage, and more than 25 million patients are served by our community health centers and other important programs.

This 5-year funding of CHIP marks one of the longest extensions of the program since it was created 20 years ago. The policy we are considering mirrors the bipartisan policy that has been introduced and voted out of our sister

committee in the United States Senate.

Funding for these important programs expired September 30. The committee worked on a bipartisan basis well before this deadline to try and reach a bipartisan agreement on a range of policies to offset the costs of this very critically important funding extension.

Three times, at the request of the Democrats, we delayed committee action—three times. We tried to find offsets that were agreeable as we have always been able to do before. Unfortunately, that was not the case this time. These delays meant Congress went past the deadline of September 30.

While States still have rollover CHIP funds available and the next wave of community health center funds won't go out until next year, we cannot wait any longer. Patients cannot wait any longer. Patients need care, these critical programs need funding, and we must move forward.

In my district alone, there are 12 federally qualified health center organizations, with 63 delivery sites. They leverage \$41 million in Federal money in order to serve more than 240,000 patients in Oregon's Second District. These health centers—and I have visited many of them—are prevention and public health in action, often serving as the main provider of care for people for hundreds of miles around.

We are also extending the National Health Service Corps and the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education program. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are really important workforce programs that place qualified providers into some of the most underserved areas of our country.

In addition to community health centers and the workforce programs, this bill extends the funding for the Special Diabetes Program and the Family-to-Family Health Information centers, the Personal Responsibility Program, and the Youth Empowerment Program. These locally based, patient-centered organizations provide comprehensive services to those most in need.

Moreover, this legislation eliminates 2 years of the across-the-board cuts to Medicaid allotments called for under the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare. We delay those cuts for disproportionate share hospitals for 2 years. Medicaid DSH funding represents an important component of many State Medicaid programs and is particularly relied upon by many States to help provide additional resources to key safety net providers.

Now, while this relief is only temporary and does not address the larger structural challenges under ObamaCare, it would give Congress time to explore what budget-neutral approaches there might be to allocate existing DSH dollars on a more equitable and fair basis. In my State alone of Oregon, hospitals have told me this relief in this bill, just for them, represents \$6.8 million over the next 2

years that they can use to help low-income people get access to hospital care.

Now, in paying for this package—and this is the area where we have the most disagreement with the Democrats—we have taken a fiscally responsible approach, like using existing funding streams for prevention and public health efforts, ensuring high-dollar lottery winners are removed from the Medicaid program so its limited resources can be prioritized for the most vulnerable, and stopping individuals on the Affordable Care Act's exchanges from gaming the system.

The bill also asks Medicare's wealthiest 1 percent, people who are retired and making \$40,000 a month—not a year, a month—to pay about \$135 more for their Medicare just on parts B and D that is already subsidized by 75 percent, just a little more so we can fund children's health insurance for 5 years.

While it was not ultimately possible, unfortunately, to reach consensus on some of the policies to offset the new funding in this bill, there is broad bipartisan agreement on the core policies contained in this legislation, and I believe there is bipartisan support for many of the reasonable and fiscally responsible offsets contained in H.R. 3922.

Mr. Speaker, this is good legislation. This is long-overdue legislation. It reflects the good work done by your House Energy and Commerce Committee, and I urge my colleagues to put politics aside today and ensure these vital programs get the funding extensions they need. We are over the deadline. It is time to act.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 3922, a partisan bill to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, as well as community health centers and other public health programs.

It pains me to be here today, because this should not be a partisan bill. I have tried for months to negotiate with Republicans to develop a bipartisan compromise, but House Republicans chose to spend the first 9 months of this year trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They failed, but now House Republicans are using the reauthorization of CHIP and community health centers as a way to once again sabotage the ACA.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker: if Republicans can't repeal the ACA outright, they will cripple it any time they can.

This time, Republicans are risking the healthcare of nearly 9 million children and the care of families all around the country that use community health centers. They are risking that care because this partisan bill has no chance of ever becoming law.

By taking this route, Republicans are guaranteeing that CHIP and community health centers will not be reau-

thorized until the end of the year, and that is extremely unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support CHIP, our community health centers, and all of our public health programs that are extended in this bill. These programs have traditionally been bipartisan, but the bill before us extends these programs by taking billions of dollars away from the Affordable Care Act and undermining Medicare.

In short, this Republican bill offers a false choice. On one hand, it strips healthcare away from upwards of 680,000 Americans and guts the Prevention Fund, which pays for immunization and vaccines, lead poisoning prevention, opioid treatment, and many other important programs; on other hand, it reauthorizes these important programs. Democrats strongly support reauthorization of these programs, but we reject the way Republicans are paying for them.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many other policies that save money, countless alternatives that Democrats have offered to Republicans for months. Yesterday I offered an alternative that would have provided a robust reauthorization and extension of these important programs, and it was paid for in a commonsense way.

My alternative would have changed the timing of payments to Medicare Advantage Plans. This approach was recommended by both the GAO and the Office of the Inspector General, but Republicans rejected it in the Rules Committee. They wouldn't even allow it to come before the full House for a vote. And why is because they would rather use reauthorization of CHIP and community health centers as another way to sabotage the Affordable Care Act.

I simply reject that approach and strongly urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, before I call on my next person to say something here, there are 17,000 children in Mr. PALLONE's district and 14 health centers that, if he votes "no," he will be voting against.

By the way, the offset he recommended, people who are watching this need to know, would violate statute and it would be a PAYGO violation. That is why it was not acceptable.

See, this is the problem we faced. We delayed three times at their request only to be offered up a pay-for that violates statute and violates our PAYGO rules. We could not accept that. We have to operate within the law like everyone else in America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time, for the recognition.

Let me just say, I want to thank members of the Health Subcommittee, both sides of the dais, who have worked hard on this legislation, and it is unfortunate that it was not brought to the floor of the House in the month of September.

From a subcommittee perspective, we were ready. We had our legislative hearings in June. We were delayed one time when the whole House recessed after the shooting of the Members at the baseball practice, but we rescheduled for 2 weeks later, and we had a successful hearing. We had a good hearing; a lot of facts were laid out. We came up with commonsense legislation that was offset in a responsible way. The offsets are not draconian.

We have before us a bill today that will, in fact, fund some of the Nation's most important public health programs. It does fund the State Children's Health Insurance for 5 years, one of the longest extensions for this program since its inception in 1996. It will ensure that children and families who rely on this program will continue to receive the access they need. It also includes, in a fiscally responsible way, to delay the harmful ObamaCare-mandated cuts to safety net hospitals, who also provide care to underserved patients.

Now, think about that for a minute. We are accused of undermining ObamaCare, but here is a cut that ObamaCare mandates to your safety net hospitals across the country—not just in Texas, but across the country—and we are replacing that today in a fiscally responsible way.

It provides funding for community health centers, an important key part of healthcare in communities across the country. It will help the Americans who rely on these vital health services.

Not only does the bill provide assistance for underserved populations, but it does so without adding to the national debt. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget called this a responsible health package, noting that the \$18 billion cost is fully offset, with savings beyond the 10-year budget window.

Other groups have also been supportive: Texas Hospital Association, Texas Health Resources—for me back home—Children's Hospital, and a number of healthcare organizations.

We have data from MACPAC, whose job it is to advise Congress on Medicaid and CHIP policy; and MACPAC has advised us that, under current law, there are no new Federal funds for State Children's Health Insurance for fiscal year 2018 and beyond. Unless Congress acts to renew funding, all States will experience a shortfall in CHIP funds for 2018, which means, if someone is contemplating a “no” vote on this bill, if you are contemplating a “no” vote, you do need to be aware that if you live in the States of Arizona and Minnesota, you ran out of money in October of 2017; North Carolina, same situation. Oregon runs out next month. Vermont runs out next month. You need to think about your “no” vote before you apply it.

Every single U.S. territory, with the exception of Puerto Rico, ran out of money in the month of October.

So those are a few facts that people do need to bear in mind, if they vote

“no” on this bill, what the actual implications of that are.

Yesterday, during debate on the rule, I heard a lot of discussion about taking money out of the Prevention Fund. It doesn't take money out of the Prevention Fund, but it does provide discretion for some prevention and public health dollars. It takes it away from the executive branch and redirects these dollars to proven public health programs that enjoy broad bipartisan support in Congress, like community health centers.

So we are fulfilling our Article I responsibility. We shouldn't just be giving everything to the administration to decide how to spend money, whether it be a Democratic or Republican administration. This is the right thing to do.

I am proud of the work done by our subcommittee. I think our subcommittee staff has performed admirably on both sides of the dais.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on the bill. It is time to act, as our chairman has said.

□ 0930

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this bill, the so-called CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act. First of all, we are a month late and many dollars short. It was the majority that brought it up late. We didn't have anything to do with being late.

Secondly, we are playing political games with the lives of 14 percent of the children in my congressional district who receive their health insurance through the Children's Health Insurance Program and the five federally qualified health centers in my congressional district. They provide medical, dental, and mental health services to almost 55,000 of my constituents every year.

Reauthorizing these historically bipartisan programs is critical to the health and safety of not only my constituents but millions of others across our country.

Today, the Republican majority is holding them hostage by insisting to fund these programs by means-testing Medicare beneficiaries, kicking individuals who purchase their health coverage on the marketplaces off their insurance, and gutting the Public Health Prevention Fund established in the Affordable Care Act.

Remember, the Republicans have set their budget based on eliminating the Affordable Care Act. My State of California will run out of funding for CHIP sometime between now and December. This has never happened before in the history of this program.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, the community health centers in my district have told me about the difficult decisions they have to make because Congress has not reauthorized their funding, including layoffs of physicians and closing clinics' doors. We are playing with people's lives here.

If we can't find the funding for these important bipartisan programs, then we don't deserve to be Members of Congress. I cannot support a bill that hurts people instead of helping them.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond.

Mr. Speaker, my friend, and she is my friend from California, obviously was not aware of the fact that it was her party, her leader, who asked us on three occasions to delay bringing this to the floor, including you could look at the CQ article from October 23 where Mr. PALLONE says he hopes it doesn't come to the floor.

This was a bipartisan agreement not to bring it until we could try to work these things out. We were all trying to figure out how to get this done.

When it comes to Medicare, remember, we are talking about people making \$40,000 a month paying \$135 a month more. We can fully fund children's health insurance for millions of children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), the conference chairwoman.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his tremendous leadership on the reauthorization of CHIP, including many vital public health programs.

CHIP provides healthcare coverage for some 9 million children—more than a million in Washington State. We all need to remember how important this program is for the health of some of the most vulnerable.

Some States, like mine, are expecting to run out of CHIP funding soon. It is crucial that we move forward now.

This bill also reauthorizes the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education program, providing funding for 2 years, with a robust increase. This not only preserves current programs like the Spokane Teaching Health Center, but it also provides funding for the creation of new programs in communities that need them.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes a real difference to those who need healthcare, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is the ultimate absurdity for my colleague, the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, to suggest that somehow I control when a bill comes to the floor of the House of Representatives.

The only reason that the Republicans ever delayed bringing this vote to the floor is because they know and I know that, if this bill is partisan, it will

never become law. It will go to the Senate, and it will sit there, and the only way that it is going to become law is if it is a bipartisan effort that actually accomplishes something and gets most people to support it.

We could keep listening to the other side all day say: Oh, the Democrats delayed the vote. The Democrats delayed the vote.

The vote shouldn't be held today. The vote should be delayed today because this is going nowhere. This bill is going nowhere. They know it. You want to keep saying it? You can say it all day for the next hour, but it is the ultimate of absurdity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), who is the ranking member of our Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking member for yielding time to me.

I rise to oppose H.R. 3922. I got elected to Congress to expand access for healthcare. I am not a doctor, I am not a nurse, but as Members of Congress, we can do as much damage as someone who isn't a doctor or nurse by legislation that we see today.

And while I strongly support extending funding for the Children's Healthcare Insurance Program and federally qualified health centers, delaying cuts to disproportionate share hospital payments, advancing our other bipartisan healthcare programs, this legislation includes offsets that undermine access to cover these services.

Again, my goal in Congress was to expand healthcare, and this bill restricts that access. Two-thirds of Medicaid dollars go to children. If you cut Medicaid, you are cutting those children's benefits. This bill cuts children from Medicaid, and it gives money to the children who are less poor on CHIP. We need both programs. We don't need one or the other.

Both CHIP and FQHCs are bedrocks of our healthcare system, providing health insurance to almost 9 million lower-income children serving on the front lines by providing high-quality primary and preventative care to more than 25 million Americans.

Congress let funding for these programs expire last month, the first time in our history, since the 1960s, that the FQHCs and the CHIP program were not bipartisan. That is the step this House is making today by doing this.

It should be bipartisan because it has always been bipartisan. Unfortunately, instead of bipartisan negotiations looking for a compromise, the process was derailed. The bill cuts, again, Medicaid. Two-thirds are children, to help poor children, and limit their access.

The Prevention Fund funds the Centers for Disease Control. We have any number of future illnesses that we need the CDC to have the ability to fight that, and here we are, cutting vaccinations in our communities. We are cutting infectious disease detection and prevention.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and let's expand access and not restrict it.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would point out there are about 50,000 kids that Mr. GREEN may be voting against today in the Houston area if this goes down and we can't get this over to the Senate and work it out with them. Twice he has voted to cut the Prevention Fund and use it for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. This package is the product of our work on the Energy and Commerce Committee under the leadership of Chairman WALDEN. This legislation accomplishes the very important goals of reauthorizing the Children's Health Insurance Program, renewing funding for community health centers, and extending critical resources for Medicaid in Puerto Rico.

One of the first votes I cast in Congress was for CHIP, creating a fiscally responsible health program that now serves 8.5 million children in the United States.

I continue to support community health centers and the work they do in areas like Dover and Somerville, New Jersey, in the district I serve.

We also cannot forget about the many families and children in Puerto Rico, who also benefit from the Medicaid program. That is why I have teamed up with Resident Commissioner GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, to make sure low-cost Federal healthcare continues to be made available to our American children in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this legislation and for the United States Senate to act as soon as possible.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the situation we are in today. Historically, CHIP and community health centers have been bipartisan priorities. We are talking about programs that provide healthcare for millions of American children and serve some of our country's most vulnerable citizens.

Yet my Republican colleagues have inexplicably taken these programs hostage, tucking into this bill new attempts to undermine Medicare, sabotage the ACA, and strip hardworking Americans of their health insurance, not to mention they are trying to export these harmful policy changes a month after they let CHIP and community health center funding expire. This is absolutely unconscionable because, make no mistake, these cuts will hurt the same Americans who depend on CHIP and community health centers.

My Democratic colleagues and I care deeply about these programs. That is why we have sounded the alarm for months, not just yesterday, for months, and urged the majority to stop wasting time on ACA repeal and get to

work on renewing these lifelines for American families.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that didn't happen, and I am disappointed by what is happening now. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), a very important member of our committee.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly encourage my colleagues to support the HEALTHY KIDS Act. There are many reasons to support this bill, but, most importantly, it extends the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP, until 2022.

CHIP ensures that children with incomes too low for Medicaid get basic health insurance. Close to 400,000 children in Texas rely on CHIP for access to quality healthcare services. We must act now.

Earlier this year, Hurricane Harvey left a path of destruction across Texas. It put a major strain on our communities and resources that has resulted in moments of uncertainty.

The bottom line is, we must act now. This bill responsibly provides children in need with the proper resources to live a healthy life without adding to our country's deficit.

Mr. Speaker, again, I strongly urge my colleagues to act now. Vote for this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), the ranking member of our Oversight Subcommittee.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the authors of the original bill 20 years ago, I rise to express deep disappointment that the House has not been able to reach a bipartisan agreement on how to fund the extension of CHIP.

The September 30 deadline has long passed, and now 9 million children and families are waiting anxiously for us to figure this out. My home State of Colorado is likely to run out of CHIP funding in January, with termination notices going out to worried families in the next few weeks.

Yet here we are with a partisan bill that asks us to pay for low-income children's insurance on the backs of seniors and the most vulnerable.

The bill also cuts the Affordable Care Act, which could result in 668,000 people enrolled in ACA plans losing their health insurance. Nobody should have to lose coverage in order for others to keep it. This is a false choice, and it is out of step with what the American people have been calling on us to do. Only the 115th Congress could find a way to make the CHIP bill partisan.

Irrespective of what happens today in this vote, I urge my colleagues to get together across the aisle, across the Capitol, find a way to reauthorize this important bill in a way that doesn't cut benefits for other people. Let's

truly give kids these benefits that they need, and let's move on with our business.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), an incredible advocate for children and healthcare in America.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to serve on this great committee under the chairman's leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important bill, which incorporates my bill, the Community CARE Act, which reauthorizes funding for community health centers for the next 2 years.

Community health centers have a proven track record of providing high-quality, cost-efficient healthcare to approximately 25 million Americans, including 7 million children, and 300,000 veterans each year. There are over 100 million coordinated and integrated patient visits through the 1,400 community health centers across the country.

□ 0945

This bill will reauthorize CHIP for the next 5 years. This program is vital for the roughly 360,000 children on CHIP in Florida alone.

Additionally, this bill provides clarity for CHIP buy-in programs, such as the one we have in Florida. This sets the rules of the road and will ensure that 12,000 children in Florida's CHIP buy-in program will continue to have access to CHIP.

Mr. Speaker, let's get this done now for our children. I urge passage of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the truth is that Republicans are holding the Children's Health Insurance Program, 9 million kids, and the Community Health Center program, 15 million people, hostage to wreak even more havoc on our healthcare system and make children and seniors sicker and undercut Medicare.

Paying for children's health insurance on the backs of seniors is simply a disgrace. This bill would increase Medicare part D and part B income-related premiums, charging higher income seniors the entire cost. This is a structural attack on Medicare, and that is why the AARP, which supports the Children's Health Insurance Program, opposes this bill. Imposing a 100 percent premium is unfair because these seniors already pay more, and it will drive many out of Medicare altogether, undermining its solvency.

To make matters worse, the Republican income threshold is not based on current income, but on a 2-year period. So, for example, seniors' income is volatile, and if you sold your home, you could get a massive premium penalty, even if you used the money you got from selling your home to buy in to assisted living and that money wasn't available.

Income-related premiums are simply unnecessary. There are many other

ways to pay for the CHIP program without using Medicare as an ATM. Democrats have offered reasonable alternatives, but Republicans opposed all of them.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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

Before I call on my next colleague, I just want to point out that, in Ms. SCHAKOWSKY's district, all we are talking about here is seniors making \$41,000 a month—a month—would pay an extra 135 bucks so we can fully fund children's health insurance, community health centers. All these programs in here are funded. We use the Prevention Fund, which is not allocated out in the out-years. It is just a pot of money you can use for prevention and wellness. We actually use that to fund this as well.

This is why we have been unable to reach agreement with the Democrats. It is sad they have made this partisan.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of the people of the San Joaquin Valley in favor of H.R. 3922.

The people of the valley whom I represent in California did not send me here to put the lives of children at risk. I have made a commitment to improve access to healthcare for families that I have the honor to represent here in the House. I will continue to meet that commitment. The question is: Will Congress do the same and extend the Children's Health Insurance Program?

My congressional district has perhaps the largest percentage of children who qualify for the Children's Health Insurance Program in the entire country. The coverage is vital to families throughout my district, but it is particularly important to communities like Gustine, Planada, Chowchilla, and Biola, where these healthcare clinics provide such important, valuable healthcare to these children and their families.

Approximately 71 percent of the children in my district receive their medical coverage through the combination of the Children's Health Insurance Program and Medicaid. We cannot let this end.

This bill is not perfect, to be sure, but these children cannot be put at risk with further delays in funding for the important programs that this bill extends. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), the vice ranking member of our committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for decades now in America we have worked together to make sure that kids can see a doctor and get the care that they need. Working with pediatricians, families, and advocates back home, we have reached a historic point where almost all kids across the country have health insurance coverage.

The Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, or known in Florida as Florida KidCare, or Healthy Kids, has been an important piece of this historic coverage level. CHIP simply is vital for families, millions of hardworking families, so that their kids can get the checkups, the immunizations, sometimes the critical care that they need so they can be healthy and well.

Now, I chair the bipartisan Children's Healthcare Caucus. We educate and advocate so that kids across America are healthy and well. So it is especially disappointing this year that my Republican colleagues failed to act before CHIP expired.

See, they were consumed all year long with ripping health coverage away, decimating the Affordable Care Act, and radically changing health services provided under Medicaid. In doing so, they let our kids down; they let our families down. And then, at the 11th hour, after the program expired, they come up with a very partisan bill rather than the bipartisan bill that has been the historic backbone of Children's Health Insurance.

Don't take it from me. A lot of the advocates across the country, like pediatricians, obstetricians, gynecologists, March of Dimes, say: Please don't fund CHIP based upon harmful cuts; don't have cuts negatively impact the health of women, children, and families. Pediatricians say: Don't jeopardize other important child health policies in the process.

Let's go back to the drawing board as soon as possible, over the weekend, next week; bring it back to the floor next week, so that families and kids get the care that they need.

This bill today, unfortunately, is simply a delay.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, there they go again: delay, delay, delay; and vote against kids, vote against their hospitals, and vote against their doctors. That is why we couldn't get agreement.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON).

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act, which extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP, for another 5 years.

In 1997, Congress created S-CHIP in partnership with the States to meet the healthcare needs of lower income kids. Last year, nearly 100,000 Hoosier kids received health insurance thanks to this critical program. I am proud that this legislation will continue to protect vulnerable children in the Eighth District of Indiana.

This bill also extends 2 years of funding for federally qualified health centers, family-to-family health information centers, and other important public health programs. This funding provides important healthcare services, resources, and information for families in the Eighth District and across America.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of the CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, speaking to my chairman, Chairman WALDEN, I accept your commitment and your leadership on insuring children, but I am speaking to you because I reject the argument that, in order to fund a health insurance program that all of us support, we have to compromise health programs that benefit many other people, including in Vermont. Let me just give an example.

The prevention program in Vermont is really helping people stay well. We had \$922,000 that was spent on immunization programs for our kids. We had \$377,000 for lead poisoning prevention. Lead poisoning is brutal. We had \$372,000 for heart disease prevention and control, and we had over \$209,000 for diabetes and prevention control.

So I acknowledge your commitment. I acknowledge the urgency with which your side and our side supports CHIP. But why is it that, if we support it, we don't pay for it? And instead of paying for it directly, coming up with ways to eliminate waste in the healthcare system, we take away our ability to immunize, to prevent lead poisoning, to reduce heart disease? That is my question. The answer for me would be that we go where the waste is.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman from Vermont an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WELCH. The answer to me would be that our committee engages in addressing the waste in healthcare, including high prescription drug costs, rather than take it out of good programs.

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

I appreciate the gentleman's sincerity. We work well together on lots of issues. He has also voted to use this Prevention Fund for other purposes in the past, as have I.

We don't touch the Prevention Fund for 2018, and there is \$400 million left in 2019, and billions thereafter for the very important programs the gentleman has articulated. We don't use all the money. We leave money behind for these other purposes.

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

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

The bottom line is, when you start cutting money from the Prevention Fund, you are cutting prevention programs for kids, adults, the disabled, and, most importantly, the opiates.

CDC spends a significant amount of money from the Prevention Fund dealing with the opiate crisis, so don't tell me that somehow this is okay. You are taking money away from opiate prevention. You are taking money away from kids programs like lead poisoning

and vaccines. It is unbelievable how much is actually going to be lost from the Prevention Fund because of this bill.

I am not interested in what happened in the past. I want to know what is going to happen in the future. We have an opiate crisis. Don't take money away from the Prevention Fund that is used to deal with that crisis.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I do think it is important to note that my friend, and he is my friend from New Jersey, has twice voted to use this Prevention Fund for other purposes, including the 2012 middle class tax cut.

I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, we have talked a lot today on the floor about the children's component of this bill, the S-CHIP. It is a good program. It covers about 45 percent of the low-income children in Texas. It is a very worthwhile program and needs to be reauthorized and funded.

I also want to talk about the community health centers. In Ennis, Texas, there is the Nell Barton Hope Clinic Annex. Nell Barton was my mother.

The Joe Barton Family Foundation purchased a building for the Hope Clinic, which is a federally funded health center that is primarily located in Waxahachie, Texas. Every day, several dozen low-income people go to the Nell Barton Hope Clinic. Over the course of the year, several thousand people go to the Hope Clinic in both Ennis and Waxahachie. This bill reauthorizes those health centers for 2 years.

Now, my friends on the Democratic side, I am not sure what they are complaining about. This is a program that funds healthcare for children and for low-income people through the community health centers. It is fully offset, and funding is increasing, Mr. Speaker, not decreasing, but it is doing so in a way that it is offset. What is the big offset?

I hope we vote for this bill when it comes up for a vote later today.

□ 1000

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

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to talk about this use of the Prevention Fund. Democrats have never supported the type of drastic cuts to the Prevention Fund that is in this proposal today. In fact, when faced with such cuts, we voted "no" nine times. In the two cases where we voted in favor of using some of the Prevention Fund as an offset, neither cut placed the CDC programs and efforts at risk as this legislation does today.

The Republican proposal would cut the Prevention Fund nearly in half and leave a \$400 million hole in funding for prevention and health programs within the CDC's budget beginning in 2019.

This cut would be devastating to local, State and Federal efforts to protect the Nation's health.

Unlike my Republican counterparts, what they contend, this cut to these programs would not be made up in the annual appropriations process, as evidenced by the proposed cut of \$198 million to the CDC in the House Republican fiscal year 2018 appropriations bill, and the decrease of \$580 million in CDC funding since 2010 when adjusted for inflation.

Again, you talk about opiates, you talk about children's health programs. These would be drastically cut because of what they are doing today to the Prevention Fund.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, I would just point out that when Democrats joined Republicans in voting for the 2012 middle class tax cut, we used \$6.3 billion out of the Prevention Fund they now say they never touched, yet they have.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3922. I want to thank Chairman WALDEN and Dr. BURGESS for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today.

The CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act reauthorizes and funds a number of programs important to my constituents, including the State Children's Health Insurance Program, community health centers, and the Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education program.

H.R. 3922 will continue CHIP for 5 years, allowing this successful Federal-State partnership to provide health coverage for low-income children and pregnant women. It also extends funding to federally qualified health centers for 2 years, a key component of the healthcare safety net; and helps address our increasing health provider shortages by investing in the education and training of future health professionals.

Of importance, this legislation is fully paid for with responsible policies, such as measures to allow States to disenroll lottery winners from Medicaid and prioritize the most vulnerable.

I am proud of the good work that was done by the Energy and Commerce Committee to advance this legislation to the floor, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the bill and to ensure the programs are available for the people who depend upon them.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3922.

Mr. Speaker, the uncertainty that we have created for our community health clinics and their patients is unacceptable. Each day it is a new threat. Most

of the year it has been TrumpCare's severe cuts to Medicaid, which health centers and their patients rely upon. Today it is a lack of extension of the critical grant funding. Tomorrow or the next week, we will be back to ripping Medicaid away to pay for the Republican's tax cuts.

We have always extended CHIP and community health center funding on a bipartisan basis, but, unfortunately, the bill before us today is not bipartisan. The Prevention Fund, which would be slashed in this bill, funds programs that are critical to children and families who rely upon CHIP and community health centers. Many times these programs are even run out of our community health centers and could not exist without the Prevention Fund. These are things like childhood asthma prevention, vaccines, and lead abatement.

It often takes someone going above and beyond a simple doctor's visit to provide families with the resources they need to stay healthy. We need to invest in these services. We cannot strip this funding from critical prevention programs that children and families rely on. We cannot allow programs like Medicare and Medicaid to be attacked and raided.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 3922.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, once again, my dear friend from California has twice voted to use these Prevention Funds for other things. By the way, when we use them for community health centers, they are doing this work on the ground, helping people with opioid addictions and other healthcare issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his outstanding leadership on this very important committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to implore my colleagues to put politics aside for the sake of the 232,000 children in my State of Georgia and the 8.9 million children across our Nation who are counting on us to reauthorize CHIP. Twelve States will run out of CHIP funding before the end of this year. So the idea of waiting around another 2 months before acting on CHIP is simply unacceptable.

Let's be clear why we are here today. Instead of having this discussion 2 months ago, we had to delay the Energy and Commerce Committee markup of the CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act, the CHIP bill, because the other side of the aisle refused to even consider reasonable offsets to pay for the program.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: How was that objection related to fighting for the middle class?

Even President Obama supported the change for high-income Medicare beneficiaries in his annual budget.

How are we supposed to look parents in the eye back home and tell them

that we choose politics instead of choosing to relieve their concerns about coverage?

Mr. Speaker, let's do our job and let's reauthorize CHIP.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to gentleman California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3922.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we authorize CHIP and community health centers, but slashing essential public health funding is not the right way to do it.

Treatment of chronic diseases accounts for 75 percent of our Nation's healthcare spending, and many of these diseases can be prevented. Unfortunately, H.R. 3922 does not do that at all. This bill cuts in half the ACA Prevention and Public Health Fund that plays a critical role in preventing and treating chronic diseases, including keeping kids healthy.

The massive cuts to this funding will be devastating to my Central Valley of California district. My district has the largest number of tuberculosis cases in California for children under 5 years old. Children in this age group are more likely to develop life-threatening forms of TB since their immune systems are less mature. Public officials in my district are relying on funding from the Prevention Fund to address TB outbreaks.

It is troubling that Republicans are using CHIP reauthorization to take core public health services away from kids. It is also frustrating, but not surprising, that the Republicans are making another attempt to sabotage the Affordable Care Act. This legislation is robbing Paul to pay Peter, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

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

Mr. Speaker, sabotaging the Affordable Care Act; what we are doing is putting off planned cuts to our hospitals that take care of low-income people that those cuts called for under the Affordable Care Act. We are putting those off so they can serve these low-income people. That, in their language, is sabotaging the Affordable Care Act.

On the issue of using the Prevention Fund, my friend from California who just spoke, has twice voted to use the Prevention Fund, including for tax cuts in 2012 and for the 21st Century Cures Act last year. Now we are using it for community health centers and children's health insurance programs. This is an appropriate use of a fund that gets replenished by law every year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Puerto Rico (Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN), whose constituents and herself have suffered such damage, such destruction as a result of the hurricanes.

Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3922, the CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act.

I wanted to begin by first thanking Chairman WALDEN and Dr. BURGESS for their leadership in moving forward this critically needed legislation. I am particularly thankful for those in the leadership and all of my colleagues in the Energy and Commerce Committee for including a \$1 billion allocation to temporarily address Puerto Rico's impending ObamaCare-created medical cliff, while also providing another year of the disproportionate share hospital relief.

To put things in perspective, when we arrived in this Congress during January of this year, more than 1 million Puerto Ricans were facing the imminent possibility of losing their healthcare coverage due to a funding shortfall resulting from ObamaCare's disparate application to the island.

We moved quickly during the appropriations bill, and they allocated \$295 million to improve that situation. In this bill, we are allocating \$1 billion for Puerto Rico's Medicaid program. This is an important step, but we still need to secure a permanent and equitable solution to Puerto Rico's longstanding Medicaid inequalities, and that means changing the FMAP for the island.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as Puerto Rico struggles to recover from the historic damage of Hurricane Maria, this legislation shortchanges the island's long-struggling healthcare system at exactly the time that Puerto Rico most needs our help.

This legislation provides a measly sum of Puerto Rico's Medicaid system. Even before Hurricane Maria made landfall, Speaker RYAN had committed to help resolve Puerto Rico's looming Medicaid crisis, yet this bill provides just \$1 billion. We have no assurance or guarantee that the next emergency supplemental will provide appropriate funds to address this problem.

The fact is that our fellow citizens have been shortchanged by the disparity in Medicaid funding. This forced the government of Puerto Rico to borrow money to provide healthcare. So if you wonder where Puerto Rico's financial crisis stems from, you can look right here at the U.S. Congress. Yet the amount included in this bill is far from sufficient to address even this year's shortfall. For the Puerto Rican people who have already suffered so much, this funding level amounts to an insult.

If ever there were a time to channel aid to the island's healthcare system and fix the systemic problems that we sought in the system underfunding, this is it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, there are a litany of reasons to oppose this bill, but let's make it clear: one of them is that it will not do enough for the people of Puerto Rico. These are U.S. citizens. They have fought, shed blood, and died in every major conflict. Now they need our help, and this bill does not supply it. Reject this bill. Vote "no."

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

How cynical what we just heard. How cynical.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ has 43,000 children in CHIP, \$2 billion in DSH cuts in her district, 43 health centers, and she is going to vote against \$1 billion for the citizens of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands because that is not enough.

Yes, we need to do more, so her answer is vote "no" today and deny \$1 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 3922. Listening to my Democratic friends, it was said right by Chairman WALDEN. It is cynical, and it is amazing that they could vote against this bill.

Not only does this bill reauthorize public health programs vital to Americans who need them most, but it does so in a fiscally responsible manner. Reauthorizing CHIP for a 5-year period was an important priority of children's healthcare providers in my district, but doing so while saving billions is an impressive feat.

On top of that, providing funding for community health centers will drastically improve rural health in South Carolina's Fifth District. This bill is proof that the American people can trust their government to provide essential services to citizens who cannot provide for themselves, without saddling our children and grandchildren with debt.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, Chairman WALDEN, for his impressive efforts in striving toward a greater government.

□ 1015

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), who is a member of our committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, this moment is a bit hard to stomach. It is hard to stomach yet another attempt to sabotage the Affordable Care Act, in the words of our colleagues, while extolling the virtues of public health programs by cutting grace periods down to 30 days that will result in hundreds of thousands of people losing access to their insurance.

It is hard to stomach a \$1 trillion tax cut being proposed for wealthy adults at the same time that our Republican colleagues are telling us that we can't afford to care for sick kids. It is hard to stomach the indifference shown in this Chamber over the course of the

past month as CHIP lapses and panic sets in amongst families whose lives depend on this program.

It is hard to stomach an idea that the only way to give them care is to somehow take it away from somebody else, by gutting the Public Health Fund in the midst of an opioid epidemic or scapegoating patients who struggle to afford the monthly premiums and sometimes fall behind.

Why is it always those patients who are asked to sacrifice?

It is always those communities that are asked to do more with less.

Why do we somehow create a false choice on this floor today that leads 9 million families to an impossible choice tomorrow?

For those families, CHIP is not a privilege or a line item in the budget, it is a lifeline. They deserve the same decency and the same urgency that our Republican colleagues showed the wealthy in their tax plan yesterday.

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

Wow. We are fully funding CHIP for 5 years. We are fully funding our community health centers for 2 years. We are taking care of programs for our citizens who have diabetes. And the pay-for that they are objecting to most is we are asking the wealthiest seniors in America, those making \$40,000 a month, to pay \$135 more for their Medicare so we can do this work that is so important.

How ironic. How cynical. This is a pay-for that has been used before for other programs. President Obama himself suggested in a budget that, instead of the top earners, the \$480,000 a year, a couple making over \$800,000 a year pay a little more as we do here, take it all the way down to \$80,000 a year.

We didn't do that. We just said, if you are making \$480,000 a year, roughly \$40,000 a month, you will pay \$135 more. They will not vote for that cut to fund children's healthcare. We will.

That is what is going on here. This is where we could never get them off dead center to make this bipartisan. It is a tragedy this is not a bipartisan bill as it always has been. I, three times, delayed moving this forward, including crossing the deadline of September 30, to try to find common ground that would be bipartisan, and we could never get there because they would never yield in a way where we could find common ground.

So we must go to the Senate from here and we must get our work done for the American people.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation because it presents us with a choice that we should not have to make. I take a backseat to nobody in this institution in terms of fighting for children and families.

But we live in the United States of America, the greatest Nation in the world. I reject the notion that we have to rob Peter to pay Paul or, in this instance, jeopardize the future of Medicare and steal \$6 billion from critical prevention programs to pay for children's healthcare. They are all equal priorities, and we shouldn't have to sacrifice the health of one population to pay for another. It is that simple.

The changes that the bill makes to Medicare may sound innocuous—and I have great respect for the chairman—but the reality is they will threaten the future of Medicare.

Means testing Social Security is a good sound bite, but it is a very slippery slope. I'm not worried about whether wealthy families can be able to afford to pay for increased Medicare premiums, but I am worried that these changes will result in wealthy people abandoning the program in large numbers, which would worsen the risk pool and ultimately increase the costs for middle- and lower-income seniors. It would fracture completely the universal nature of Medicare and put the entire program at risk. It is an unwise proposal that should be rejected.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, may I get a time count, please, on how much each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 45 seconds remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Children's Health Insurance Program began as a truly bipartisan initiative, but now it is being overwhelmed by Republican indifference. So low is it on their priority list that they let the law expire. Three States have already required emergency funding, and 400,000 Texas children are at risk if this program is not continued.

In the face of this crisis, their response is: We won't put another new dollar into this program unless we take it from Medicare beneficiaries.

Why should we begin calling on those who rely on Medicare to pay for non-Medicare purposes?

It is wrong.

The second way they propose to fund this bill is by reducing funding for public health and prevention, whether it is for Zika and West Nile virus, where I live down in Texas, or it is for the opioid crisis, which is affecting our State like every other one.

Sure, we are glad to hear President Trump do a tweet and give a speech. But he did not add any new dollars to fight this opioid crisis. We need bold action, and it is not by reducing the Prevention and Public Health Fund. It is by supporting our children.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I will just point out that the gentleman who just spoke has voted to cut the Prevention Fund before to use it for other purposes.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support fully funding the CHIP Act, but to oppose to the Republican bill.

Because of the reduction in the grace period, we are forcing Americans to go into their own pocket. Although this bill will reauthorize CHIP, it fails to show compassion for the low-income families and children who do not have access to critical healthcare, and it is a matter of life and death.

CHIP's impact is overwhelmingly felt in communities of color. Together, CHIP and Medicaid help cover 52 percent of Hispanic and 54 percent of all Black children nationwide.

As Members of Congress, we have a duty to protect our Nation's children. We need to support the millions of families who rely on this vital program. This is not the right way. We need to work together in a bipartisan manner to pass an important piece of legislation like CHIP and not take away from our children but support them.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 45 seconds remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to stress again that one of the pay-fors that the Republicans don't talk about much is the fact that they are reducing the grace period from 90 days to 30 days. So if someone misses a payment on their insurance, they currently have 90 days to make up for it. Under this bill, they will only have 30 days.

Now, the CBO estimates that over 500,000 people will lose their health insurance and have to reapply for next year because of this reduction in the grace period. I know my colleague from the other side says: Well, that is too bad because they have the responsibility to pay it.

But the fact of the matter is that a lot of people have a hard time paying their monthly premium, and we should not be passing legislation that ends up with half-a-million people losing their health insurance.

Again, this is a way to sabotage the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act is trying to make more people covered, and has succeeded in covering 95 percent of the people in this country.

Why in the world would we use a pay-for that cuts back on half-a-million people who would lose their health insurance?

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, we did not have to be here today. We could have done a bipartisan bill without sabotaging the Affordable Care Act. That is what concerns me most, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans tried to re-

peal the Affordable Care Act. They failed, and now they are trying to repeal it piece by piece.

The pay-fors that are in this legislation are unfair to the American people. The Prevention Fund is used for opiate prevention and used for kids for various programs. Don't cut back on that to pay for these other things.

The grace period—half-a-million Americans are going to lose their insurance because of the cutbacks in the grace period—another effort to sabotage the Affordable Care Act.

Lastly, and probably even most important, again, the Republicans are going against the Medicare program. They are trying to make cuts in the Medicare program and restructure the Medicare program in a way that I believe will hurt the Medicare program, reduce the amount of people in the insurance pool, and ultimately lead to higher costs for middle class and lower-income seniors and the disabled in the Medicare program.

I urge my colleagues: Don't let the Republicans continue to sabotage the Affordable Care Act. We could have done this on a bipartisan basis. Passing this bill today does nothing for the Children's Health Initiative or for community health centers because this bill is going nowhere. It will end up in the Senate. The Senate will not take it up, and we will be waiting around until Christmas to actually find a way to fund these programs and put these programs at risk. Vote "no."

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, let's get this back where it belongs. We are fully funding the Children's Health Insurance Program for 5 years and community health centers for 2 years. The only sabotage of the Affordable Care Act going on here today is stopping cuts for hospitals in our districts that serve low-income people that would otherwise occur under the Affordable Care Act. We do that for 2 years.

The Democrats don't think seniors making \$40,000 a month—\$40,000 a month—should pay an extra \$135 for their part B and part D Medicare so we can take care of our community health centers and children who need health insurance.

We delayed this bill coming to the floor at a bipartisan request to find a bipartisan solution that was elusive, sadly. We have never had this problem before, but we have it today. We must act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Community Health and Medical Professionals Improve Our Nation (CHAMPION) Act of 2017 (H.R. 3922).

While I support reauthorizing funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), the Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs), and various other important public health programs, I oppose this bill because it cuts funding for public health, puts families at

risk of losing their health insurance, and weakens Medicare.

The health of children and expecting and new mothers is something that we can all agree on. In my home state of Minnesota, CHIP funding is essential for providing healthcare to 125,000 low income children and 1,700 expecting and new mothers. Minnesota also depends on FQHC funding with over 190,000 people receiving care from one of the more than 70 community health centers in my state last year.

Unfortunately, House Republicans have turned these bipartisan issues into an opportunity to divide us. The offsets included in this legislation are unacceptable to me and to Minnesota families.

Once again, Republicans are using this legislation as yet another opportunity to weaken the Affordable Care Act (ACA) by cutting \$6.35 billion from the Prevention and Public Health Fund over the next ten years. This fund, created by the ACA, directly funds our nation's prevention, preparedness, and response capabilities.

If these Republican cuts become law, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention would be forced to provide less funding to cities, states, and tribes to rapidly address public health crises. This money includes funding for vaccines, flu prevention, and addressing the opioid epidemic. When my home state of Minnesota had to recently deal with a serious outbreak of measles, our community health officials utilized these federal resources to rapidly contain the spread of disease. Simply put, this irresponsible offset leaves American communities more vulnerable to, and unprepared for, outbreaks of disease.

In addition, this bill takes aim at yet another ACA provision by shortening the 90-day grace period for individuals to pay premiums before their insurer can terminate their coverage. The current grace period allows low and moderate income families experiencing temporary financial difficulties to remain covered by their health insurance. Shortening this grace period from 90 days to 30 days would cause nearly 700,000 Americans to lose their health care and bars them from purchasing health insurance until the next season.

I am also concerned by the provision that introduces means testing to Medicare. A key strength of Medicare is its universal nature. All Americans pay into Medicare and all Americans should receive at least some benefit from it. This provision breaks that guarantee and sets a dangerous precedent for the future. I am also concerned that it could weaken the Medicare risk pool and increase costs for the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, even the Majority concedes that this bill is unlikely to pass the Senate due to the partisan nature of its provisions. Republicans need to stop playing games and reauthorize these programs before Minnesota faces a critical December 1 deadline to continue coverage for children and expecting mothers.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure and instead to work together to fund CHIP and community health centers.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the bill being considered on the floor today, H.R. 3922, the CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act. Unfortunately, this deceitfully named measure to reauthorize the Children's Health

Insurance Program (CHIP) and Community Health Centers (CHCs) will reauthorize these programs through FY19—but does so by kicking thousands of Americans off private insurance.

Like many of my colleagues, I strongly support CHIP, CHCs, and other critical public health initiatives. However, the bill in its current form was drafted as yet another attempt by Republicans to undermine the Affordable Care Act in order to justify its repeal. The bill is misguided in its attempt to cut \$6.35 billion over ten years from the Prevention and Public Health Fund in order to fund the extension.

H.R. 3922 also reduces grace periods from 90 to 30 days, putting more than 688,000 low- and moderate-income individuals at risk of losing their state Marketplace coverage for simply paying their premiums in the second of third month of the existing grace period. This grace period is essential to low-income households that are barely making ends meet. By reducing the current grace period, Republicans are exposing thousands of families to risk due to a lack of health coverage. It is frankly disgraceful that we would even consider undermining these important public health programs in such a manner.

Mr. Speaker, CHIP, CHCs, the National Health Service Corps, and other programs funded under this measure are vitally important to our nation and the public health of our citizens. As the first registered nurse elected to Congress, I understand the critical need for proper long-term funding of our public health centers and programs. However, these cuts to the Prevention and Public Health Fund represent a purely political move by the GOP to undermine the ACA. I oppose this controversial offset, not my support for health centers across America. I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure so that we can find offsets driven by policy, not politics, in order to sufficiently fund our health centers and promote public health for all.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on House consideration of H.R. 3922, Championing Healthy Kids Act, which would reauthorize the State Children Health Insurance Program (S-CHIP).

As the founder and chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I am well aware of the work that went into creating this important program.

I joined with members of the bipartisan Children's Caucus to champion the worthy goals of S-CHIP.

Congress and President Clinton responded to the needs of 10 million children in the United States who lacked health insurance, S-CHIP was created in 1997 to insure children in families with too much income to qualify for Medicaid and too little to afford private insurance.

I voted for the S-CHIP program when it came to the floor for a vote as part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

I worked tirelessly along with other members of the House to make sure the S-CHIP program was created.

I voted to extend the life of the program when Congress reauthorized S-CHIP in 2009 under the Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act and again when it became part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010.

The program represented a grand bargain that allowed Democrats and Republicans to

agree that healthcare for the nation's children was a laudable and achievable goal.

H.R. 3922, Championing Healthy Kids Act, is not a reauthorization of the S-CHIP program it is political theater at its worse.

The leadership of the House is betraying all that this body has done for 20 years to sustain and improve S-CHIP.

The bill before the House is political theater and not real legislating—a partisan attack against Medicare that has no place in a real bill about healthcare for children.

I am a strong supporter of S-CHIP and would vote for that program any day it is brought to the House Floor.

This imposter S-CHIP bill is not worthy to be considered by this body.

The motion to recommit this bill should be supported so that the offensive offsets could be removed so that the bill can be brought back to the full House for consideration.

After weeks of negotiations to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), Community Health Centers (CHCs) and other important public health programs, which have always been bipartisan priorities, House Republicans have decided to bring a partisan bill to the Floor.

This bill will only further delay the reauthorization of these programs, many of which expired on September 30th.

The bill passed out of the Energy and Commerce Committee at the beginning of October with no Democratic support.

Democrats in Committee instead offered a package that invests in our children and safety net providers, and does not sacrifice the nation's health.

Democrats have made it clear for weeks that the pay-fors in this bill are problematic.

Rather than working toward a bipartisan agreement, Republicans revised their bill to include even steeper cuts to public health programs, in addition to undermining the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

The bill includes woefully inadequate funding for Medicaid programs in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, which are facing unprecedented demands on their health care systems following the devastation caused by Hurricane Maria.

Puerto Rico Governor Ricardo Rossello last week requested \$1.6 billion annually to deal with the state's underfunded Medicaid program that is expected to be further strained by the short- and long-term health implications of the natural disaster.

The approximately \$1 billion over two years in Puerto Rico Medicaid funding included in the Republican bill is not only insufficient, but it would also require Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands to match those dollars at a time of increased demand and revenue collapse in both territories, exacerbating delays in recovery.

This bill also seeks to cut \$6.35 billion to the Prevention and Public Health Fund (PPHF).

The Prevention Fund was created by the ACA to make national investments in prevention and public health, to improve health outcomes, to enhance health care quality, and reduce health care costs.

It has been used to increase awareness of and access to preventive health services, such as cancer screenings, tobacco cessation and childhood vaccines—as well as concentrating on preventing chronic disease to help more Americans stay healthy.

Cutting these funds will have a devastating impact on public health initiatives at the federal, state and local levels.

Republicans are also shortening the grace period for missed premium payments from ninety days to thirty, which would result in up to 688,000 people losing health coverage.

House Republicans are insisting that in order to provide some of our most vulnerable Americans with coverage, it must be paid for by cancelling the health insurance of other Americans after a single payment is missed.

While Republicans are pushing for tax cuts for the wealthy that explode the deficit, when it comes to health coverage for children and low-income Americans, Republicans are insisting that it be paid for at the cost of weakening our health care system and pushing other Americans off health insurance.

States have begun to use emergency funding, cut benefits, and will soon begin sending disenrollment notices to thousands of families if CHIP is not reauthorized.

Republicans' decision to advance a partisan bill rather than a compromise has very real consequences for families across the country.

In 2016, 35,626,329 children in the United States had healthcare coverage under S-CHIP or the Medicaid Child Program.

In 2016, although the state of Texas had 38 percent of our children covered under the S-CHIP program, there were still 9.2 percent children without health insurance coverage.

Paying for this package by weakening health care in America:

Shortening the grace period for missed premium payments will cause up to 688,000 Americans to lose their health coverage.

Cutting \$6.35 billion from the Prevention Fund will have a devastating impact on public health initiatives at the federal, state and local levels.

Requiring Medicare means testing of 100 percent for beneficiaries making over \$500,000. This provision will take away a benefit American seniors have paid into their entire lives.

These offsets are even more egregious since they are being considered just one week after House Republicans began the process of passing tax cuts for the wealthy that is not offset and will add \$1.5 trillion to the deficit.

Instead of reauthorizing these programs, House Republicans wasted time attempting to repeal the ACA.

There are better ways to pay for S-CHIP that do not put the guarantee of Medicare at risk our nation's seniors.

1. Reduce tax expenditures for the top 1 percent of income-earners—Our current tax code imposes higher tax rates on income earned through hard work while providing preferential treatment to unearned financial gains and allowing billions of dollars of stock profits and other capital gains to pass tax-free to heirs of multi-million-dollar fortunes. Reducing the benefit of these tax expenditures would help rebalance the tax code so that it stops favoring wealth over work. CBO has determined that 17 percent of the benefits of major "tax expenditures" go to households in the top one percent of income earners at a cost of more than \$1.5 trillion over ten years. We could reduce this benefit to pay for needed national priorities.

2. Cancel the tax break for corporate jets—Repeal tax breaks such as those for corporate jets, which are allowed a faster depreciation

schedule than passenger and freight aircraft. Based on past Joint Committee on Taxation estimates, repealing the tax break on corporate jets alone would raise \$3 billion over ten years.

3. Restrict deductions for egregious CEO bonuses when employees don't get a raise—Repeal the exemption to the \$1 million limit on compensation for CEOs and other specified corporate employees that a publicly traded corporation can deduct as a business expense, unless their workers are getting paycheck increases that reflect increases in worker productivity and the cost of living. Based on Joint Committee on Taxation estimates, just limiting the deductibility of excessive CEO compensation would raise \$12 billion over ten years.

4. Close loopholes in the U.S. international corporate tax system that encourage companies to invert, and ship jobs and profits overseas—Prevent U.S. companies from “inverting” and pretending that they are based in other countries purely to reduce their taxes. Enact proposals that would limit the ability of corporations to reap substantial tax benefits by shifting operations, capital, intellectual property, and jobs overseas for tax purposes or to shelter their profits from U.S. taxation in foreign tax havens. Based on estimates of past proposals, over \$500 billion over ten years could be raised under such proposals.

5. Close the “carried interest” loophole taxing hedge fund managers’ compensation at lower capital gains rates—End the loophole which allows certain investment managers at hedge funds and private equity firms to pay capital gains tax rates (up to a maximum of just 20 percent) on income received as compensation for services they provided, rather than ordinary income tax rates up to 39.6 percent that all other working Americans pay on the compensation they receive for their labor. Past estimates show closing this loophole would raise over \$19 billion over ten years.

States have begun to use emergency funding, cut benefits, and will soon begin sending disenrollment notices to thousands of families if CHIP is not reauthorized.

It is time for the House Leadership to stop playing politics with health insurance coverage for our nation's most vulnerable children and pass a clean S-CHIP bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 601, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. CLYBURN. I am opposed in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Clyburn moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3922 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Continuing Community Health and Medical Professional Programs to Improve Our Nation and Keep Insurance Delivery Stable Act of 2017” or the “CHAMPION KIDS Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.

Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—MEDICAID AND PUBLIC HEALTH EXTENDERS

Sec. 101. Extension for community health centers and the National Health Service Corps.

Sec. 102. Extension for special diabetes programs.

Sec. 103. Reauthorization of program of payments to teaching health centers that operate graduate medical education programs.

Sec. 104. Extension for family-to-family health information centers.

Sec. 105. Youth empowerment program; personal responsibility education.

Sec. 106. Decreasing reduction in Medicaid DSH allotments.

Sec. 107. Increase in territorial cap for Medicaid payments.

Sec. 108. Puerto Rico and United States Virgin Island Disaster Relief Medicaid.

Sec. 109. Delay of Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 third party liability provisions.

TITLE II—CHIP

Sec. 201. Five-year funding extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 202. Extension of certain programs and demonstration projects.

Sec. 203. Extension of outreach and enrollment program.

Sec. 204. Extension of additional Federal financial participation for CHIP.

TITLE III—OFFSET

Sec. 301. Implementation of Office of Inspector General recommendation to delay certain Medicare plan prepayments.

TITLE I—MEDICAID AND PUBLIC HEALTH EXTENDERS

SEC. 101. EXTENSION FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS AND THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS.

(a) COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS FUNDING.—Section 10503(b)(1)(E) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b-2(b)(1)(E)) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”.

(b) OTHER COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS PROVISIONS.—Section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(A)(ii), by striking “abuse” and inserting “use disorder”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(A), by striking “abuse” and inserting “use disorder”;

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (B) through (D);

(B) by striking “(1) IN GENERAL” and all that follows through “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) CENTERS.—The Secretary”; and

(C) in paragraph (1), as amended, by redesignating clauses (i) through (v) as subparagraphs (A) through (E) and moving the margin of each of such redesignated subparagraph 2 ems to the left;

(4) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) IMPROVING QUALITY OF CARE.—

“(1) SUPPLEMENTAL AWARDS.—The Secretary may award supplemental grant funds to health centers funded under this section to implement evidence-based models for increasing access to high-quality primary care services, which may include models related to—

“(A) improving the delivery of care for individuals with multiple chronic conditions;

“(B) workforce configuration;

“(C) reducing the cost of care;

“(D) enhancing care coordination;

“(E) expanding the use of telehealth and technology-enabled collaborative learning and capacity building models;

“(F) care integration, including integration of behavioral health, mental health, or substance use disorder services; and

“(G) addressing emerging public health or substance use disorder issues to meet the health needs of the population served by the health center.

“(2) SUSTAINABILITY.—In making supplemental awards under this subsection, the Secretary may consider whether the health center involved has submitted a plan for continuing the activities funded under this subsection after supplemental funding is expended.

“(3) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary may give special consideration to applications for supplemental funding under this subsection that seek to address significant barriers to access to care in areas with a greater shortage of health care providers and health services relative to the national average.”;

(5) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “2 years” and inserting “1 year”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“The Secretary shall not make a grant under this paragraph unless the applicant provides assurances to the Secretary that within 120 days of receiving grant funding for the operation of the health center, the applicant will submit, for approval by the Secretary, an implementation plan to meet the requirements of subsection (1)(3). The Secretary may extend such 120-day period for achieving compliance upon a demonstration of good cause by the health center.”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “AND PLANS”;

(ii) by striking “or plan (as described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (c)(1))”;

(iii) by striking “or plan, including the purchase” and inserting the following: “including—

“(i) the purchase”;

(iv) by inserting “, which may include data and information systems” after “of equipment”;

(v) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(vi) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) the provision of training and technical assistance; and

“(iii) other activities that—

“(I) reduce costs associated with the provision of health services;

“(II) improve access to, and availability of, health services provided to individuals served by the centers;

“(III) enhance the quality and coordination of health services; or

“(IV) improve the health status of communities.”;

(6) in subsection (e)(5)(B)—

(A) in the heading of subparagraph (B), by striking “AND PLANS”; and

(B) by striking “and subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (c)(1) to a health center or

to a network or plan” and inserting “to a health center or to a network”;

(7) by striking subsection (s);

(8) by redesignating subsections (g) through (r) as subsections (h) through (s), respectively;

(9) by inserting after subsection (f), the following:

“(g) NEW ACCESS POINTS AND EXPANDED SERVICES.—

“(1) APPROVAL OF NEW ACCESS POINTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may approve applications for grants under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (e)(1) to establish new delivery sites.

“(B) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary may give special consideration to applicants that have demonstrated the new delivery site will be located within a sparsely populated area, or an area which has a level of unmet need that is higher relative to other applicants.

“(C) CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall approve applications for grants under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (e)(1) in such a manner that the ratio of the medically underserved populations in rural areas which may be expected to use the services provided by the applicants involved to the medically underserved populations in urban areas which may be expected to use the services provided by the applicants is not less than two to three or greater than three to two.

“(D) SERVICE AREA OVERLAP.—If in carrying out subparagraph (A) the applicant proposes to serve an area that is currently served by another health center funded under this section, the Secretary may consider whether the award of funding to an additional health center in the area can be justified based on the unmet need for additional services within the catchment area.

“(2) APPROVAL OF EXPANDED SERVICE APPLICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may approve applications for grants under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (e)(1) to expand the capacity of the applicant to provide required primary health services described in subsection (b)(1) or additional health services described in subsection (b)(2).

“(B) PRIORITY EXPANSION PROJECTS.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary may give special consideration to expanded service applications that seek to address emerging public health or behavioral health, mental health, or substance abuse issues through increasing the availability of additional health services described in subsection (b)(2) in an area in which there are significant barriers to accessing care.

“(C) CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall approve applications for applicants in such a manner that the ratio of the medically underserved populations in rural areas which may be expected to use the services provided by the applicants involved to the medically underserved populations in urban areas which may be expected to use the services provided by such applicants is not less than two to three or greater than three to two.”;

(10) in subsection (i) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “and children and youth at risk of homelessness” and inserting “, children and youth at risk of homelessness, homeless veterans, and veterans at risk of homelessness”;

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (B);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in subparagraph (B) (as so redesignated)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “ABUSE” and inserting “USE DISORDER”; and

(II) by striking “abuse” and inserting “use disorder”;

(11) in subsection (l) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by inserting “UNMET” before “NEED”;

(ii) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “and an application for a grant under subsection (g)” after “subsection (e)(1)”;

(iii) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “unmet” before “need for health services”;

(iv) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(v) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(vi) by adding after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) in the case of an application for a grant pursuant to subsection (g)(1), a demonstration that the applicant has consulted with appropriate State and local government agencies, and health care providers regarding the need for the health services to be provided at the proposed delivery site.”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or subsection (g)” after “subsection (e)(1)(B)”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “in the catchment area of the center” and inserting “, including other health care providers that provide care within the catchment area, local hospitals, and specialty providers in the catchment area of the center, to provide access to services not available through the health center and to reduce the non-urgent use of hospital emergency departments”;

(iii) in subparagraph (H)(ii), by inserting “who shall be directly employed by the center” after “approves the selection of a director for the center”;

(iv) in subparagraph (L), by striking “and” at the end;

(v) in subparagraph (M), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(vi) by inserting after subparagraph (M), the following:

“(N) the center has written policies and procedures in place to ensure the appropriate use of Federal funds in compliance with applicable Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award.”; and

(C) by striking paragraph (4);

(12) in subsection (m) (as so redesignated), by adding at the end the following: “Funds expended to carry out activities under this subsection and operational support activities under subsection (n) shall not exceed 3 percent of the amount appropriated for this section for the fiscal year involved.”;

(13) in subsection (q) (as so redesignated), by striking “grants for new health centers under subsections (c) and (e)” and inserting “operating grants under subsection (e), applications for new access points and expanded service pursuant to subsection (g)”;

(14) in subsection (r)(4) (as so redesignated), by adding at the end the following: “A waiver provided by the Secretary under this paragraph may not remain in effect for more than 1 year and may not be extended after such period. An entity may not receive more than one waiver under this paragraph in consecutive years.”;

(15) in subsection (s)(3) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking “appropriate committees of Congress a report concerning the distribution of funds under this section” and inserting the following: “Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, and the Committee on Energy and Com-

merce of the House of Representatives, a report including, at a minimum—

“(A) the distribution of funds for carrying out this section”;

(B) by striking “populations. Such report shall include an assessment” and inserting the following: “populations;

“(B) an assessment”;

(C) by striking “and the rationale for any substantial changes in the distribution of funds.” and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the distribution of awards and funding for new or expanded services in each of rural areas and urban areas;

“(D) the distribution of awards and funding for establishing new access points, and the number of new access points created;

“(E) the amount of unexpended funding for loan guarantees and loan guarantee authority under title XVI;

“(F) the rationale for any substantial changes in the distribution of funds;

“(G) the rate of closures for health centers and access points;

“(H) the number and reason for any grants awarded pursuant to subsection (e)(1)(B); and

“(I) the number and reason for any waivers provided pursuant to subsection (r)(4).”; and

(16) in subsection (s) (as so redesignated) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) FUNDING FOR PARTICIPATION OF HEALTH CENTERS IN ALL OF US RESEARCH PROGRAM.—In addition to any amounts made available pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, section 402A of this Act, or section 10503 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, there is authorized to be appropriated, and there is appropriated, out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Secretary \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2018 to support the participation of health centers in the All of Us Research Program under the Precision Medicine Initiative under section 498E of this Act.”.

(c) NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS.—Section 10503(b)(2)(E) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b-2(b)(2)(E)) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3014(h)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “, as amended by section 221 of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015.”.

SEC. 102. EXTENSION FOR SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAMS.

(a) SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAM FOR TYPE I DIABETES.—Section 330B(b)(2)(C) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-2(b)(2)(C)) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”.

(b) SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAM FOR INDIGENTS.—Section 330C(c)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-3(c)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “and \$112,500,000 for the period consisting of the second, third, and fourth quarters of fiscal year 2018; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 2019.”.

SEC. 103. REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM OF PAYMENTS TO TEACHING HEALTH CENTERS THAT OPERATE GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

(a) PAYMENTS.—Subsection (a) of section 340H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) PAYMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (h)(2), the Secretary shall make payments under this section for direct expenses and indirect expenses to qualified teaching health

centers that are listed as sponsoring institutions by the relevant accrediting body for—

“(A) maintenance of existing approved graduate medical residency training programs;

“(B) expansion of existing approved graduate medical residency training programs; and

“(C) establishment of new approved graduate medical residency training programs, as appropriate.

“(2) PRIORITY.—In making payments pursuant to paragraph (1)(C), the Secretary shall give priority to qualified teaching health centers that—

“(A) serve a health professional shortage area with a designation in effect under section 332 or a medically underserved community (as defined in section 799B); or

“(B) are located in a rural area (as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act).”.

(b) FUNDING.—Subsection (g) of section 340H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h) is amended—

(1) by striking “To carry out” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To carry out”;

(2) by striking “and \$15,000,000 for the first quarter of fiscal year 2018” and inserting “, \$15,000,000 for the first quarter of fiscal year 2018, \$111,500,000 for the period consisting of the second, third, and fourth quarters of fiscal year 2018, and \$126,500,000 for fiscal year 2019, to remain available until expended”;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Of the amount made available to carry out this section for any fiscal year, the Secretary may not use more than 5 percent of such amount for the expenses of administering this section.”.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTING.—Subsection (h)(1) of section 340H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (H); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) The number of patients treated by residents described in paragraph (4).

“(E) The number of visits by patients treated by residents described in paragraph (4).

“(F) Of the number of residents described in paragraph (4) who completed their residency training at the end of such residency academic year, the number and percentage of such residents entering primary care practice (meaning any of the areas of practice listed in the definition of a primary care residency program in section 749A).

“(G) Of the number of residents described in paragraph (4) who completed their residency training at the end of such residency academic year, the number and percentage of such residents who entered practice at a health care facility—

“(i) primarily serving a health professional shortage area with a designation in effect under section 332 or a medically underserved community (as defined in section 799B); or

“(ii) located in a rural area (as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act).”.

(d) REPORT ON TRAINING COSTS.—Not later than March 31, 2019, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Congress a report on the direct graduate expenses of approved graduate medical residency training programs, and the indirect expenses associated with the additional costs of teaching residents, of qualified teaching health centers (as such terms are used or defined in section 340H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h)).

(e) DEFINITION.—Subsection (j) of section 340H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) NEW APPROVED GRADUATE MEDICAL RESIDENCY TRAINING PROGRAM.—The term ‘new approved graduate medical residency training program’ means an approved graduate medical residency training program for which the sponsoring qualified teaching health center has not received a payment under this section for a previous fiscal year (other than pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(C)).”.

(f) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Subsection (f) of section 340H (42 U.S.C. 256h) is amended by striking “hospital” each place it appears and inserting “teaching health center”.

(g) PAYMENTS FOR PREVIOUS FISCAL YEARS.—The provisions of section 340H of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256h), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply with respect to payments under such section for fiscal years before fiscal year 2018.

SEC. 104. EXTENSION FOR FAMILY-TO-FAMILY HEALTH INFORMATION CENTERS.

Section 501(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 701(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) in clause (v), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (vi), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vii) \$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019.”;

(2) in paragraph (3)(C), by inserting before the period the following: “, and with respect to fiscal years 2018 and 2019, such centers shall also be developed in all territories and at least one such center shall be developed for Indian tribes”; and

(3) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

“(5) For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘Indian tribe’ has the meaning given such term in section 4 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1603);

“(B) the term ‘State’ means each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia; and

“(C) the term ‘territory’ means Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.”.

SEC. 105. YOUTH EMPOWERMENT PROGRAM; PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY EDUCATION.

(a) YOUTH EMPOWERMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 510 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 710) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 510. YOUTH EMPOWERMENT PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) ALLOTMENTS TO STATES.—For the purpose described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall, for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, allot to each State which has transmitted an application for the fiscal year under section 505(a) an amount equal to the product of—

“(A) the amount appropriated pursuant to subsection (e)(1) for the fiscal year, minus the amount reserved under subsection (e)(2) for the fiscal year; and

“(B) the proportion that the number of low-income children in the State bears to the total of such numbers of children for all the States.

“(2) OTHER ALLOTMENTS.—

“(A) OTHER ENTITIES.—For the purpose described in subsection (b), the Secretary shall, for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, for any

State which has not transmitted an application for the fiscal year under section 505(a), allot to one or more entities in the State the amount that would have been allotted to the State under paragraph (1) if the State had submitted such an application.

“(B) PROCESS.—The Secretary shall select the recipients of allotments under subparagraph (A) by means of a competitive grant process under which—

“(i) not later than 30 days after the deadline for the State involved to submit an application for the fiscal year under section 505(a), the Secretary publishes a notice soliciting grant applications; and

“(ii) not later than 120 days after such deadline, all such applications must be submitted.

“(b) PURPOSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except for research under paragraph (5) and information collection and reporting under paragraph (6), the purpose of an allotment under subsection (a) to a State (or to another entity in the State pursuant to subsection (a)(2)) is to enable the State or other entity to implement education exclusively on sexual risk avoidance (meaning voluntarily refraining from sexual activity).

“(2) REQUIRED COMPONENTS.—Education on sexual risk avoidance pursuant to an allotment under this section shall—

“(A) ensure that the unambiguous and primary emphasis and context for each topic described in paragraph (3) is a message to youth that normalizes the optimal health behavior of avoiding nonmarital sexual activity;

“(B) be medically accurate and complete;

“(C) be age-appropriate; and

“(D) be based on adolescent learning and developmental theories for the age group receiving the education.

“(3) TOPICS.—Education on sexual risk avoidance pursuant to an allotment under this section shall address each of the following topics:

“(A) The holistic individual and societal benefits associated with personal responsibility, self-regulation, goal setting, healthy decisionmaking, and a focus on the future.

“(B) The advantage of refraining from nonmarital sexual activity in order to improve the future prospects and physical and emotional health of youth.

“(C) The increased likelihood of avoiding poverty when youth attain self-sufficiency and emotional maturity before engaging in sexual activity.

“(D) The foundational components of healthy relationships and their impact on the formation of healthy marriages and safe and stable families.

“(E) How other youth risk behaviors, such as drug and alcohol usage, increase the risk for teen sex.

“(F) How to resist and avoid, and receive help regarding, sexual coercion and dating violence, recognizing that even with consent teen sex remains a youth risk behavior.

“(4) CONTRACEPTION.—Education on sexual risk avoidance pursuant to an allotment under this section shall ensure that—

“(A) any information provided on contraception is medically accurate and ensures that students understand that contraception offers physical risk reduction, but not risk elimination; and

“(B) the education does not include demonstrations, simulations, or distribution of contraceptive devices.

“(5) RESEARCH.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State or other entity receiving an allotment pursuant to subsection (a) may use up to 20 percent of such allotment to build the evidence base for sexual risk avoidance education by conducting or supporting research.

“(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Any research conducted or supported pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be—

“(i) rigorous;

“(ii) evidence-based; and

“(iii) designed and conducted by independent researchers who have experience in conducting and publishing research in peer-reviewed outlets.

“(6) INFORMATION COLLECTION AND REPORTING.—A State or other entity receiving an allotment pursuant to subsection (a) shall, as specified by the Secretary—

“(A) collect information on the programs and activities funded through the allotment; and

“(B) submit reports to the Secretary on the data from such programs and activities.

“(c) NATIONAL EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) in consultation with appropriate State and local agencies, conduct one or more rigorous evaluations of the education funded through this section and associated data; and

“(B) submit a report to the Congress on the results of such evaluations, together with a summary of the information collected pursuant to subsection (b)(6).

“(2) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the evaluations required by paragraph (1), including the establishment of evaluation methodologies, the Secretary shall consult with relevant stakeholders.

“(d) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—

“(1) Sections 503, 507, and 508 apply to allotments under subsection (a) to the same extent and in the same manner as such sections apply to allotments under section 502(c).

“(2) Sections 505 and 506 apply to allotments under subsection (a) to the extent determined by the Secretary to be appropriate.

“(e) FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To carry out this section, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

“(2) RESERVATION.—The Secretary shall reserve, for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, not more than 20 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for administering the program under this section, including the conducting of national evaluations and the provision of technical assistance to the recipients of allotments.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section takes effect on October 1, 2017.

(b) PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY EDUCATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 513 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 713) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”; and

(B) in subsection (a)(4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “2017” each place it appears and inserting “2019”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “3-YEAR GRANTS” and inserting “COMPETITIVE PREP GRANTS”; and

(II) in clause (i), by striking “solicit applications to award 3-year grants in each of fiscal years 2012 through 2017” and inserting “continue through fiscal year 2019 grants awarded for any of fiscal years 2015 through 2017”;

(C) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting after “youth with HIV/AIDS,” the following: “victims of human trafficking,”; and

(D) in subsection (f), by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection take effect on October 1, 2017.

SEC. 106. DECREASING REDUCTION IN MEDICAID DSH ALLOTMENTS.

Section 1923(f)(7)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396r-4(f)(7)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “2018” and inserting “2023”; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking subclauses (I) through (VIII) and inserting the following:

“(I) \$5,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2023;

“(II) \$5,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2024; and

“(III) \$6,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2025.”.

SEC. 107. INCREASE IN TERRITORIAL CAP FOR MEDICAID PAYMENTS.

Section 1108(g)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1308(g)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D)”; and

(B) by striking “2019” and inserting “2022”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(C) The amount of the increase otherwise provided under subparagraph (A) for—

“(i) Puerto Rico shall, after application of subparagraph (B), be further increased by \$1,600,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022; and

“(ii) the Virgin Islands shall be further increased by \$55,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022.

“(D) The amount of the increase otherwise provided under subparagraph (A) for Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and America Samoa, respectively, shall be further increased by such amounts that the total amount of increases under this subparagraph is equal to \$150,000,000. In applying the previous sentence, the Secretary shall increase amounts for such territories in such a proportion as would be applied under subparagraph (A) if such territories were the only territories to which such subparagraph applied.”.

SEC. 108. PUERTO RICO AND UNITED STATES VIRGIN ISLAND DISASTER RELIEF MEDICAID.

(a) SIMPLIFIED ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS AND REDETERMINATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), a State shall, as a condition of participation in the Medicaid program under such title and without submitting an amendment to the State Medicaid plan—

(A) use streamlined procedures described in paragraph (2) in processing applications and determining and redetermining eligibility for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan for DRM-eligible Maria Survivors during the DRM coverage period; and

(B) provide, in the case of such a Survivor, for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan to such Survivor during such period based on the family income level eligibility requirements established under the State Medicaid plan or, if higher, under the State Medicaid plan of the State in which such Survivor resided as of September 17, 2017.

(2) STREAMLINED PROCEDURES.—The streamlined procedures described in this paragraph, with respect to a State and an applicant for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan, are the following:

(A) COMMON APPLICATION FORM.—Use of a common 1-page application form developed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the National Association of State Medicaid Directors. Such form shall—

(i) require an applicant to provide an expected address for the duration of the DRM coverage period and to agree to update that information if it changes during such period;

(ii) include notice regarding the penalties for making a fraudulent application;

(iii) require the applicant to assign to the State any rights of the applicant (or any other person who is a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor and on whose behalf the applicant has the legal authority to execute an assignment of such rights) under any group health plan or other third-party coverage for health care; and

(iv) require the applicant to list any health insurance coverage which the applicant was enrolled in immediately prior to submitting such application.

(B) SELF-ATTESTATION.—Self-attestation by the applicant for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan that the applicant is a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor, including with respect to citizenship, identity, immigration status, and income requirements.

(C) NO DOCUMENTATION.—No requirement for documentation evidencing the basis on which the applicant qualifies to be a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor.

(D) ISSUANCE OF ELIGIBILITY CARD.—Issuance of a DRM assistance eligibility card to an applicant who completes such application, including the self-attestation required under subparagraph (B). Such card shall be valid as long as the DRM coverage period is in effect and shall be accompanied by notice of the termination date for the DRM coverage period and, if applicable, notice that such termination date may be extended. If the President extends the DRM coverage period, the State shall notify DRM-eligible Maria Survivors enrolled in the State Medicaid plan of the new termination date for the DRM coverage period.

(E) DEEMED ELIGIBILITY.—If an applicant completes the application and presents it to a provider or facility participating in the State Medicaid plan that is qualified to make presumptive eligibility determinations under such plan (which at a minimum shall consist of facilities identified in section 1902(a)(55) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(55)) and it appears to the provider that the applicant is a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor based on the information in the application, the applicant will be deemed to be a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor eligible for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan.

(F) CONTINUOUS ELIGIBILITY.—Continuous eligibility, without the need for any redetermination of eligibility, for the duration of the DRM coverage period.

(b) NO CONTINUATION OF DRM ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), no DRM assistance shall be provided after the end of the DRM coverage period.

(2) PRESUMPTIVE ELIGIBILITY.—In the case of any DRM-eligible Maria Survivor who is receiving DRM assistance from a State in accordance with this section and who, as of the end of the DRM coverage period, has an application pending for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan for periods beginning after the end of such period, the State shall provide such Survivor with a period of presumptive eligibility for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan (not to exceed 60 days) until a determination with respect to the Survivor's application has been made.

(3) PREGNANT WOMEN.—In the case of a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor who is receiving DRM assistance from a State in accordance with this section and whose pregnancy ended during the 60-day period prior to the end of the DRM coverage period, or who is pregnant as of the end of such period, such Survivor shall continue to be eligible for DRM assistance after the end of the DRM coverage period, including (but not limited

to) all pregnancy-related and postpartum medical assistance available under the State Medicaid plan, through the end of the month in which the 60-day period (beginning on the last day of her pregnancy) ends.

(C) TREATMENT OF MARIA SURVIVORS PROVIDED ASSISTANCE PRIOR TO DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Any Maria Survivor who is provided medical assistance under a State Medicaid plan in accordance with guidance from the Secretary during the period that begins on September 17, 2017, and ends on the date of enactment of this Act shall be treated as a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor, without the need to file an additional application, for purposes of eligibility for medical assistance under this section.

(d) SCOPE OF COVERAGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State providing medical assistance under a State Medicaid plan to a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor pursuant to this section shall provide medical assistance that is either—

(A) equal in amount and scope to the medical assistance that would otherwise be made available to such Survivor if the Survivor were a State resident enrolled in the State Medicaid plan; or

(B) if greater in amount and scope, equal in amount and scope to the medical assistance that would have been made available to such Survivor under the State Medicaid plan of the State in which such Survivor resided as of September 17, 2017.

Coverage for such medical assistance for DRM-eligible Maria Survivors shall be retroactive to items and services furnished on or after September 17, 2017 (or in the case of applications for DRM assistance submitted after January 1, 2018, the first day of the 5th month preceding the date on which such application is submitted).

(2) CHILDREN BORN TO PREGNANT WOMEN.—In the case of a child born to a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor who is provided DRM assistance during the DRM coverage period, such child shall be treated as having been born to a pregnant woman eligible for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan and shall be eligible for medical assistance under such plan in accordance with section 1902(e)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(e)(4)). The Federal medical assistance percentage applicable to the State Medicaid plan shall apply to medical assistance provided to a child under such plan in accordance with the preceding sentence and Federal payments for such assistance shall not be considered to be payments under this section.

(e) 100 PERCENT FEDERAL MATCHING PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 1905(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(b)), subject to paragraph (2), the Federal medical assistance percentage or the Federal matching rate otherwise applied under section 1903(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(a)) shall be 100 percent for—

(A) providing DRM assistance to DRM-eligible Maria Survivors during the DRM coverage period in accordance with this section;

(B) costs directly attributable to administrative activities related to the provision of such DRM assistance; and

(C) DRM assistance provided in accordance with paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (b) after the end of the DRM coverage period.

(2) LIMITATION.—

(A) TERRITORIES.—Payments provided to a State that is a territory (as defined in section 1108(c)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1308(c)(1))) in accordance with this subsection shall be subject to subsections (f) and (g) of section 1108 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1308).

(B) OTHER STATES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of States not described in subparagraph (A), the difference between—

(I) the total amount of payments made to such States in accordance with this subsection, by reason of the Federal medical assistance percentage or the Federal matching rate applied under paragraph (1); and

(II) the total amount of payments that would otherwise be made to such States if the Federal medical assistance percentage and the Federal matching rate under section 1905(b) of the Social Security Act and 1903(a) of such Act were applied;

may not exceed the amount appropriated under clause (ii).

(ii) APPROPRIATIONS.—There are appropriated, out of any amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$1,000,000,000 for the DRM coverage period for purposes of making payments in accordance with this subsection to States not described in subparagraph (A).

(3) EXEMPTION FROM ERROR RATE PENALTIES.—All payments attributable to providing DRM assistance in accordance with this section shall be disregarded for purposes of section 1903(u) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(u)).

(f) VERIFICATION OF STATUS AS A MARIA SURVIVOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State shall make a good faith effort to verify the status of an individual who is enrolled in the State Medicaid plan as a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor under the provisions of this section. Such effort shall not delay the determination of the eligibility of the Survivor for DRM assistance under this section.

(2) EVIDENCE OF VERIFICATION.—A State may satisfy the verification requirement under paragraph (1) with respect to an individual by showing that the State obtained information from the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or the State Medicaid Agency for the State from which the individual is from (if the individual was not a resident of such State on any day during the week preceding September 17, 2017).

(g) PROVIDER PAYMENT RATES.—In the case of any DRM assistance provided in accordance with this section to a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor that is covered under the State Medicaid plan (as applied without regard to this section) the State shall pay a provider of such assistance the same payment rate as the State would otherwise pay for the assistance if the assistance were provided under the State Medicaid plan (or, if no such payment rate applies under the State Medicaid plan, the usual and customary prevailing rate for the item or service for the community in which it is provided).

(h) APPLICATION TO INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting any rights accorded to an individual who is a recipient of medical assistance under a State Medicaid plan who is determined to be a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor but the provision of DRM assistance to such individual shall be limited to the provision of such assistance in accordance with this section.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DRM ASSISTANCE.—The term “DRM assistance” means medical assistance under a State Medicaid plan for a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor during the DRM coverage period.

(2) DRM COVERAGE PERIOD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “DRM coverage period” means the period beginning on September 17, 2017, and, subject to subparagraph (B), ending on the date that is 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) SECRETARY AUTHORITY TO EXTEND DRM COVERAGE PERIOD.—The Secretary may ex-

tend the DRM coverage period for an additional 12 months. Any reference to the term “DRM coverage period” in this section shall include any extension under this subparagraph.

(3) DRM-ELIGIBLE MARIA SURVIVOR DEFINED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “DRM-eligible Maria Survivor” means a Maria Survivor whose family income does not exceed the income eligibility standard which would apply to the Survivor under the State Medicaid plan of the State in which the Survivor applies for medical assistance.

(B) NO RESOURCES, RESIDENCY, OR CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Eligibility under subparagraph (A) shall be determined without application of any resources test, State residency, or categorical eligibility requirements.

(C) DEFINITION OF CHILD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a DRM-eligible Maria Survivor shall be determined to be a “child” in accordance with the definition of “child” under the State Medicaid plan.

(4) MARIA SURVIVOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “Maria Survivor” means an individual who, on any day during the week preceding September 17, 2017, had a primary residence in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

(B) TREATMENT OF CURRENT MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as preventing an individual who is otherwise entitled to medical assistance under a State Medicaid plan from being treated as a Maria Survivor under this section.

(C) TREATMENT OF HOMELESS PERSONS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an individual who was homeless on any day during the week described in subparagraph (A), the individual’s “residence” shall be deemed to be the place of residence as otherwise determined for such an individual under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(6) STATE.—The term “State” has the meaning given that term for purposes of title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(7) STATE MEDICAID PLAN.—The term “State Medicaid plan” means a State plan under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) (or a waiver of such plan).

SEC. 109. DELAY OF BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2013 THIRD PARTY LIABILITY PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-67; 127 Stat. 1177; 42 U.S.C. 1396a note), as amended by section 211 of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-93; 128 Stat. 1047; 42 U.S.C. 1396a note) and section 220 of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-10), is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2019”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE; TREATMENT.—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall take effect on September 30, 2017, and shall apply with respect to claims pending, generated, or filed after such date.

TITLE II—CHIP

SEC. 201. FIVE-YEAR FUNDING EXTENSION OF THE CHILDREN’S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) APPROPRIATION; TOTAL ALLOTMENT.—Section 2104(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (19), by striking “and”;

(2) in paragraph (20), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(21) for fiscal year 2018, \$21,500,000,000;“(22) for fiscal year 2019, \$22,600,000,000;“(23) for fiscal year 2020, \$23,700,000,000;“(24) for fiscal year 2021, \$24,800,000,000; and“(25) for fiscal year 2022, for purposes of making 2 semi-annual allotments—

“(A) \$2,850,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2021, and ending on March 31, 2022; and

“(B) \$2,850,000,000 for the period beginning on April 1, 2022, and ending on September 30, 2022.”.

(b) ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2104(m) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(m)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “THROUGH 2016” and inserting “THROUGH 2022”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “(19)” and inserting “(24)”; and

(II) in clause (ii), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting “(other than fiscal year 2022)” after “even-numbered fiscal year”; and

(III) in clause (ii)(I), by inserting “(or, in the case of fiscal year 2018, under paragraph (4))” after “clause (1)”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking “or (4)” and inserting “(4), or (10)”; and

(ii) by striking “or 2017” and inserting “, 2017, or 2022”;

(C) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting “(or, in the case of fiscal year 2018, by not later than the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of the CHAMPION KIDS Act of 2017)” after “before the August 31 preceding the beginning of the fiscal year”; and

(iii) in the matter following subparagraph (B), by striking “or fiscal year 2016” and inserting “fiscal year 2016, fiscal year 2018, fiscal year 2020, or fiscal year 2022”;

(D) in paragraph (9)—

(i) in the heading, by striking “FISCAL YEARS 2015 AND 2017” and inserting “CERTAIN FISCAL YEARS”;

(ii) by striking “or (4)” and inserting “, (4), or (10)”; and

(iii) by striking “or fiscal year 2017” and inserting “, 2017, or 2022”; and

(E) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(10) FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022.—

“(A) FIRST HALF.—Subject to paragraphs (5) and (7), from the amount made available under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (25) of subsection (a) for the semi-annual period described in such subparagraph, increased by the amount of the appropriation for such period under section 201(b)(3) of the CHAMPION KIDS Act of 2017, the Secretary shall compute a State allotment for each State (including the District of Columbia and each commonwealth and territory) for such semi-annual period in an amount equal to the first half ratio (described in subparagraph (D)) of the amount described in subparagraph (C).

“(B) SECOND HALF.—Subject to paragraphs (5) and (7), from the amount made available under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (25) of subsection (a) for the semi-annual period described in such subparagraph, the Secretary shall compute a State allotment for each State (including the District of Columbia and each commonwealth and territory) for such semi-annual period in an amount equal to the amount made available under such subparagraph, multiplied by the ratio of—

“(i) the amount of the allotment to such State under subparagraph (A); to

“(ii) the total of the amount of all of the allotments made available under such subparagraph.

“(C) FULL YEAR AMOUNT BASED ON GROWTH FACTOR UPDATED AMOUNT.—The amount described in this subparagraph for a State is equal to the sum of—

“(i) the amount of the State allotment for fiscal year 2021 determined under paragraph (2)(B)(i); and

“(ii) the amount of any payments made to the State under subsection (n) for fiscal year 2021,

multiplied by the allotment increase factor under paragraph (6) for fiscal year 2022.

“(D) FIRST HALF RATIO.—The first half ratio described in this subparagraph is the ratio of—

“(i) the sum of—

“(I) the amount made available under subsection (a)(25)(A); and

“(II) the amount of the appropriation for such period under section 201(b)(3) of the CHAMPION KIDS Act of 2017; to

“(ii) the sum of—

“(I) the amount described in clause (i); and

“(II) the amount made available under subsection (a)(25)(B).”.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 2104(m)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(m)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “the allotment increase factor under paragraph (5)” each place it appears and inserting “the allotment increase factor under paragraph (6)”.

(3) ONE-TIME APPROPRIATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022.—There is appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$20,200,000,000 to accompany the allotment made for the period beginning on October 1, 2021, and ending on March 31, 2022, under paragraph (25)(A) of section 2104(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(a)) (as added by subsection (a)(3)), to remain available until expended. Such amount shall be used to provide allotments to States under paragraph (10) of section 2104(m) of such Act (as added by subsection (b)(1)(E)) for the first 6 months of fiscal year 2022 in the same manner as allotments are provided under subsection (a)(25)(A) of such section 2104 and subject to the same terms and conditions as apply to the allotments provided from such subsection (a)(25)(A).

(c) EXTENSION OF THE CHILD ENROLLMENT CONTINGENCY FUND.—Section 2104(n) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(n)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(i) by striking “2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2016” and inserting “2010 through 2014, 2016, and 2018 through 2021”; and

(ii) by striking “fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal years 2015, 2017, and 2022”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2016” and inserting “2010 through 2014, 2016, and 2018 through 2021”; and

(ii) by striking “fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2017” and inserting “fiscal year 2015, 2017, and 2022”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “or a semi-annual allotment period for fiscal year 2015 or 2017” and inserting “or in any of fiscal years 2018 through 2021 (or a semi-annual allotment period for fiscal year 2015, 2017, or 2022)”.

(d) EXTENSION OF QUALIFYING STATES OPTION.—Section 2105(g)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(g)(4)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “THROUGH 2017” and inserting “THROUGH 2022”; and

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”.

(e) EXTENSION OF EXPRESS LANE ELIGIBILITY OPTION.—Section 1902(e)(13)(I) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(e)(13)(I)) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”.

(f) ASSURANCE OF AFFORDABILITY STANDARD FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2105(d)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(d)(3)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “UNTIL OCTOBER 1, 2019” and inserting “THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2022”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(i) by striking “2019” and inserting “2022”; and

(ii) by striking “The preceding sentence shall not be construed as preventing a State during such period” and inserting “During the period that begins on October 1, 2019, and ends on September 30, 2022, the preceding sentence shall only apply with respect to children in families whose income does not exceed 300 percent of the poverty line (as defined in section 2110(c)(5)) applicable to a family of the size involved. The preceding sentences shall not be construed as preventing a State during any such periods”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1902(gg)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(gg)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “UNTIL OCTOBER 1, 2019” and inserting “THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2022”; and

(B) by striking “September 30, 2019” and inserting “September 30, 2022 (but during the period that begins on October 1, 2019, and ends on September 30, 2022, only with respect to children in families whose income does not exceed 300 percent of the poverty line (as defined in section 2110(c)(5)) applicable to a family of the size involved)”.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

(a) CHILDHOOD OBESITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—Section 1139A(e)(8) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-9a(e)(8)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and \$10,000,000” and inserting “, \$10,000,000”; and

(2) by inserting after “2017” the following: “, and \$25,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2022”.

(b) PEDIATRIC QUALITY MEASURES PROGRAM.—Section 1139A(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-9a(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Out of any” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Out of any”;

(2) by striking “there is appropriated for each” and inserting “there is appropriated—“(A) for each”;

(3) by striking “, and there is appropriated for the period” and inserting “;“(B) for the period”;

(4) by striking “, Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended” and inserting “; and”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, \$75,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out this section (other than subsections (e), (f), and (g)).

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under this subsection shall remain available until expended.”.

SEC. 203. EXTENSION OF OUTREACH AND ENROLLMENT PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION AND REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 2113 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397mm) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “2017” and inserting “2022”; and

(2) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking “and \$40,000,000” and inserting “, \$40,000,000”; and

(B) by inserting after “2017” the following: “, and \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2022”.

(b) MAKING ORGANIZATIONS THAT USE PARENT MENTORS ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE GRANTS.—Section 2113(f) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397mm(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(E), by striking “or community-based doula programs” and inserting “, community-based doula programs, or parent mentors”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) PARENT MENTOR.—The term ‘parent mentor’ means an individual who—

“(A) is a parent or guardian of at least one child who is an eligible child under this title or title XIX; and

“(B) is trained to assist families with children who have no health insurance coverage with respect to improving the social determinants of the health of such children, including by providing—

“(i) education about health insurance coverage, including, with respect to obtaining such coverage, eligibility criteria and application and renewal processes;

“(ii) assistance with completing and submitting applications for health insurance coverage and renewal;

“(iii) a liaison between families and representatives of State plans under title XIX or State child health plans under this title;

“(iv) guidance on identifying medical and dental homes and community pharmacies for children; and

“(v) assistance and referrals to successfully address social determinants of children’s health, including poverty, food insufficiency, housing, and environmental hazards.”.

(c) EXCLUSION FROM MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Section 1902 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(17), by striking “(e)(14), (e)(14)” and inserting “(e)(14), (e)(15)”;

(2) in subsection (e), in the first paragraph (14), relating to income determined using modified adjusted gross income, by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(J) EXCLUSION OF PARENT MENTOR COMPENSATION FROM INCOME DETERMINATION.—Any nominal amount received by an individual as compensation, including a stipend, for participation as a parent mentor (as defined in paragraph (5) of section 2113(f)) in an activity or program funded through a grant under such section shall be disregarded for purposes of determining the income eligibility of such individual for medical assistance under the State plan or any waiver of such plan.”; and

(3) in subsection (e), by striking “(14) EXCLUSION” and inserting “(15) EXCLUSION”.

SEC. 204. EXTENSION OF ADDITIONAL FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION FOR CHIP.

Section 2105(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(b)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting “and during the period that begins on October 1, 2019, and ends on September 30, 2020, the enhanced FMAP determined for a State for a fiscal year (or for any portion of a fiscal year occurring during such period) shall be increased by 11.5 percentage points” after “23 percentage points”.

TITLE III—OFFSET

SEC. 301. IMPLEMENTATION OF OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL RECOMMENDATION TO DELAY CERTAIN MEDICARE PLAN PREPAYMENTS.

(a) MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PAYMENTS.—Section 1853(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–23(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i)—

(A) by striking “subsections (e), (g), (i), and (1)” and inserting “subparagraph (J), subsections (e), (g), (i), and (1).”; and

(B) by inserting “(or, for months beginning with January 2019, on the date specified in subparagraph (J))” after “in advance”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(J) TIMING OF PAYMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to monthly payments under this section for months in a year (beginning with 2019), the date specified in this subparagraph with respect to a payment for a month is the first business day occurring on or after the applicable date defined in clause (ii).

“(ii) APPLICABLE DATE.—For purposes of clause (i), with respect to a year (beginning with 2019), the term ‘applicable date’ means, with respect to a payment for—

“(I) January of such year, January 2nd;

“(II) February of such year, February 5th;

“(III) March of such year, March 10th;

“(IV) April of such year, April 15th;

“(V) May of such year, May 20th;

“(VI) June of such year, June 25th;

“(VII) July and each succeeding month (other than December) of such year, the first day of the next month; and

“(VIII) December of such year, December 24th.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO PART D.—Section 1860D–15(d)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–115(d)(1)) is amended by inserting “and shall be made consistent with the timing of monthly payments to MA organizations under section 1853(a)(1)(J)” after “as the Secretary determines”.

Mr. CLYBURN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman’s point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have reserved a point of order against this motion.

Let me be clear about what this means. The Republican leadership does not want a vote on providing proper CHIP funds to our United States territories, including Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

There may be a point of order against this provision, but it is the same point of order that applies to the Republicans’ bill.

Do you know what that means?

They waive the point of order for their bill, but they will not waive the point of order for this bill.

I won’t take up too much time, Mr. Speaker. I just want the body to know that the Republican leadership is, once again, rigging the game in favor of the majority.

This isn’t about hurting me and the Democratic Members of this body, no. This hurts the people who are already struggling in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

□ 1030

To my friends on the other side of the aisle, you may hide behind proce-

dural tactics, but the fact remains that doing so denies our United States citizens living in the territories the proper funding that the Governor has requested to recover.

Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill nor send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

It has been 34 days, Mr. Speaker, since Republicans allowed the Children’s Health Insurance Program and Community Health Centers to expire. These proven programs insure 9 million children and serve 27 million people.

The bill before us is the latest in a long line of cynical attempts by President Trump and Republican Leaders to sabotage and undermine the Affordable Care Act. We ought not be funding efforts to treat infectious diseases like the flu and measles by taking away the funds needed to prevent those illnesses from occurring in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, this bill turns on its head that adage, “an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.” Instead of joining President Trump’s campaign to sabotage the ACA, the Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats, should join to reauthorize CHIP and CHCs for 5 years, fully paid for without robbing Peter to pay Paul.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to reconsider.

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, today, Members of this House can deliver peace of mind to parents of over 8 million low-income children who depend on the Children’s Health Insurance Program. The House can extend funding for important public health programs, including resources for the critical work community health centers do in our communities and in my district and yours. This bill will help deliver much-needed healthcare resources to our friends and fellow citizens in the Virgin Islands and in Puerto Rico.

Yet we have heard complaints about how this package is paid for. Well, let us be clear how this bill funds healthcare for kids and important public health priorities like community health centers.

In paying for this package, we have taken a fiscally responsible and reasonable approach. Our bill funds kids’ healthcare by allowing States to disenroll lottery winners—these are winners making \$80,000 or above—from the low-income Medicaid program. We ensure high-dollar lottery winners are removed from the Medicaid program so that those resources can go to Medicaid-eligible, low-income people in our districts.

Our bill directs funding from the Prevention and Public Health Fund to finance important prevention and public

health needs, like funding the National Health Service Corps, Teaching Health Center Graduate Medical Education, Family-to-Family Health Information Centers, and community health centers. If these are not important programs for prevention, wellness, and public health, I don't know what are.

Our bill before us today, which I predict will have bipartisan support, directs funds from the Prevention Fund for important public health priorities that have long had bipartisan support. We are using a bipartisan fund to pay for bipartisan healthcare support for health and wellness, which was its intent from the beginning.

Most recently, nearly every House Republican and Democrat supported this idea just a year ago. Just a year ago, when we passed the 21st Century Cures Act, we said: Here is a health and wellness fund and a Prevention Fund that makes sense for cures, make sense for, we believe today, our community health centers, and for Children's Health Insurance.

Our bill also asks the wealthiest among us, the 1 percent of beneficiaries, those making \$40,000 a month, over half-a-million dollars a year—that is an individual—to pay a little more to help fund health insurance for low-income children. I think they are willing to do that, and I think we should be as well.

On multiple budgets, President Obama said this is a reasonable way to pay for other priorities. That was bipartisan. It is bipartisan today.

These reasonable pay-fors have been opposed by some in the Democratic leadership. Some House Democrats want to use children's healthcare and funding for community health centers as a bargaining chip for a bigger end-of-the-year goulash, yet kids and our frontline providers can't wait any longer.

In just a few weeks, States like Minnesota run out of funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program. At the request of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we have agreed to postpone it time and again, but time has run out. The negotiations did not end as we all hoped they would.

But we can't wait any longer. It is time for this House to deliver peace of mind to the families that rely on these critical programs. It is time to vote "yes."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion to recommit and to approve the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and mentor, the gentleman from South Carolina, for his kind words and for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we deal with important issues every day in this House, but there are few issues as meaningful to so many lives as the Children's Health Insurance Program.

At this time the divisions in this House mimic those in our nation.

And on many issues, those divisions can be challenging to bridge.

One of my top priorities as a new Member of this body is to help bridge those divides, instead of widening them.

I hope that my colleagues—both Democrats and Republicans—will tell me if I fall short on that commitment.

One of the few things that does not divide us is the importance of children's healthcare and the CHIP program.

When it was signed into law 20 years ago, this landmark legislation meant so much to me.

First, as a mother of then 9-year-old, Alyssa, and 11-year-old, Alex I deeply understood the fear a parent could feel with a sick child and no insurance.

But also because at that time, I was the Deputy Secretary of Health & Social Services for Delaware.

And I had the honor of helping implement the law and seeing thousands of children who had never had healthcare get the coverage they deserved.

From the 600,000 children across the nation who were the program's first enrollees in 1998 to the nearly 9,000,000 children in 2016.

Kids across this country owe their yearly check-ups, their immunizations, and their doctor's office lollipops to this program.

And in Delaware we owe a big debt to the CHIP program, Medicaid, and the Affordable Care Act.

Today, 97 percent of Delaware's children obtain medical coverage because of these programs.

In 1997, the legislation passed in a Republican Congress with a Democratic President, highlighting how this truly was not a partisan issue.

That's why it's disappointing to me that we aren't moving forward on renewing the Children's Health Insurance Program with that same reasonable, bipartisan approach.

The bill before us today forces us to choose between healthcare for children and healthcare for other vulnerable populations.

Choosing between prevention and healthcare for kids is unacceptable—particularly in a nation as great as ours.

I have spoken to many of you over the past 10 months.

I know that the people I have met in both political parties know—in their hearts—that we should not play games with the healthcare of our children.

I know that it may seem hard to oppose one's party leadership. But today I ask you to consider whether this is one of those rare times . . . those rare subjects . . .

Where we can come together to stand up for the those in need . . .

And to stand up for a clean reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

That's what our motion to recommit does.

Let's step back and consider whether we can use our common desire to deliver healthcare to our children, as a moment to surprise the public . . .

To set a new tone for how we deal with one another . . . and how we address issues on which both of our parties fundamentally agree.

Please join with me on this vote to put our children first—they're watching.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. CLYBURN. 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 the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the question of passage of H.R. 3922, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 231, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 605]

YEAS—187

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

NAYS—231

Abraham	Barr	Bost
Allen	Barton	Brady (TX)
Amash	Bergman	Brat
Amodei	Biggs	Brooks (IN)
Arrington	Bilirakis	Buchanan
Babin	Bishop (MI)	Buck
Bacon	Bishop (UT)	Bucshon
Banks (IN)	Blackburn	Budd
Barletta	Blum	Burgess

Byrne Hollingsworth
Calvert Hudson
Carter (GA) Huizenga
Carter (TX) Hultgren
Chabot Hunter
Cheney Hurd
Coffman Issa
Cole Jenkins (KS)
Collins (GA) Jenkins (WV)
Collins (NY) Johnson (LA)
Comer Johnson (OH)
Comstock Jones
Conaway Jordan
Cook Joyce (OH)
Costello (PA) Katko
Cramer Kelly (MS)
Crawford Kelly (PA)
Culberson King (IA)
Curbelo (FL) King (NY)
Davidson Kinzinger
Davis, Rodney Knight
Denham Kustoff (TN)
Dent Labrador
DeSantis LaHood
DesJarlais Lamborn
Diaz-Balart Lance
Donovan Latta
Duffy Lewis (MN)
Duncan (SC) LoBiondo
Duncan (TN) Long
Dunn Loudermilk
Emmer Love
Estes (KS) Lucas
Farenthold Luetkemeyer
Faso MacArthur
Ferguson Marchant
Fitzpatrick Marino
Fleischmann Marshall
Flores Massie
Fortenberry Mast
Foxy McCarthy
Franks (AZ) McCaul
Frelinghuysen McClintock
Gaetz McHenry
Gallagher McKinley
Garrett McMorris
Gianforte Rodgers
Gibbs McSally
Gohmert Meadows
Goodlatte Meehan
Gosar Messer
Gowdy Mitchell
Granger Moolenaar
Graves (GA) Mooney (WV)
Graves (LA) Mullin
Graves (MO) Newhouse
Griffith Noem
Grothman Norman
Guthrie Nunes
Handel Olson
Harper Palazzo
Harris Palmer
Hartzler Paulsen
Hensarling Pearce
Herrera Beutler Perry
Hice, Jody B. Pittenger
Higgins (LA) Poe (TX)
Hill Poliquin
Holding Posey

NOT VOTING—14

Aderholt Gutiérrez
Bishop (GA) Jackson Lee
Black Johnson, E. B.
Bridenstine Johnson, Sam
Brooks (AL) LaMalfa

□ 1058

Messrs. BARTON, PALAZZO, CALVERT, SMITH of Texas, COLLINS of New York, WITTMAN, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. HOLDING, SCALISE, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. JAYAPAL, Messrs. TAKANO, LANGEVIN, and DAVID SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. PALLONE. 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 242, nays 174, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 606]

YEAS—242

Abraham Granger
Allen Graves (GA)
Amodei Graves (LA)
Arrington Graves (MO)
Babin Griffith
Bacon Grothman
Banks (IN) Guthrie
Barletta Handel
Barr Harper
Barton Harris
Bera Hartzler
Bergman Hensarling
Bilirakis Herrera Beutler
Bishop (MI) Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (UT) Higgins (LA)
Blackburn Hill
Blum Holding
Bost Hollingsworth
Brady (TX) Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter Rooney, Francis
Hurd Rooney, Thomas
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo

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

NAYS—174

Adams Frankel (FL)
Aguilar Nadler
Amash Fudge
Barragán Gabbard
Bass Gallego
Beatty Garamendi
Beyer Gomez
Biggs Gonzalez (TX)
Blumenauer Gottheimer
Blunt Rochester Green, Al
Bonamici Green, Gene
Boyle, Brendan Grijalva
F. Hanabusa
Brady (PA) Hastings
Brown (MD) Heck
Brownley (CA) Higgins (NY)
Bustos Himes
Butterfield Hoyer
Capuano Huffman
Cárdenas Jayapal
Carson (IN) Jeffries
Cartwright Johnson (GA)
Castor (FL) Kaptur
Castro (TX) Keating
Chu, Judy Kelly (IL)
Ciilline Kennedy
Clark (MA) Khanna
Clarke (NY) Kihuen
Cleaver Kildee
Clyburn Kilmer
Cohen Krishnamoorthi
Connolly Kuster (NH)
Conyers Langevin
Cooper Larsen (WA)
Courtney Larson (CT)
Crist Lawrence
Crowley Lawson (FL)
Cummings Lee
Davis (CA) Levin
Davis, Danny Lewis (GA)
DeFazio Lieu, Ted
DeGette Lofgren
Delaney Lowenthal
DeLauro Lowey
DelBene Lujan Grisham,
Demings M.
DeSaulnier Luján, Ben Ray
Deutch Lynch
Dingell Maloney,
Doggett Carolyn B.
Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean
F. Massie
Ellison Matsui
Engel McCollum
Eshoo McEachin
Españat McGovern
Esty (CT) McNeerney
Evans Meeks
Foster Meng
Moore
Moulton

NOT VOTING—16

Aderholt Jackson Lee
Bishop (GA) Johnson, E. B.
Black Johnson, Sam
Bridenstine LaMalfa
Brooks (AL) Peters
Gutiérrez Pocan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1106

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 606 on H.R. 3922—The Community Health and Medical Professionals Improve Our Nation Act due to my attendance at the Vatican's Health of People, Health of Planet and Our Responsibility: Climate Change, Air Pollution and Health. I intended to vote “aye.”

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 606 on passage of H.R. 3922, I am not recorded due to a family concern. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, due to an unavoidable conflict, I missed the following votes on November 1, 2, and 3. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 597, "nay" on rollcall No. 604, "yea" on rollcall No. 605, and "nay" on rollcall No. 606.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 604, and "yea" on rollcall No. 606.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

□ 1115

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the week to come.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9:00 a.m. for legislative business. On Friday, no votes are expected in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 3043, the Hydropower Policy Modernization Act, sponsored by Representative CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS. This bill will continue our efforts to improve America's energy infrastructure by streamlining the FERC licensing process for hydropower projects.

The House will also consider two good jobs bills: first, H.R. 3441, the Save Local Business Act, sponsored by Representative BRADLEY BYRNE. This bipartisan legislation will ensure small businesses and franchises across America receive fair government treatment rather than confusing regulations that harm workers.

Second, the House will consider H.R. 2201, the Micro Offering Safe Harbor Act, sponsored by Representative TOM EMMER. As part of our Innovation Initiative, this bill creates a smarter way

for entrepreneurs to start new ventures or grow existing businesses.

Now, lastly, Mr. Speaker, additional legislative items are possible in the House. If anything is added to our schedule, I will be sure to inform my friend and all Members.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for that information.

First, I want to start by saying that the majority leader and I and four other Members of the House had an opportunity to visit both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands last weekend since we had our last colloquy.

First, I want to thank the majority leader for organizing that trip and including me on it. It was an eye-opening trip. The majority leader and I have done an op-ed, which will be appearing sometime in the near term, on our observations.

One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that I know the majority leader and I had the opportunity to see, we were in Marathon, where you had housing that was built after Andrew and housing that was built before Andrew.

Now, the difference was, after Andrew, that extraordinary hurricane, the building code was changed. We saw the stark difference between housing that survived essentially Maria and Irma and housing that did not, and the difference was, of course, that the housing that survived was built to different standards after Andrew.

The majority leader and I discussed this matter, along with Mr. BISHOP, who chairs the committee that oversees both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and I think all of us are convinced that it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish not to build back, as Florida did, to standards that can withstand storms of this type.

So I wanted to thank the majority leader for his leadership on this issue.

The majority leader took the extraordinary effort to climb down a river bank, go across the river—the river was very low at that point in time—and then up a very long ladder, because people were stranded on the other side. The majority leader went to see them and assure them that we would not forget them.

We were the first codel to go to the interior of Puerto Rico, as opposed to simply go to San Juan or another large city, so I thank the majority leader for his leadership on that issue.

Mr. Leader, let me ask you about tax reform. That, of course, has been the big issue for some period of time now, but now we have a bill that is not on the floor yet, but was released yesterday.

It is clear this bill will cut taxes, in our view, for the wealthy. I don't know the statistics yet, what the division is, whether it is 80/20, as the initial proposal was, or perhaps a little less than that that goes to those over \$900,000 in income. But, in any event, it also eliminates tax preferences that the

middle class families rely on, and, obviously, we think it is going to face hurdles in Congress.

What I wanted to ask was: When does the gentleman expect the bill to be marked up?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am excited about his question, because I am excited about this bill.

For more than three decades, we have waited for tax reform. Many people know the challenge of what they have with the government taking more than they should, and the challenge to see individuals raise their paychecks.

Ways and Means has announced that they will start markups next week. I assume that it will take them probably a week to get through the entire bill, going through regular order as we do, and then I would assume that we would bring that to the floor right after. We would like to get this to the American people as soon as possible.

I am willing to talk about the bill, I am willing to talk about the bill in any different manner, because we spent a lot of time working on this.

The very first thing that is going to happen for the American public, come January 1, they are going to get more in their paycheck, because what we do, we take the standard deduction, because in the current law today, a single individual in America, it is only the first \$6,000 they have are tax free. Well, that is going to go to 12. For a couple, it is going to go to 24.

We take seven confusing rates and make it four. It is about cutting them. Every rate is lowered except the highest rate.

Then we go and look at: How can we make America competitive? I started my first business when I was 20 years old. Small business is the backbone of this country. Small businesses work harder than almost anybody else. We lower their rate to 25. That is the lowest it has been in 40 years.

Then all this money that is being pushed overseas that we tax too high so people won't bring it back—and there are trillions of dollars there—we are going to have that money come back. And what are they going to do? They are going to invest in America.

Now, the name of our bill is Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Just yesterday, I was with a company, Broadcom. We went into the Oval Office. I had worked with this company for quite some time. They started in America. Bell Labs was part of it, and others. Three companies got together. They are technology; they were building; they were growing. Then what they found was, America's Tax Code was so burdensome on them, that for them to compete around the world, they became a company that domiciled in Singapore.

Talking to them just the last month or so, laying out our tax bill, they said: You know what, we are so confident in you passing this, we are going to announce that we are moving back to America.

They have \$20 billion a year in revenue. They invest \$9 billion every year in R&D and manufacturing, those manufacturing jobs we care so much about.

So yesterday, we were sitting in the Oval Office, and this is exactly what the CEO said. You know what he talked about? He grew up in Singapore. He said: When I turned 18, the greatest engineering school in America gave me an opportunity, MIT, but my parents did not have wealth, but they gave me a scholarship.

He comes to America, gets his education, becomes an American, builds a company. He said it broke his heart he had to leave. He wants to give back to this country that has been so good to him, and he said this tax bill is actually doing it.

So we are creating jobs even before we pass it.

So I am very excited, but, if I may, I wanted to do a little research for you. So we have taken all the IRS tax information, and I broke it down in spreadsheets. So any district that wants to know about it, please come see me, and I will walk you through it.

So I take your district, Maryland's Fifth, currently, 47 percent of your filers in Maryland's Fifth take the standard deduction. They will be better off, because it doubles right off the bat. Another 11 percent of those who itemize their deductions won't have to do that anymore. Instead of spending weeks on their taxes, they will put it on a postcard in minutes. So they are going to get a higher deduction; they are going to get more money. That means even before lowering of the rates, 58 percent of your district is better off from day one.

Now, in addition, we repeal the alternative minimum tax, that AMT. So that costs 13,000 of your constituents in your district an average of \$3,750. That is wiped away.

As we lower all the brackets, we will create a great deal of savings for everybody else. So I am excited about this.

I would love to look forward to working with you on it, because just as we just passed the CHIP bill bipartisan and the IPAB with more than 70 Democrats on that, I think this has been a very good week for America.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. He talks about IPAB. Of course, we add the \$17.5 billion to the debt.

The gentleman did not mention the \$1.5 trillion in additional debt that the passage of the tax bill will result in, but he did talk about some people who are going to be really advantaged.

So I would like to ask the majority leader: Will those people who will be advantaged or, for that matter, disadvantaged have the opportunity next week to testify in a hearing on the substance of this bill?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I think this is an excellent question.

So, first of all, you are asking about hearings. I caught you yesterday; I

caught you on TV yesterday. You were pretty good. You were asked about hearings. This is what you said: A hearing is when you ask the public to come in and say: What do you think? What are your suggestions? How will this impact you?

Since taking the majority—you know what anniversary it is this week? When we rolled this bill out, it was the seventh anniversary of the Republicans winning on that election day for the majority. This is what we campaigned on.

Now, we have been working quite some time. Dave Camp has retired, but when he was with Ways and Means, he put out a Camp proposal. We have been having numerous hearings in those Congresses and this Congress. It took us to win the White House, it took us to win the Senate, but, you know what, we have kept our promise.

Let me walk you through the rest of what we have done. Since taking the majority, we have held at least 59 hearings on tax reform with witnesses from all sides on everything from simplification, to closing those loopholes that we have talked so much about together, to creating jobs, to accelerating economic growth. That is not to mention the countless town halls and the forums of Members who have held them in their districts all across.

Now, if we need further witnesses on the burden of our Tax Code, look no further than just me. As I told you, I was 20 when I started that first business. You know the three lessons I learned in my first business? I was the first one to work, I was the last one to leave, and I was the last one to be paid.

I remember investing all that I had. It was just a deli. I had six employees. It was early in the morning, the front was all glass, and here pulled up a little truck from the city, and they were knocking on the door 2 hours before I started. I thought maybe they wanted to give me a key to the city for starting a new business. He wanted to give me a ticket for my sign. I thought that was a little odd, because the sign was bringing more people in that paid more sales tax that paid their salary.

I learned the challenges of starting a small business.

What is so great about this bill is there are going to be so many more Americans who are going to take that risk, start a small business, and be successful, with so many more Americans working.

So I am excited about this, because that is what we have been hearing in our hearings—all those hearings we had, all those town halls, all those years we fought so hard to get to this point.

Mr. Speaker, I think this has been a good week.

□ 1130

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, he did not answer my question, however. Will people have an opportunity to testify on this bill? The answer is no. No Amer-

ican will have an opportunity to come to a hearing.

In 1968, the gentleman from California, the majority leader, was not here. I was here. We had hearings over months, both sides of the aisle. Over 450 witnesses testified not on tax bills that may have been offered at some time in the future, including the Camp bill.

When the Camp bill, Mr. Speaker, was reported—actually, it wasn't reported. When it was put on the table by Chairman Camp from Michigan, who is now retired, the Speaker's response was, when asked by the press, "What are you going to do with that bill?" he said, blah, blah, blah, blah. In other words, what he was saying was all talk. We are not going to do anything with that bill, and that bill never saw the light of day.

It was paid for, Mr. Speaker. It was tough love. I didn't agree with everything in the Camp bill, but I congratulate Congressman Camp for having the courage to put a bill on the floor that was paid for, not creating \$1.5 trillion in additional debt that our children will have to pay. They are not here to testify either.

I don't want to really get into a debate on the specifics. We are going to have a lot of time to do that next week, and I intend to do it next week, but he talked about small businesses being reduced to 25 percent. They will be if they make over \$500,000.

That is why the NFIB is not for this bill, Mr. Speaker, talking about small business. They are the spokespersons for small businesses, and they are not for this bill.

We will talk about the substance, but the process mirrors the process for the Affordable Care Act: no hearings, no witnesses, very, very little time for the public or the Congress to digest the substance of this bill dropped yesterday. It is going to be marked up on Monday. That is 96 hours to consider a bill well over 500 pages.

Mr. Speaker, I asked about process. The reason I asked about process and regular order is because regular order provides for input from the people we serve, the public, about whether the bill is good, bad, or indifferent and how it will impact them.

We are going to debate it here. We represent those people. But regular order is hearing from them before we act, not after we act.

Yes, we are replicating the Affordable Care Act: put on the table, quickly passed, jammed through, sent to the Senate. And it didn't work, Mr. Speaker. I don't think this will work either.

I was here in 1986, Mr. Speaker, when Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan, Bob Packwood, who was the Republican's chair of the Senate Finance Committee, and Dan Rostenkowski from Illinois, the Democratic chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, worked together with Jim Baker, the former Secretary of State but then Secretary of the Treasury, worked with us to

come up with a bill that could be passed. And it was passed, Mr. Speaker, with overwhelming votes from both sides of the aisle. It was the last time we passed tax reform. Since then, we have just passed tax cuts.

Under Ronald Reagan, we passed a tax cut in 1981. The deficit increased under Ronald Reagan 189 percent. Under George H.W. Bush, the deficit increased 55 percent in 4 years, 189 percent in 8 years. Under Bill Clinton, the debt increased 36 percent; George Bush, 87 percent after the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, and we were promised that they were going to energize the economy and dynamic scoring would come into effect and the country would be rolling in clover. Seven years later, we had the deepest recession anybody serving in this body has experienced, Mr. Speaker, and the debt exploded.

Barack Obama, just by contrast, inherited the worst economy any of us has seen—the worst economy—hemorrhaging 787,000 jobs per month in January of 2009. We had to bring the economy out of that deep recession, and we invested dollars. But even given all that necessity and the \$700 billion bill that we passed, that George Bush passed, where two-thirds of Republicans were opposed and which kept us out of a depression, Barack Obama increased the debt by 1 percentage point more than George Bush.

I say to my friend, the reason for having hearings, the reason for having economic experts like Mr. Bartlett, who worked for Ronald Reagan, who said that tax cuts do not pay for themselves. They say \$1.5 trillion. I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker—I may not be here when we can find this out—this is going to be far above \$1.5 trillion in additional debt, and my children and my grandchildren and my great-grandchildren will be exposed to paying that bill.

It is a shame, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have extensive hearings on this bill in the House and in the Senate. My judgment is the Senate doesn't expect to have hearings on this either. They are just going to try to jam it through, Mr. Speaker, and that is not good. That is not good for this institution. Much, much more importantly, it is not good for the present generation or generations to come.

We will debate, Mr. Leader. I know you are passionate about the substance. You are very knowledgeable about the substance. We talked about it in private, and I admire the passion that you have and the information that you argue. I may differ with your information, but we will have the opportunity to debate that, I think, next week and the week after.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, the first lesson, if you ever take debate, if you cannot win the argument on the substance of the bill, argue about process; go to process.

But you know what? This is not the beginning of the process. This is the end of the process. For 31 years, we have been working to get here. We had hearings upon hearings. We have gone to the American people. We went to the American people 7 years ago this week, and they made a very big decision: to change the direction.

We went back in 2014, and they made another big decision, and they made one just a short time ago.

I heard you talk about a lot of Presidents, but I think you missed one. Really, this bill is about growth in this country, about job creation, about raising somebody's paycheck.

The history of America, from the beginning of time until 2006, we always averaged more than 3 percent growth. If you just take the last 8 years, if you take the very best year under Barack Obama—and I will go apples to apples. Let's take Bill Clinton. The growth year under Bill Clinton's worst year is higher than Barack Obama's best year. That is why the middle class is hurting. That is why this tax cut helps the middle class.

What is most interesting, you want to talk about debt? You talked about a lot of Presidents. You can add up all those Presidents, and you know what? Just one President, Barack Obama, added all that money and more to the debt.

What is more interesting to me, if my friend is concerned about the deficit, I want to ask you this: Why did you vote for a budget that increases the deficit by \$6.8 trillion over 10 years? Why would you do that this year? Why would you, as a party, bring that forward as your plan.

Do you know what we are bringing forward? We are going right through the rules. We have gone all through the hearings. We know, even before this bill passes, just as yesterday, that the companies are coming back to America; \$20 billion a year in revenue, one company has already announced. They are going to put \$3 billion every year into research and development and \$6 billion into manufacturing.

I think the debate on process is over. This bill is less than 500 pages.

You talk about us bringing it up? Yes, so the whole American public can see the bill and read it. It is much different than when we talk about your ACA—more than 2,000 pages, and I was here. I watched what was brought right to the floor and jammed through. And you are right; the ACA doesn't work.

We believed in doing something different. We made a promise to the American public—3 days for public viewing. It is longer than 3 days.

We made a promise to the American public that we would make sure you keep more of what you earn, we would create more jobs. You know what happened after that last election? We just went through the second quarter of 3 percent growth.

You and I just talked about the number of hurricanes we just watched, the

devastation. People say it probably knocked off 1 percent of growth. You know what the Atlanta Fed just came out with? They are predicting, they think we are going to go to 4½.

Do you know what? The best days of America are in front of us because of the work we have done. Let's not argue about process, because we know we have been through this process for 31 years. We know what the American public has said. We know in the hearings what they have told us, and we have listened. Now I think is the time to have the courage to lead. Let's take what we heard in those committees and put it into a bill, exactly what we just did.

To have the returns before the bill is even passed of jobs coming back, to me, like I said earlier, this is a good week, but this is going to be a great month.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we are going to debate the substance of the bill; we are going to debate it fully. We think it will not hold up well under that debate. Therefore, we will have a significant difference.

He is right. The best economy anybody in this House has experienced—the best economy—was the last 4 years of the Clinton administration, period. Guess what we had? We had a little bit of a tax increase. We increased the gasoline tax, and we tried to pay for infrastructure. We haven't increased it since then.

The Republicans said: You do that, oh, the economy is going to go down the drain. The best economy any Republican has experienced in their lifetime is under Bill Clinton. We balanced the budget 4 years in a row under Bill Clinton, the only President you can mention that balanced.

It never balanced under Ronald Reagan. It never balanced under George H.W. Bush. It never balanced under George Bush. As a matter of fact, as soon as they took office, they made sure we wouldn't have further balances because they cut taxes in 2001 and 2003, but they didn't cut spending.

He talks about President Obama. I know the majority leader will be interested in these statistics. I didn't count January of 2017 because, after all, that was the Obama economy. Trump had not done anything on the economy, but let's start with February 2017.

Under Donald Trump, 232,000 jobs were created. That is great. That is good. I would say that the Obama economy is still working.

Same exact month a year earlier, not 232, but 237,000 jobs were created under Barack Obama.

March 2017, 50,000 under Trump. March 2016, 225,000 jobs created under Barack Obama.

April 2017, 207,000 jobs. Barack Obama was a little down that month, 153,000 jobs.

145,000 under Trump, 43,000.

Then June of 2017, 210,000 under Donald Trump, 297,000 jobs under Barack Obama.

July of 2017, we are getting more recent. Under Trump—now he has been in

office a little longer—138,000. What was it under Barack Obama? 291,000 jobs—double.

August of this year, just a few months ago, 169,000 under Donald Trump; 176,000.

Last month we had hurricanes. I will give the majority leader that. We lost 33,000 jobs. Under Barack Obama, same month a year ago, 249,000 jobs created.

As a matter of fact, under Barack Obama, we created 11,773,000 jobs.

□ 1145

Under George Bush, 2 million—excuse me—lost under George Bush, private sector jobs, a loss, after the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, lost 1,159,000 jobs. The last 12 months of the George Bush administration, 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, we couldn't change economic policy. We were in charge for the last 2 years, couldn't change it, lost 4,568,000 jobs.

Now, as a matter of fact, I have done a little thing for 68 years. Over 68 years, we had 36 years of Republican Presidents and 32 years of Democratic Presidents. Under Republican Presidents, from Truman to Obama, there were 35,448,000 jobs created, Mr. Leader. Under Democrats, in 32 years, 62,669,000 jobs.

Now, I would like to go on to another subject, as we could go on debating this all day, but I will yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because you did ask a question in there.

When you talked about Bill Clinton, you asked: What did he have?

Well, when he first came in, he had Democrats in the majority, but all that growth happened because he won a Republican House and a Republican Senate. That is when we turned it around with John Kasich as the budget chair. That is when we balanced the budget in those 4 years.

We had to send him welfare reform how many times?

Three times. He vetoed it all the other times and claimed some glory.

But also there is another question you asked. I love a good debate. I love to pick just facts when you don't want to look at the whole picture. The best thing to even just look at if you want to go: Did the election matter? Did the election matter to the American public?

Well, I heard a lot of pundits on the other side say: Oh my God, if President Trump got elected, the market is going to crash.

You know what? Most everyone in America that invests for retirement invests in the market, and President Donald Trump has given them all a raise because we set new records, more than 60 times; that is because of the belief of what they think he could achieve.

When you look at what he has been able to do with regulation, unbelievable.

The few headlines you didn't announce during Obama, when you were doing those jobs, you didn't say any-

thing about Nabisco leaving the country, or Burger King went and domiciled someplace else. Why?

What was the answer that President Obama would have when companies were leaving America because the taxes were too high? We will pass a law to say they can't.

You know the difference that election has made?

We just proposed a tax bill. Companies are now coming to the Oval Office to say: We are coming back. And all that means is more jobs, more money for Americans.

I understand that we are going to probably have a philosophical difference of agreement. I believe Americans should keep more of what they earn. I know what you said a few weeks ago. My friend cast his vote in favor of a budget that calls for "\$3.9 trillion in revenue enhancements."

You know who I think needs the revenue?

The American public. That is why we doubled the standard deduction, and that is for every American. On day 1 they will get more in their check.

Small businesses, lowest tax in 40 years. All that money that those companies were being pushed out are going to come back.

We can argue all you want about this, but for 31 years we have had this argument. I think the American public is waiting for us to lead.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, you noticed that he didn't talk about any of the statistics I mentioned about job creation under Barack Obama. He didn't talk about the 62 million jobs that were created in 32 years, as opposed to the 35 million jobs, just half of what we did in less than 4 years than they had as President of the United States.

And what he didn't talk about was—he said: You know, we Republicans were in charge of the Congress the last 6 years of the Clinton administration.

That is right.

And what Bill Clinton said: Let's save Social Security first. Let's not cut out revenues that we need to invest in the education and the growth of our economy.

They weren't for that, but they couldn't do anything about it.

Then, guess what happened. They took the Presidency. They had the House and they had the Senate.

Why couldn't you do what was done under Bill Clinton then, when you controlled everything, I ask my Republican friends, Mr. Speaker? Why couldn't you, when you controlled every organ of government, do what you say was done under the Clinton administration, because you were in the minority, very frankly, or you were in the majority and controlled things? Why couldn't you do it when you controlled everything? Why did you leave us with 4.8 million hemorrhaging jobs as you came out of office, and your economic program was still in place that you put in place in 2001 and 2003, and

the deepest recession you and I have experienced in our life times?

And I am older than you are. You didn't answer that. You continue to talk about what is going to happen.

I tell the story about the guy who comes in and he wants to be the left fielder for the Nats, and he says: You know, I am going to hit 350 next year.

I said: But you hit 260 last year.

He says: Well, yeah, I know, but this year I am going to hit 350.

And the other guy comes in and says: I would like the same job. I hit 325 this year and I hit 324 last year. Who do you think you hire?

The whole point is, Mr. Leader—I say to the Speaker—is that performance counts, not just talk, not just promises. Because I will tell you, Mr. Leader, I have been here a long time and I heard the same language in 1981 from David Stockman. He now says it was baloney. I heard the same talk in 2001 and 2003. It didn't work out so well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to go on to another subject because we need to go to another subject, but we need to have this debate because it is critical for my children, my grandchildren, and my great-grandchildren, and for generations to come as to whether this country is, like we did it under Clinton, on a fiscally sustainable path where we are balancing budgets, or whether we are going to go back to the deep deficits.

He didn't respond, 189 percent increase in the debt under Ronald Reagan. One person in America, Mr. Speaker, can stop spending: the President. He can veto spending bills.

In my 37 years, we have never had a veto overridden of a President who vetoed a bill because we spent too much money; not once in the 37 years I have been here, Mr. Speaker.

But I want to go on to another subject that ought to be less controversial because I think the majority of Republicans and I think, unanimously, the Democrats want to see us do what the President, apparently, has asked us to do. And that is, protect the DACA students, the DACA doctors, the DACA teachers.

We have a Dream Act that has been filed. Every Democrat supports it. We want that to come to the floor in this transparent, open process, and I have talked to the majority leader about it.

The President, contrary to Speaker RYAN's advice, rescinded the protections for the childhood arrivals who arrived here through no fault of their own. He said to the Congress, it needs to be done in legislation. He didn't say it needs to be done in legislation with a lot of other things. And the Speaker has said we are going to take one issue at a time. I won't bring out that quote, but the majority leader has heard me use it before.

So I urge the majority leader because I believe he does not want to send these mostly young people who don't know any other country but America, who see themselves as Americans, who have

been educated in our schools, serving in our communities, positive participants in growing America like so many immigrants before them, a nation of immigrants. Send me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses.

We should have the DACA bill on the floor before we leave for this Thanksgiving. Mr. Leader, I said this with respect to the Export-Import Bank, that a majority of your party would vote for that if it came to the floor. We got it to the floor and, as I predicted, a majority of your Members voted for it.

I believe that very close to, if not all, a majority of your party will vote for this, and the overwhelming numbers in this House will vote for that bill.

I would urge my friend to bring it to the floor before we leave for the Thanksgiving break on the 16th of November. I would urge that because we are going to have some very messy 8 days after Thanksgiving, with great workload on our desks; not the least of which is how to deal with the sequester, how to deal with funding government for the balance of the year, what to do with flood insurance, and so many other issues; not to mention our supplemental that we need to do with respect to Houston and Florida and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

So I urge my friend to work with us to bring the Dream Act to the floor, or bring your alternative to the floor. But let us not leave these people, who the President says he loves, who are positive Americans in everything but paper, who have been here almost all of their lives. Some came at 2 or 3 years of age and know no other country. Let's bring a bill to the floor that we can end before we go on the Thanksgiving break, in a united way—we are going to be divided on the tax bill. We understand that—but in a united way on this, where even Rush Limbaugh says we are not going to send these kids home.

I would hope that you could do that, Mr. Leader. I believe you have it in your heart to do it, and I would hope that we could do it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have great respect for the gentleman.

It is true, we just recently traveled to look at the hurricanes and we had a lot of discussions. We disagree philosophically at times, but I think there is a place that we can find agreement upon.

I listen to you when you speak. I did just hear you ask right before: "Why couldn't you do it when you controlled everything?"

I kind of ask my friend the same thing. When you controlled everything, the White House, the House, and the Senate, you had a self-proclaimed master legislator as Speaker. You had an opportunity.

But I know this is the window, and I know President Trump wants to get it done. That is why he put out things that he wants to see done as well. We

talked about chain migration. We talked about border security.

We have been meeting—the Speaker and I just had a meeting yesterday with a number of Members about this. We would like to solve this problem overall, and I think it is a place everybody can work together, to secure our border, work on the chain migration problem, and solve this problem for others.

Now, I know there is a 6-month time period here, and I don't want to confuse issues because I would like to focus on this issue as well, but I don't want to have the government shutting down over an issue. You and I know we both discussed things like that, and I never think that is productive with whatever we do; but I look forward to continuing working with you to solve this issue.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me remind the leader that we passed the Dream Act through the House of Representatives. We brought it to the floor. We had a vote on it.

I know you and the Speaker said there was going to be a working task force on this issue, and it has been, I think, going on for nigh on to a month, but we haven't seen anything on the floor.

Mr. Leader, what I am saying is that I think we agree on this issue. Let us not confuse it with things on which we do not agree. Don't hold hostage these 800,000 young people who are positive—because if they are not positive they couldn't get into the Dream Act—I mean, they couldn't get into DACA. They had to have a sterling performance, be in school, be working, be in the Armed Forces. This is not a free pass to people.

We agree on this, I think. Maybe I am wrong on that, but it seems to me that we agree. The President seems to agree.

Wouldn't it be—as we have done in the past some bipartisan things, and we thought that was good for the institution and good for the American people to see us work in a bipartisan fashion. I think we agree on this issue.

Some of the things you want to attach to it, we are going to have disagreements on. Why don't we enact what we agree upon?

By the way, this has been pending for a long period of time, as opposed to your tax bill. I know you think we have had hearings on it, but, very frankly, that bill changed from Tuesday to Thursday of last week.

□ 1200

We think your bill is a pretty new bill and we would like to have hearings on it. But nevertheless, on DACA, I think we have an agreement. If you bring it to the floor, I think it will get a majority of the votes, a significant majority. I think it will get close to 300, if not over. So I would just urge my friend to see if he, as the majority leader—I was the majority leader—as the gentleman knows, I could bring a bill

to the floor or I could keep it off the floor. This is a bill that ought to come to the floor. We ought to give peace of mind to these 800,000 of folks, and we ought to pass this bill and give the House an opportunity to work its will.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman does not want to say anything further, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2017, TO MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, November 6, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING FRANK DOOLITTLE, CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL RECIPIENT

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

Ms. TENNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Frank Doolittle of Bainbridge, New York. At 104 years old, Frank will be awarded the Nation's highest honor for a civilian, the Congressional Gold Medal for his service in the Civil Air Patrol.

At a pivotal time in our Nation's history, Frank dedicated himself to service here at home. In 1944, in the midst of World War II, Frank volunteered to join the Civil Air Patrol squadron in Sidney, New York. His unit was active and often tasked with finding C-47s that went down in the Northeast.

In addition to being on call 24 hours a day, Frank taught classes ranging from navigation to meteorology 3 nights a week. During World War II, members patrolled the country's coastline from Maine to Mexico, watching for enemy submarines and potential saboteurs while conducting search and rescue missions.

On Saturday, November 11, Veterans Day, I will have the distinct honor of presenting Mr. Doolittle with the Congressional Gold Medal. Since 1776, only 300 of these medals have been awarded. I ask everyone to join me today in thanking Frank Doolittle and all serving the Civil Air Patrol for their service and dedication to our country.

OPEN TAX REFORM DISCUSSIONS

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, there is no question we need to reform our outdated, overly complex Tax

Code. That is something we all agree on. We need to encourage growth and support our middle class. But the Republican decision to approach taxes in an exclusively partisan and fiscally irresponsible way is not the way to go.

I am deeply concerned about the partisan plan rolled out by the Republican leadership, in no small part because it saddles future generations with trillions more in debt just to pay for tax cuts for the most fortunate Americans.

Furthermore, restricting provisions relied upon by countless middle class families, including the State and local tax—SALT—deductions and property tax deductions hurts working families. This is particularly true in States like Illinois, where one in every three filers depends on the SALT deduction.

In the days ahead, I hope my Republican colleagues will open the tax reform discussion to bipartisan engagement. I remain ready and willing to sit down and work across the aisle to achieve responsible tax reform that will grow our economy, protect our seniors, truly help middle class families, and secure our future.

TAX PLAN GIANT STEP IN RIGHT DIRECTION

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

Mr. MESSER. Madam Speaker, Hoosier families deserve a pay raise, and that is what President Trump's tax plan is going to give them: more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks for working Hoosiers.

Importantly, the plan includes a provision that I have been working on that would stop \$4 billion to \$7 billion in refundable tax credits paid out each year to illegal immigrants. This is a giant step in the right direction to protect American taxpayers and American families. In the Trump tax plan these savings will help increase child tax credits for American citizens by \$600 each child.

Hoosiers get it. It is past time to address an immigration system that rewards people who come here illegally. No one should get a tax incentive to violate the law.

CONGRATULATING CRISTINA JIMENEZ MORETA

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I am proud to recognize and congratulate an immigrant advocate, and now MacArthur genius, Cristina Jimenez Moreta. Like me, she is a CUNY alumni and she grew up undocumented.

Since founding United We Dream in 2008, Cristina Jimenez Moreta has become a powerhouse champion for immigrant groups across the country. By elevating the stories of DREAMers and

putting faces and names to a discussion that was, at times, dismissive and dehumanizing, she changed the dialogue surrounding undocumented young people.

Her work has impacted the lives of young immigrants nationwide, and in honor of her significant contributions, she was recently selected as one of 24 MacArthur Fellow winners worldwide in 2017.

I congratulate Ms. Jimenez on her MacArthur Fellowship, and I applaud her decision to use the grant money to further the development of other undocumented young people.

Cristina, your work is paramount now more than ever now that we brace as a nation to give rich people a big tax write-off that will put our country in jeopardy, a big gambling casino effort that has seen a failed attempt in the past with trickle-down economy.

"Because we are not one. We are not 100. We are millions. Count us well." "Porque no somos uno. No somos cien. Somos millones. Cuentanos bien."

MERIT-BASED VISA PROGRAM

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, Uzbekistan uber terrorist Saipov's attack in New York City is another example why the United States should end the diversity visa lottery. And I emphasize the word "lottery."

The program should have ended years ago. Under this 1990 program, the State Department gives 50,000 visas each year to immigrants from different parts of the world using a lottery system. Getting into the United States is like playing bingo. It is a game of chance.

Our immigration system should be changed to accept the best and brightest throughout the world. It is time to go to a merit-based visa system. Grant visas to people who will benefit America. Stop the random system that allowed Saipov to come in; a system that rolls the dice where foreigners win and Americans lose.

And that is just the way it is.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 9066

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

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, this year marks the 75th anniversary of Executive Order 9066, which authorized the internment of over 110,000 Japanese Americans on U.S. soil during World War II.

Our country will never be able to undo this grave miscarriage of justice or relieve the pain and suffering that was inflicted upon our fellow Americans. So we must remember this dark period in our Nation's history and ensure that this dark shadow of prejudice, bigotry, and hate never occurs again.

However, sadly, as we look around us, today we see that this divisiveness and bigotry persists far too much. We cannot give into hate and intolerance. We must confront it and defeat it with the light and love of the Aloha Spirit.

We must learn from this dark stain on our past and vow to never repeat it again.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DORENE ANDERSON

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Madam Speaker, Wednesday marked the 1-month anniversary of the terrible shooting that happened in my hometown of Las Vegas.

Today I rise to remember the life of Dorene Anderson from Anchorage, Alaska, a woman who was known for her kindness and her smile.

Dorene was a loving wife, mother, sister, aunt, and friend who always went above and beyond for everyone in her life. Not only was she a dedicated mother to her two daughters, she was known as a mother to her community.

Dorene loved hockey and was the treasurer of the Cowbell Crew, a non-profit hockey organization that supported hockey at all levels.

Her friends describe her as an all-around wonderful Alaskan who had a heart of gold, a person who was friendly to everyone.

I would like to extend my condolences to Dorene's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas and the State of Nevada and the whole country grieve with you.

AMERICANS DESERVE REAL TAX REFORM

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, again and again, President Donald Trump has promised tax reform that would help the middle class; and again and again, the President has broken those promises.

Instead of helping America's middle class and the working poor, his proposals offer big breaks for millionaires and corporations, and painful cuts for nearly everyone else.

The House Republican plan rolled out yesterday, rolls over the middle class and those looking to ascend the middle class. It cuts the estate tax, a tax that only affects a few thousand of the wealthiest American families, all while raising taxes on the lowest income bracket from 10 to 12 percent.

This plan slashes commonsense deductions for middle class families, including those for medical bills, student loan interest, and even mortgage interest. My Republican colleagues claim their plan would save people money,

but they say nothing about the \$1.5 trillion their plan would add to the deficit over the next 10 years. That is about \$12,000 of debt for each American household.

The American people deserve real tax reform, not just more tax cuts for the wealthy and powerful and those connected.

TOPICS OF THE WEEK

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I have a couple of topics that I intend to take up for the folks here watching and listening.

Madam Speaker, I want to talk about the Heartbeat bill and I want to talk about the immigration bill and the tax policy all together. But there is an important issue before this Congress that I want to hear about before I take up these issues. And for that purpose, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) to get this off of his heart.

Mr. DESANTIS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Iowa for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, it was really distressing to hear that Christ Church in Alexandria is removing a monument honoring its most famous parishioner, George Washington. It just made me think: What is this world coming to?

Now, Christ Church is free to do as it pleases, but I think we are also free to criticize such an absurd course of action. If we can't honor the Father of our Country, then we truly are drowning in a sea of knee-jerk political correctness.

George Washington was one of the few truly great men, an American original without whom we would not be standing here today as free people.

I just want to tick off a few things before I yield back to my colleague from Iowa, but this is important.

His stewardship during the American Revolution brought America a victory that we really had no right to win against the most powerful army on Earth.

He only had one-third of the country behind the revolutionary cause, yet, against all odds, Washington led our country to victory. But then having won that military victory, what does Washington do?

Throughout all of human history, when you win a military victory, that commanding general then seizes power for themselves and creates a society which is at that individual's beck and call.

□ 1215

That is not what George Washington did. He famously surrendered his sword

to the Continental Congress and gave up power voluntarily because he wanted to establish a republic. Then he went home to Mount Vernon. When word of Washington's relinquishment of power reached King George III in England, he was flummoxed. He said: Well, if that is really true, then Washington is the greatest man in the world.

It is unheard of that you would relinquish power in that way. Napoleon, on his deathbed—obviously, he had a lot of trials and tribulations—said: Look, they wanted me to be another Washington, and I just couldn't do it.

Washington presided over the Federal Convention in 1787, which created our Constitution. Had Washington not been willing to lend his legitimacy to that proceeding and to the Constitution, I think it is pretty clear the Constitution would have never been ratified.

He gets elected the first President of the United States unanimously. I think we really needed somebody with Washington's character and stature to be able to launch this new ship of state. If you had had anybody else—and there were many great Founding Fathers—you may not have been able to launch it successfully. He was that type of man.

He was also somebody who has offered some of the most eloquent defenses of religious liberty in our country's history. I want to quote from a letter he wrote to the Hebrew congregation at Newport in 1790.

He said: "It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it were the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights, for, happily, the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Those are words that I think ring as true today and are as important today as they were in 1790.

He established a two-term voluntary limit for President. People thought he could have been President for life, and, of course, he could have been. He didn't think that that was the right way to go. In fact, his entire career—from surrendering his sword at the Continental Congress to the two-term limit—was dedicated to the notion that in a republic—the government of laws and not of men—no one individual is indispensable. Yet he really was the exception to that rule. He was truly first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.

Mr. Speaker, I think, when you look back at history, you can obviously point to things that we don't necessarily like, and I think it is fair to air that. But to simply remove somebody's monument—somebody who truly exhibited greatness—I think is a direction in this country that we do not want to go.

So I just thought it was important to stand up here and to say that the Father of our Country is somebody who all Americans should hold in profound esteem because I don't think we would be sitting here on the floor of the House of Representatives in the most powerful country on Earth if Washington had not existed.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his presentation and certainly support and endorse every word that I have heard here.

I think about the leadership that George Washington provided, and a couple of things come to mind. One of them is, in my six trips into Egypt, I have met with President el-Sisi each of those times. He finds himself in a position in Egypt very similar to where Washington was in his first term, Madam Speaker, and that is now with a constitution that has a limitation of two 4-year terms for the President of Egypt. He was elected under that constitution, committed to accepting civilian leadership of the military—and that has been taking place—rebuilding the Christian churches in Egypt, establishing a parliament that reflects women as well as men, and religious diversity in allowing for a lot more religious freedom in Egypt. He has followed through on all of that.

The real test will be if President el-Sisi is re-elected in Egypt when he is up for that re-election, if that should happen, and I hope it does, then I am also listening very closely to what would be his second inaugural address. In that second inaugural address, I am calling upon him to announce that the second term will be his last term in keeping with the standards that are set by George Washington. That is how you transition into a republican form of government that is a representative form of government, a government of we the people.

I would also reflect, as I listened to Mr. DESANTIS speak about the greatness of George Washington—and we understand that there has been, I think, an erroneous reading of history and a misinterpretation of history—that there is an effort to purge from and to revise our American history to conform with what contemporary values are. So now if we disparage and expunge from history the statues, the faces, the words, and the leadership of people—some of whom were slave-owners back in that time: Washington, Jefferson, and a list of others all the way up the line—then we fall prey to this weakness of wanting to judge our Founding Fathers and the people who went before us in each generation by the standards of this generation.

Yet we admire people like William Wilberforce and John Adams who stood for years to defend the battle against slavery. They made the moral arguments against slavery. We had people who were against slavery who owned slaves. If you were in Virginia, and if you owed taxes, then you couldn't free

your slaves. That was true for some of our Founding Fathers who found themselves in that position. They couldn't legally free their slaves. They opposed slavery anyway, but they just couldn't pay their taxes. That is a piece of history that isn't often discussed, Madam Speaker.

We need to judge Washington for what he did as the Father of our Country and judge him within the context of the values that they had then. We should remember that they tried to eliminate slavery in the founding documents of this country. They were not able to do so because they had enough representation in the South that prevented it.

So we were, then, less than a century later swept into a giant Civil War which was still the bloodiest war that we have been involved in in our 200-plus years of our history, and that was a bloody war of brother fighting brother, North versus South. 600,000 Americans—mostly White, male Christians—went to their graves to put an end to slavery. That is how huge that contest was.

That argument needed to be won here. It was debated here in the U.S. House of Representatives and in the United States Senate. It went through the Supreme Court.

I listened to the testimony of Star Parker who testified this past Wednesday morning on the Heartbeat Bill, H.R. 490. Star Parker is a magnificent witness. I count her as a real leader in this country and a good friend. She is also an African American who has had several abortions before she came to the conviction that she understood that life begins at the moment of conception and that human life is sacred in all of its forms. So now her voice is being heard—heard in this Congress and heard across the land.

As an African American, she compared slavery to the abortion issue today. I look back in the slavery era, the first half of the 19th century building up to the Civil War, and I ask myself, in looking back at my heritage and my predecessors and the things that they believed in and passed on down to me: Where would I have been? Where would I have been, Madam Speaker, if I had been, say, born in 1800?

Would I have had enough vision to step forward and oppose slavery in the same fashion that I oppose abortion today? I would hope I would have. I pray I would have. I would think that those same principles would apply as Star Parker drew that comparison and that juxtaposition in her testimony last Wednesday before the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee.

Yet here we are today with a similar debate and a similar argument before us. Slavery was morally wrong. Today, I have never in my lifetime met someone who defended slavery, but there were many of them who defended slavery right here where I stand, Madam Speaker, and across the rotunda in the

United States Senate where they stand. They defended it because it was the legacy of the culture and the civilization of their times that was included within every civilization throughout the world. Every nation had to figure out how to throw off that yoke of slavery and give all creatures created in God's image an equal opportunity and equal freedom. It cost a lot of blood to put an end to that—600,000 lives.

As a matter of fact, not that long ago, I was standing in the Lincoln Memorial. They call it the temple area there around where the huge statue of Lincoln is seated in his chair up in the Lincoln Memorial. Every time I have walked up those steps, I have walked over to Lincoln's left—it is my right as I face him—I read Lincoln's second inaugural address. I don't have the text of it precisely in front of me, but I will get the gist of it, Madam Speaker.

There in his second inaugural address—remember, the Civil War is not over yet, so we don't know how it is going to end. He said:

Until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said, so it is written that the Word of the Lord is true and righteous altogether.

Now, I stood there some time back and read that. Sometimes you can read things four, five, six, ten, or twenty times before you see the wisdom in it, but it hit me as I stood there, a drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by a drop of blood drawn by the sword; how many Americans died in the Civil War? 600,000. Lincoln could not have known that.

I thought I knew how many Black Africans had been brought to what is now the United States to be slaves and to be enslaved here; I thought I knew that number. I looked it up. It is without much contention, there is a consensus number out there, Madam Speaker—600,000. 600,000 Americans died to put an end to slavery, and 600,000 Africans were brought to what is now America to be slaves.

Lincoln could not have known either number. He could not have known those killed in action and those who died in the Civil War. He could not have known that 600,000. He could not have known how many were brought to what is now America to be slaves. A drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, so it is written, the Word of the Lord is true and right and just altogether.

It turns out to be 600,000 versus 600,000. Those are prophetic words that came from the mouth of Abraham Lincoln in his second inaugural address, Madam Speaker. It is chilling to think about how prescient they were. It is impossible for Lincoln to have known, but the instinct that the hand of God that guided him, the guidance of providence that put those words in his mouth that day, turned out to be true this day.

I think of all that this Nation went through to put an end to slavery and

all that we are going through to put an end to abortion. I look at the cases of *Roe v. Wade*, *Doe v. Bolton*, and a Supreme Court that one might say was leaning very strongly to it as an activist court and the string of decisions that brought them to *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*.

I would take us back through that, Madam Speaker. In about—I have got to guess at the years here again—about 1964 or 1965, there was a case that came before the Supreme Court called *Griswold v. Connecticut*. There, the State of Connecticut, being a strong Catholic State, had outlawed contraceptives in Connecticut because that was also the position of the Catholic Church. There was a couple that decided to sue to be able to purchase contraceptives. So it made its way all the way to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court looked into it and decided, well, there is a right to privacy, and the State of Connecticut has no business interfering with the constitutional right to privacy that a married couple has in Connecticut to purchase contraceptives.

So they created this new right—this right to privacy—that didn't exist in the Constitution. It still doesn't exist in the Constitution. Now there are those who will argue that it exists in precedent and exists in case law, and, according to *stare decisis*—respect for previous decisions—it cannot be changed. We are stuck with this idea that the Constitution includes a right to privacy, a right to privacy that is applied to married couples who wanted to buy contraceptives in the State of Connecticut.

That was when the Supreme Court reached well beyond their bounds, and they needed to stay within the guidelines of the Constitution itself, hence this right to privacy.

Then there was the *Eisenstadt* case where the decision was that unmarried people had the same right to privacy as married people. So they extended that right to privacy to unmarried people as well, and now everybody could buy contraceptives everywhere at any time, and many other things were included underneath that definition.

So *Roe v. Wade* came together, and they decided that, yes, these rights existed, this right to privacy could be extrapolated into a right to abortion because this was all written in the emanations and the penumbras that are up there. To explain that, emanations and penumbras are like this: they are in the shadows of. So if you look up at the clouds during, let's say, a semi-cloudy day, then you will see that little shadow along the edge of the cloud. You can't quite see the other side of the cloud, but you see that fringe along the edge.

□ 1230

Someplace in there, those black-robed jurists could see constitutional rights that they couldn't actually find in the text of the Constitution, that they couldn't quite find in *Griswold*,

that they couldn't quite find in Eisenstadt, but they wrote it into *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* and decided: Okay, we are going to guarantee this constitutional right to have an abortion as long as the baby is not viable.

The viability, of course, is a pretty mushy definition. The Court has thrown some of our pro-life legislation back at us because they thought our definitions were a little too mushy, but they write some mushy ones themselves.

Then you have the *Doe v. Bolton* case settled at the same time, simultaneous with *Roe v. Wade*. There they write in the exceptions, which would be anything that might affect the life or health of the mother. The health of the mother can be determined to be the physical health, the mental health, or even the familial health of the mother. So what it means is any reason whatsoever.

When you couple those two cases together—and if you respect the Supreme Court decisions, which America did—it said abortion on demand for any reason whatsoever, whether it is a physical reason, whether it is a mental health reason, or whether it is a family issue, anything that is an inconvenience. We ended up with abortion as birth control and abortion on demand for everyone.

At that time, the Court could not have seen that we would be having partial-birth abortions conducted across this country in significant numbers to the 24th week and beyond.

That is such a ghastly process. This Congress did deal with that through legislation and wrote legislation to ban partial-birth abortion. It was defined. It was outlawed by this Congress. It was litigated all the way to the Supreme Court, as we would know.

When I arrived here, the Supreme Court had found that it was unconstitutional for Congress to ban this ghastly process of partial-birth abortion, of bringing a baby to birth through breach, feet first, and one inch before that baby could fill its lungs full of American air and scream for its own mercy. They would kill the baby while it struggled and squirmed, and they would collapse the skull by withdrawing from it the contents. That is the ghastly process. It went on over and over again.

The Court found it to be unconstitutional for Congress to ban—or any State, for that matter—that ghastly process. So we went back to work here in this Congress in the Judiciary Committee.

Under the leadership especially of STEVE CHABOT of Ohio, we held hearing after hearing after hearing, and we established and first wrote a definition for partial-birth abortion that was precise so that the Court couldn't argue that it was too mushy, too vague, not precise enough. We wrote a precise definition.

Then we held hearings that determined that a partial-birth abortion is never medically necessary to save the

life of the mother. We outlawed partial-birth abortion again. Then it went through the litigation process.

Our statute that banned partial-birth abortion, that came from we the people, was shot down in three circuits around the country but appealed to the Supreme Court, and it finally survived on that final analysis of the Supreme Court. Even they couldn't bear the thought of what was going on in this country. It was too stark. It was too ghastly. It was too gruesome.

So here we are today, with this House of Representatives having passed legislation that bans abortion if the baby can feel pain at 20 weeks. It was a true and right and just thing for this Congress, this House of Representatives to do altogether, Madam Speaker.

We have sent that bill over to the United States Senate. The bill has a little bit of vagueness in it because we are saying 20 weeks. We would like to precisely identify the exact time that the baby can feel pain. But it screams at our conscience that a baby who is struggling for its own survival can be killed in the womb. If it could fill its own lungs, it would scream for its own mercy. It fights to get away from the abortionist's tools.

That is the bill that bans that, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which we sent to the United States Senate and now sits on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk and probably doesn't move unless there is a Democrat who also agrees with us over in the House of Representatives.

It was bipartisan here in the House of Representatives, and I thank the Democrats who have joined us in the pro-life movement; but it has diminished significantly among Democrats in my time here, Madam Speaker.

I won't use the name of the Member. I will just say that a Democratic Member who is a pro-life Member whom I have served with for roughly a decade, but I went to him and said: Can you sign onto my Heartbeat bill, H.R. 490? Are you ready to do that?

He said: Not yet.

That left the door open for: Well, maybe.

I said: How many Democrats do you think we can get to sign onto the Heartbeat bill that bans abortion from the time a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected?

He said, without hesitation: Two. We can get two—which meant, I think, him and one other.

I said: How many pro-life votes were there in the House of Representatives among Democrats when you came here roughly 10 years ago, how many pro-life votes among Democrats?

His answer, without hesitation, was 60. Sixty Democrats would put up a pro-life vote. Ten years later, today, two, maybe three. I hope and pray it is more than that. I will work for all the votes that we can get.

But that, I think, tells us something about how polarized the political arena here is in this House of Representa-

tives, in the United States Senate, and explains why Tom Perez, head of the DNC, can say there is no room for pro-life people in the Democratic Party. If you can't be a Republican, then transform the Democratic Party so we can save the lives of these innocent unborn.

That is what the Heartbeat bill is, H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act, which we held a hearing on last Wednesday. The testimony, I think, was stellar that came out of the panelists who were there.

David Forte delivered the constitutional arguments even more so in the Q&A than he did so in his presentation.

We heard from Dr. Kathi Aultman, who has been an abortionist and committed an uncounted number of abortions, and she has also had an abortion herself. She has delivered a baby girl vaginally herself. So she is a mother and an abortionist.

She said in her testimony: I realize that when I meet the young people whom I delivered—an OB/GYN who had a dual purpose of bringing babies forth in the world, protecting their lives with all the medical technology and skill set that can be developed on this hand, but over on this hand, kill them, and the dichotomy of that hit her after she delivered her own daughter.

She went back to work and her hands were still doing what they had been doing, but her conscience screamed at her, and she had to put the tools down and stop this ghastly practice of abortion. Now she has committed a significant portion of her life to putting an end to this.

But she said she realized, when she met young people, the joy that she had helped bring them into the world if she delivered them; but at the same time, she understood that there were a lot of young people who are not here because she aborted them. So it always tore at her conscience that way.

Another thing that I had not heard from anyone in this movement in the past, in all of our discussions, was this. She said: If I was going to abort the baby, I always referred to it, when I spoke with the mother, as a fetus. But if we were going to deliver the baby and give this baby a chance at life, I always referred to it as a baby.

I think that explains to us the difference in the disagreements we have here in the House of Representatives. Almost universally, over on this side, people support abortion in every form they can, with those exceptions whom I tip my hat to and those who will be converted, hopefully, by their conscience over time like Cathy Aultman was.

They say "fetus"; we say "baby." God knows it is a baby. God knows that it is a unique human being from the moment of conception. What we can't yet do, medically, is precisely tell the mother the moment of conception. We don't have a medical way to determine that moment, or I would be focusing our legislation on that moment. But what we do have now, with ultrasound,

is the ability to identify that heartbeat in that baby.

The legislation in H.R. 490, the Heartbeat Protection Act, says this: We require the would-be abortionist to check for a heartbeat before that abortionist would continue with an abortion. They have to maintain records on this: check for a heartbeat, and then if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. We know that is life. If an abortionist stops that beating heart, we know that has ended the life of that innocent baby.

As we brought this legislation forward, we found out that there is something about that heartbeat that speaks to the conscience and the hearts of America, Madam Speaker. We know that billboard after billboard—there must be thousands of them around America, many of them put up by the Knights of Columbus—saying: Abortion stops a beating heart.

When we see that billboard, maybe it only registers a little bit, but many of us have seen it hundreds and hundreds of times, and we associate the heartbeat with life. If there is a beating heart, we know there is life. If you stop that beating heart, you know that you ended a human life.

On the argument that a baby isn't viable, in the *Roe v. Wade* era back in 1973, the Supreme Court said maybe that is at 28 weeks. But now we have babies that survive at 22 weeks. That is a month and a half less than before.

I recall a circumstance in 1992 where I had an individual who was part of the administrative oversight on a construction project that I was on that fall. He was gone for 2 weeks, and I knew why. His wife had gone into labor and delivered a little baby boy prematurely.

This little baby boy was in the early part of 20-some weeks. And I am not certain, but I am just guessing earlier than 24 weeks, but certainly not 28.

They went to the city and stayed in that hospital with this little boy for 2 weeks and didn't leave. They stayed at his side and prayed for him and they did all they could. He was hooked up to all kinds of tubes.

When he came back to me after 2 weeks, he was relatively assured that this little boy would survive. He walked up to me and handed me a cigar that said, "It's a boy." He wasn't handing out those cigars the first 2 weeks because he wasn't confident this little boy was going to live.

But he handed me that cigar—and I knew where he stood politically—and I said to him: We would do anything to save the life of any little baby. Any little boy or girl, we would do anything to save their life. There is no amount of expense we wouldn't go to. There is no amount of medical effort we wouldn't go to to save the life of a baby, no matter how small their chance was to survive. We will do everything. We will spend \$100,000, \$200,000, \$500,000 to save that innocent little life. We do everything we can do

with all the medical technology that we have. We spare no effort from doctors or nurses. We will spare no effort on our knees praying to God this little baby can be born and grow into a full human being.

He agreed with me 100 percent. He said: I agree with you, and I am so glad that my little boy looks like he is going to be okay.

I said: Then are you going to go into the polls of next month—this is October of 1992—and vote for the man for President who will appoint Justices to the Supreme Court who are going to continue to enable abortion in America?

He looked at me and called me a name that we can refer to by the first letter of those three words, but he said it in such a way that it wasn't insulting to me. It said instead: You have drilled a point home.

After these 30-some years, I ran into him in the grocery store here several Sundays ago after mass. We are both Catholic. I hadn't talked to him in a long time. I asked him how that little boy was doing, and he told me.

He said: You straightened me out back then, didn't you? Do you remember that?

He asked me if I remembered it. Of course I did. I said: Yes, I remembered it, but I didn't want to bring it up. I did want to know how he is.

So that is a composite of the conscience of the Nation, Madam Speaker. I think it tells us that we all haven't come to the realization of the immorality of abortion yet, but America came to the realization of the immorality of slavery. We will get to the realization of the immorality of abortion. We are making progress.

Looking at this legislation, H.R. 490, we have a number of 69 percent of Americans supporting protecting any baby with a heartbeat.

□ 1245

That is, 55 percent of Democrats support protecting a baby with a heartbeat, and this legislation would save the lives of at least 90 percent of the babies that are otherwise being aborted.

So I want to thank all the people who have done so much work on this that brought us to this point. We are at 170 cosponsors. We have had a hearing. Next step, hopefully, is to get the markup before the Judiciary Committee. My goal is to bring the Heartbeat bill to this floor of the House of Representatives January 19 of 2018. That is the date of the March for Life here in this town, and that is the date we need to bring that legislation to this floor. If we can do so and send it over to the Senate, if the Senate can take it up and pass it, I am confident our President will sign it, and we can begin to put an end to this carnage.

To speak of the magnitude of the carnage of abortion: 60 million babies aborted since 1973 in *Roe v. Wade*.

I had a lady, who is a Democrat, say to me just over here a couple of months

ago: Steve, why are you so worried about this? We have abortions down to where they are almost, or maybe even are below, a million a year?

Only a million abortions a year? How can anyone quantify that and say that is anything other than a bloody carnage and a loss of human potential and a denial of the gifts from God?

Sixty million babies aborted since *Roe v. Wade* in 1973. And how many babies would be born to those who were aborted? How many of those little girls that were aborted in the 1970s, the 1980s, the 1990s, and even in the early part of this millennia—for a small part, the earliest part of this millennia—how many of those little girls would be having babies today? And how many would they have?

Just a back-of-the-envelope calculation tells me that there are another 60 million babies that are missing because of the 60 million that have been aborted. And here we are, America. I am listening to people argue, and they will say: Well, you know there is work that Americans won't do, and we have a shortage of labor, so we have to go to some other culture, some other civilization and bring in hundreds of thousands or millions of people to do work that Americans won't do.

I wonder, if you would ask those innocent little voices that are in Heaven today, if they wouldn't mind laying a few bricks or maybe cutting some grass or doing a little bit of landscaping around or maybe cutting a little bit of meat. These are all things I do, by the way, even today, if I get the chance. Ask them if they wouldn't have liked to have had a chance at the right to life, if they wouldn't have liked to have an opportunity to live, to love, to breathe air, to laugh, to have their own children, to enjoy the greatest country the world has ever seen, and it is all denied to them.

It is denied to 60 million of them, and it is denied to perhaps another 60 million who didn't even have the chance to be aborted because their future parents were killed in the womb. So 60 million plus 60 million is 120 million missing in this country today. No wonder we have a labor shortage.

Oh, here is another reason why we have a labor shortage, Madam Speaker. If you look at the numbers of—according to the Department of Labor statistics in their website, there are 94½ million Americans who are simply not in the workforce. They are old enough to work. They are not in the workforce, 94½ million.

If you add to that the 7-plus million who are on unemployment today, you get up to right at 102 million Americans who potentially could be in the workforce, they are not looking for work or they are on unemployment, and I am listening to employers scream for more labor, more labor, more labor.

By the way, they are screaming for more unskilled labor. I look on that same website, and I see—where are the highest levels of unemployment?

In the lowest skills we have. We don't have a shortage of low-skilled laborers. We have a shortage of employers who want to pay a competitive wage.

So call it 102 million Americans that could be in this workforce. Then we took that number and we started chopping it down.

How about those that are too old?

We can't ask them to work, so dial that down a little bit.

And then how about those that are physically disabled?

They can't work, so dial that down.

What would it be if we were going to mobilize our workforce on the levels of, say, World War II, where at the end of World War II, we had the lowest unemployment in history? And often this is misquoted and people want to point to some other number. 1.2 percent was our unemployment rating at the end of the Second World War.

Women went to work. My mother did. Of course, my father was deployed. But if we mobilized on that level, how many would be available to go into this workforce?

We think about 82 million Americans are sitting there today. Some of them on a couch in their front lawn, some of them are riding around in their Mercedes, but a lot of them could be going to work.

In fact, everybody I mentioned so far should be at work contributing to our GDP instead of just consuming. Eighty-two million or so out there out of the 102 million that are not in the workforce, and they say: Well, we have to bring in hundreds of thousands or millions or tens of millions of people to do this work in America.

Around our family, Marilyn and I raised three sons. I started a business in 1975. I started a family in 1975. Those three sons got an allowance. They got paid for the work they did. In addition, the allowance was younger, paid for the work they did came a little later. But of those three sons, they all knew what they had to do.

Now, if one of those three sons—by the way, I am talking about one-third of our workforce is not in the workforce. They are simply not in the workforce. But one-third of the people who could be are sitting back on the sidelines.

So let's just say, around our operation, there is work that has to be done. You got to scoop the tracks out of the dozer. Somebody has got to change their oil. Somebody has got to mow the lawn. Somebody has got to take care of the other chores. Somebody has got to trim the trees, all those things that need to be done. They all got their assignments and they did them.

But if one of those sons said, "Well, I am not working. I am going to sit on the couch and watch the ball game or sit on the porch and watch the rest of you work. I want to eat with the rest of the family. I want to put my feet under the table. I want good food. I want my clothes all clean. I want them ironed. I

want them ready to go. Somebody else can clean my room, too, but I still want my allowance," you all know, if you grew up in the family, how long that would last.

If one of the siblings, a brother or a sister, said, "I am not doing my work, but give me my allowance, and I still want the keys to the car," it wouldn't last one day.

In our house, it goes completely the other way. It is: "Oh, you think that? Now you get all the work, and they get your allowance until you change your mind."

We fixed that really quick in my household, and I think it would be fixed a number of different ways, but really quickly in every household in America. We don't tolerate a slacker sitting there taking up a room in the house that is demanding all the benefits of the work of the rest of the family.

But we have got 102 million Americans sitting there. Many of them are being bribed not to work by welfare checks. We have over 70 different means-tested Federal welfare programs in the United States. Over 70. Some say 87 of them. No one has even memorized the list. So that should tell you that no one understands how they interrelate with each other. No one understands whether there are disincentives or incentives for people to do the right thing and step forward and carry their share of the load.

So why wouldn't we dial the welfare down in America until the labor force magically shows up in the workplace?

That is what happened with John Smith. His experiment early on in America worked exactly like that. He said that there were—of all the royalty that was there, they thought, because they had blue blood—and that is, of course, the expression of royalty—that they didn't have to work and those commoners needed to work for the rest of time.

He said: I am not going to burn up the labor of these common people here so that a bunch of royalty can sit around with their feet up.

That is a summarization of the statement.

Everybody had to work, and they had the "no work, no eat" policy. Well, when you get to that policy, a lot of people decide that working is better than going hungry, but it doesn't mean we don't take care of the people who are needy. It doesn't mean we eliminate these programs. It just means, as I said, maybe we need 10 million more American workers. We can dial this welfare system down, ratchet it down.

It is now a hammock. It used to be a safety net, and this Congress with special interests has cranked up the level of the safety net to the level of the hammock, and now 102 million Americans, a good share of them, are in that hammock.

We just crank it back down. We could dial it down in proportion to the amount of labor that we need. Every-

body that gets off the hammock and goes to work becomes a contributor. They grow our GDP—our gross domestic product—and they pay taxes and they take themselves off the welfare rolls.

So why wouldn't you do the twofer, instead of go to some other country and bring people here to do the work who don't speak our language, who don't understand our culture, and who don't embrace the American civilization in many cases, and who run down people in bike paths in New York, and who attack us at Fort Hood—the list goes on and on—Orlando, Florida; San Bernardino, on and on, the people who hate us?

As LOUIE GOHMERT often says, "We don't have to pay people to hate us. They will hate us for free." He was talking about foreign policy. We have got people on welfare who hate us. We don't have to pay them either. We need more people working. We need more people back in the rolls.

So I want to applaud KEVIN BRADY, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and I thank him for the very diligent work that he has done in order to bring this tax policy as far as it is today, and to roll it out with the coordination that they have, with the support from the leadership within the House, the Senate, and the White House, and that message has been clear.

Also, KEVIN MCCARTHY, our majority leader, stood here today and defended it and explained it, I think, very well. He is an articulate voice for our entire conference and he does an excellent job, along with our Speaker and our whip.

By the way, our whip, STEVE SCALISE, maybe he doesn't have all of his moves back yet, but his heart and his head are back as strong as ever. His voice is as strong as ever. STEVE SCALISE has his mojo back, Madam Speaker, and I am awfully glad to see that. We need that. It is a gift to us to have him.

So what do we do with this need for labor?

I asked the question a little earlier in a tax conference downstairs: Of this tax policy, the bill now that was dropped yesterday, does it allow an employer to deduct as a business expense the wages and benefits that are paid to illegals who are in his employment?

The answer that I got was: We didn't address that in the bill, so whatever it is today is what it is.

What it is today, Madam Speaker, is every employer—let me put it this way: I will say virtually every employer who deducts the wages that are paid of them is often—if they have illegals working for them, they go on the schedule C, like any other employer.

So let's just say, if there is an employer there who pays \$1 million out to illegals, that shows up in his schedule C as a business expense, wages. And those wages then are deducted as a business expense. Of course, you don't pay taxes on business expenses.

I don't pay taxes on fuel. I don't pay taxes on parts. I don't pay taxes on the wages our company pays in 42 years in the construction business or on the benefit packages that we have there. And—but—so employers are deducting wages and benefits paid to illegals, and that is supposed to be against the law.

But they don't address that in this tax bill. And the way the IRS has addressed it is that—it says this—according to section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code, it denies a deduction for “illegal payments.”

But even though it denies a deduction, under the statute for illegal payments, the IRS has interpreted this a little bit differently. So it says here in this document: even though it is illegal to employ unauthorized alien workers, the IRS has ruled that section 162(e) does not apply to the wages paid to those aliens—and I would call them aliens—even if the employer knowingly broke the law.

Well, there is a problem with IRS interpretation, but I also know they are not very likely to change that interpretation, unless Congress should crack them over the knuckles with some legislation.

I have, for a number of Congresses, introduced legislation known as the New IDEA Act. Today, the New IDEA Act is H.R. 176. It does this: it clarifies. It amends 162(e) of the Code, and it clarifies that wages and benefits paid to illegals are not tax deductible for Federal income tax purposes. It gives the employer safe harbor if he uses E-Verify to verify his employees.

In other words, if you hire people, you have got people on your payroll, you run them through E-Verify. We know all about this program. The Judiciary Committee passed a mandatory E-Verify bill out of the committee here a couple of weeks ago. But you run them through E-Verify. If you are the employer and they have qualified to be legal to work in the United States through the E-Verify program, then the IRS cannot touch you with regard to hiring illegals. So it is a safe harbor that we build into the bill.

So tax, wages, and benefits paid to employers are not tax deductible. The employer gets safe harbor if he uses E-Verify.

We also require the IRS to exchange information and build a working committee with the Social Security Administration and the Department of Homeland Security so that the right hand, the left hand, and the middle hand know what each other is doing.

□ 1300

This is the Federal Government, after all. And how can we have departments within this government working at cross purposes with each other?

So the IRS' job should be to collect taxes. They should not be allowing the deductions of wages and benefits paid to illegals. They are not legal to work in America.

If you are buying illegal drugs, do you get to deduct your illegal drugs?

If you pay off somebody to commit an illegal activity, do you get to deduct that?

No. In none of those cases, we don't allow deductions for illegal activity. That is partly what the legislation said. But the IRS has their practice.

By the way, before I wrote this bill, I was looking around for what department within any branch of government do the people respect fear the most. As one who has been audited thoroughly a number of times, I notice that the IRS is the one that we respect the most—probably fear the most—and the last organization that we want to show up at our door that is going to check to see if we are hiring illegals.

So what would happen under this bill is the IRS would show up—we don't accelerate any audits. The IRS would show up to do a normal audit under normal terms of identifying businesses that they would normally audit, and, in the course of that audit, they would run the Social Security numbers and the identifying information of the employees off of the I-9 forms that have been required since 1986 and punch them into E-Verify.

If they could verify that all of the employees could work legally in America, then, fine, no problem, and that employer only has his other tax issues to worry about. But if E-Verify kicks any of those employees out—one or more—then the employer has 72 hours' notice to cure, like they would under any other circumstance, to correct any records that might need to be corrected. Otherwise, the IRS could look at that and say: Okay, this million dollars that you wrote off as a business expense is not a business expense. That goes back into the gross receipts and shows up at the bottom as net taxable income.

If we do the math on this and break it down, what is the impact? Well, the impact works out to be this:

If you have a \$10-an-hour illegal and the audit comes in and says you can't deduct that \$10 an hour, then the impact of it is that the employer then would be billed for interest and penalty and the tax liability that we calculated, I think, at around 35½ or 36 percent. That turns your \$10-an-hour illegal into about a \$16-an-hour illegal.

Now, if you are going to have to pay \$16 an hour, maybe you could actually hire an American to do that work. You wouldn't have to hire somebody that is sneaking around and that snuck into America. That is one way to look at this it raises the cost.

There is also a 6-year statute of limitations. Nothing goes backwards. There is no ex post facto in this. It would only be from the day of enactment. From that point forward, there could be a 6-year cumulative liability.

So the first year that the bill would pass—hopefully, in this tax package that we have in front of us that is coming to us next week—from the first year the bill would pass, you have 1 year of liability.

And say the IRS doesn't audit you the first year. The second year, now you have 2 years of liability. That risk accumulates then for the period of 6 years, that statute of limitations. So, each year, the employer would see that they had a contingent liability: the IRS. If the IRS shows up and audits, they are going to go back at least 4 years, I am going to guess, maybe longer.

That means that they are going to work to clean up their workforce. They can do it incrementally or they can do it all at once. But nobody is going to want to sit there with a 6-year statute of limitations hanging over their head.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article that is written by the Center for Immigration Studies, dated August 31, 2017, titled: “Raise More than a Quarter Trillion Dollars of Tax Revenue by Ending Tax Subsidies for Unauthorized Employment of Illegal Aliens.”

[From the Center for Immigration Studies,
August 31, 2017]

RAISE MORE THAN A QUARTER TRILLION DOLLARS OF TAX REVENUE BY ENDING TAX SUBSIDIES FOR UNAUTHORIZED EMPLOYMENT OF ILLEGAL ALIENS

(By CIS)

Aliens enter the United States without authorization for many reasons, but for most of them the goal is to secure employment at much higher wages than are available in their native countries. While breaking the law provides very significant economic benefits to these illegal workers and to the businesses that hire them, it comes at a cost to American workers. According to Harvard economist George Borjas, recent empirical research indicates that American workers suffer a reduction of \$99 billion to \$118 billion in annual wages because of illegal immigration.

The economic rewards of unauthorized employment of aliens are not limited to the higher wages of the illegal workers and the lower labor costs of their employers. Unauthorized alien workers and their employers also enjoy multi-billion dollar tax deductions and tax credits that were enacted into law for the benefit of law-abiding workers and businesses.

When Congress returns from summer recess on September 5, it is expected to focus attention on a major reform of the federal income tax system, including a combination of lower rates and other tax incentives to families and to businesses. The largest challenge facing tax reformers is finding sufficient additional revenue to pay for the tax cuts and tax incentives they promised to the people who elected them. In fairness to the American families and businesses to whom these tax cuts have been promised, and in particular to the American families whose household incomes have been diminished by illegal immigration, Congress should consider eliminating unwarranted tax breaks to unauthorized alien workers and their employers.

Each of the following reforms—one that eliminates a tax subsidy for employers of unauthorized aliens and the other that eliminates a tax subsidy for the unauthorized workers—comes with an estimate of the additional revenues that would be raised by the reform. Together they could raise \$296 billion over 10 years—more than a quarter-trillion dollars.

1. No Deduction for Wages Paid to Illegal Aliens. Section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code denies a deduction for “illegal

payments". Even though it is illegal to employ unauthorized alien workers, the IRS has ruled that section 162(e) does not apply to the wages paid to those aliens, even if the employer knowingly broke the law. On January 3, 2017, Rep. Steve King and eight other members of Congress introduced H.R. 176, the New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act, Section 2 of which would amend section 162(e) to clarify that no deduction is allowed for wages paid to unauthorized alien workers. H.R. 176 provides employers a "safe harbor", allowing a deduction to employers that used the Department of Homeland Security's free, online E-Verify system to confirm the employee's eligibility to work.

The amount of wages paid to unauthorized alien workers cannot be known with certainty. One of the most extensive studies of unauthorized immigrants in the United States was conducted by the Pew Hispanic Center in 2009. According to that study, there were approximately 8.3 million undocumented immigrants in the U.S. labor force, a figure that Pew more recently estimated had fallen to 8.0 million. Pew estimated the median household income of unauthorized worker families to be approximately \$36,000 and that there were approximately 1.75 workers per household, implying median per-worker earnings of \$20,571. Multiplying Pew's estimated number of unauthorized alien workers by the earnings-per-worker estimate yields an estimated total of wages paid to unauthorized alien workers of approximately \$165 billion.

Many unauthorized workers are employed in the "underground economy", i.e., by households and other employers that are not reporting or paying payroll taxes and presumably are not deducting the wages. A 2013 report by the Social Security Administration estimated that, of approximately seven million alien workers in various irregular work statuses in 2010, approximately 3.1 million (44 percent) had Social Security numbers (mostly false or fraudulently secured), while approximately 3.9 million (56 percent) were working in the "underground economy." On the assumption that employers reported payroll taxes and claimed wage expense deductions only for the 44 percent of unauthorized workers who could produce an SSN, and that most employers deducted wages at or near the corporate tax rate of 35 percent, we estimate that disallowing a deduction for wages paid to unauthorized alien workers would increase federal tax revenues by approximately \$25.4 billion per year (35 percent x 44 percent x \$165 billion), or \$254 billion over 10 years.

2. Deny Refundable Tax Credits to Illegal Aliens. Section 24(a) of the Internal Revenue Code allows a \$1,000 per-child tax credit for taxpayer's whose earnings fall below a specified threshold. The Child Tax Credit is refundable to the extent it exceeds the taxpayer's tax liability, in which case it is referred to as the Additional Child Tax Credit or ACTC. A 2011 report by the U.S. Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration explained that aliens authorized to work in the United States are required to obtain a Social Security number (SSN). For aliens who need to file U.S. federal tax returns for other reasons, such as to claim refunds of withholding tax on dividends, the IRS issues Individual Tax Identification Numbers (ITINs). Unfortunately, according to the inspector general, the IRS had been permitting aliens to claim ACTCs on returns that reported an ITIN rather than a Social Security number.

The payment of ACTCs to illegal aliens is arguably a direct violation of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 ("PRWOA"), which expressly provides that an illegal alien "is not eligible for any

Federal public benefit." The IRS has applied the PRWOA rule to prohibit payments of Earned Income Tax Credits to ITIN filers, but based on a questionable interpretation of the law has allowed ITIN filers refunds of ACTCs.

According to the Inspector General, "[b]ased on claims made in Processing Year 2010, disallowance of the ACTC to filers without a valid SSN would reduce Federal outlays by approximately \$8.4 billion over 2 years," i.e., \$4.2 billion per year. Although the inspector general's figures are based on 2010 fiscal data, Treasury Department tax expenditure estimates indicate that the total child tax credit expenditure was virtually unchanged between 2010 and 2017. Accordingly, based on the inspector general's report, we estimate that limiting the Child Tax Credit to taxpayers with Social Security numbers would increase federal tax revenues by approximately \$4.2 billion per year, or \$42 billion over 10 years.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The bulk of this article addresses my bill, H.R. 176, the New IDEA Act, the New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act. They go through the calculations here, and I will just touch on some of them.

This is data from a Harvard economist, George Borjas. It is his empirical research. He shows that the workers in America, because wages have been suppressed by an oversupply of unskilled and illegal laborers, that American workers are suffering somewhere between a \$99 billion and \$118 billion loss in annual wages because they haven't gotten a raise in a long time. Nobody gets a raise as long as there is cheaper labor there that keeps that down—no effective raise. So between \$99 billion and \$118 billion. That is the Harvard economist, George Borjas. That is the annual wages loss because of illegal immigration.

If we go to the next page on this, it lays out the conditions, and we are seeing this. This is a number from the Pew Hispanic Center in 2009. It says that there are 8.3 million undocumented immigrants in the U.S. labor force. They recently estimated that number is actually ratcheted down to about 8 million. It doesn't say why. But if they estimated the median household income of unauthorized worker families to be approximately \$36,000 at 1-3/4 average workers per household, that is roughly—let's see. It says, "implying median per-worker earnings of \$20,571," they estimated that the earnings-per-worker estimate yields \$165 billion a year. This is some of the magnitude of the money that is going out of our economy. Also, added to that, roughly \$60 billion is being wired out of America.

So those who say, "Well, we really need these illegal workers because they stimulate our economy, they grow our economy," they are siphoning this off. They are holding down the wages for the working people in America to the tune of \$100 billion or more a year. They are earning something like \$165 billion a year, and they are sending at least \$60 billion of that south of the border, about half to Mexico and the other half to Central America, South America, and the Caribbean.

So all of these are economic impacts.

But the CIS, the Center for Immigration Studies, drew this estimate that, should my bill, the New IDEA Act, H.R. 176, become law—and the perfect place for it is in this tax policy—they estimate that it would score at, the number would be, \$25.4 billion a year. If we do a 10-year estimate, that means a \$254 billion score, a quarter of \$1 trillion poured into our budget at a time that we are cutting taxes and we have a red ink tax policy—which I want to see passed, by the way. We have got some solutions here, and I want to see those solutions become law.

H.R. 176 is one of the unique tools that has been here for some time. It is thoroughly vetted. It has had a good number of cosponsors on it over the past years. I knew Barack Obama would never sign it, but Donald Trump will. It was on his website.

Early on, when he first launched his Presidency, the support for the New IDEA Act was on his immigration policy that was posted then. I haven't checked it now in quite some time, but I don't have any doubt that, if we send a tax bill to Donald Trump's desk with H.R. 176 in it, it will score better, to the tune of probably a quarter of \$1 trillion.

It will put an end to the illegal workforce in America, or at least an end to the deductibility of wages and benefits paid to illegals, and it brings together the Social Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security, and the IRS to exchange information so that, if there is a Social Security number that is overused, they need to tell the DHS and they need to tell the IRS. If the IRS comes up with employers that are hiring illegals—and they will—they need to tell the Department of Homeland Security so ICE can come in and enforce the law.

So each one of these agencies needs to cooperate with each other. This way, we open up jobs for American workers, and we give the American workers a raise.

Now, what could be better than giving the American workers a raise and giving the American workers a tax cut all at the same time, while we nearly guarantee an economic growth cycle for the next decade of an average of over 3 percent per quarter? We can do that. It is all sitting here in front of us. And my hope, my prayer, and my effort is that we can all work together to reach all of those goals.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it is certainly an honor and pleasure to follow my dear friend from Iowa with whom I got to share a little time last

weekend, be out in God's nature and just enjoy the best Iowa has to offer, and STEVE KING is one of those best things.

Well, we have heard a great deal about the New York terrorist, although I believe Governor Cuomo told us there are no terrorist ties initially, before he had any time to know anything, really. But that seems to be kind of the way most mayors where these terrorist attacks occur respond. They immediately declare, "This is not terrorist. No terrorist ties." And then, lo and behold, we find out, eventually, there certainly are.

One of the problems that has been created during the last 8 years and a little bit during the last part of the Bush administration is the development discussion of countering violent extremism. But I do want to touch on something about the diversity visa lottery program.

My first year in Congress, in 2005, we eliminated the diversity visa lottery program—at least voted in the House to eliminate it—but the Senate would not take it up, wouldn't take it up. We had a Republican majority in the House and Senate, and the Senate wouldn't take it up.

Then, in November of 2006, we lost the majority in both Houses. And, of course, the Democratic majority in both Houses loved the diversity visa lottery program. In fact, I have a floor speech from Senator CHUCK SCHUMER where he extols the virtues of the diversity visa lottery program. Here are some highlights.

Senator SCHUMER said—this is May 24, 2006: "As a Member of the House, I helped create this program, which my colleague, Senator Kennedy, created in the Senate in 1990."

He said: "In fact, my city of New York has dramatically benefited from this program, and diverse countries such as Ireland, Poland, and Nigeria have had large numbers of immigrants to be able to come, set roots, and help the diversity of New York and of America."

"So this is an excellent program. Nobody has said it has done a bad job."

Those were his comments in 2006.

Well, I am here to say it has done a bad job. So now nobody can say that nobody has said it has done a bad job, because I am saying it has done a bad job.

No matter how noble the original idea was, you should never trust the country's security to a lottery. That is insanity.

Of course, in a speech back in 2006, then Congressman SCHUMER, now Senator SCHUMER, said—or, actually, he was a Senator in 2006. But Senator SCHUMER said: "I think America should admit many more of those people but not at the expense of this small, successful program that guarantees that other countries, such as the Irelands, the Polands, and the Nigerias that are unable to have immigrants come in for family reasons, can get people to come into this country."

Senator SCHUMER also said, about the diversity visa lottery program: "But one of the things great about America is, again, we allow people from all over the world to come here."

"So I plead with my colleagues, keep the diversity visa program."

He said: "As I ride my bike around New York City on the weekends, I see what immigrants do for America. This program has dramatically helped. Neighborhoods such as Woodlawn and Greenpoint have been revitalized by new Irish and Polish immigrants. Neighborhoods such as East Flatbush and Harlem have been revitalized by West African immigrants. We don't have to stop this program."

□ 1315

Well, again, it is insanity to trust our national security to a lottery, and that is what the diversity visa lottery program does.

We have had terrorists, and we have known it for a number of years, that have been getting their names into the lottery so that hopefully they would win the lottery and come to America to kill Americans.

I understand that there was a stepped-up effort in the last couple of years to vet people a little better, but the trouble here is, as then-Director Comey of the FBI testified before our Judiciary Committee, we have got nothing to vet these people against, so many of them, from Syria, from Yemen.

He said in Iraq, we had all of the government records. It turns out, even with all the government records, they let in two terrorists. We had fingerprints of theirs on IEDs that killed Americans, and they let them in, and eventually realized they had made a mistake. So they said we are going to step up our vetting after they realized they had admitted known terrorists into the United States that created IEDs to kill and maim Americans.

They could say we were stepping up the vetting program, but when there is no information—this is what Comey said. With Iraq, we had the government records, we had fingerprints, we took fingerprints off IEDs.

Syria, Yemen, we have got nothing. The government there doesn't give us their records. We have nothing to work from. In Syria, for a while, ISIS had taken over one of the printing facilities where they could print the passports. So we had no information to work from. We didn't know what was true and what wasn't.

So, once again, we were trusting our national security and the lives of Americans to a fatal game of Russian roulette, but it was from the Middle East, it was from Uzbekistan, it was from places where people have been radicalized.

I have got the numbers here. In fact, let's see, diversity visa program statistics, as I understand, the New York terrorist, the ISIS supporter who killed eight people, wounded so many others,

in 2011, we had 5,091 from Uzbekistan. There were none from Poland, and in the top ten, there were certainly none from Ireland.

We had, in 2012, 4,800 from Uzbekistan; and even better news, we had 4,453 from Iran. For those who are not keeping track, the Iranian Government has not given us information that we can count on about people in Iran who want to come to America, and we know Iran is the largest national supporter of terrorism in the world. So we don't have much of anything to vet these people on, but, you know, Senator SCHUMER said it is a great program, and nobody said anything against it as he rides his bicycle around.

Well, fortunately he wasn't riding his bicycle around in front of the terrorist that was allowed in on the program he thinks was so grand. And, frankly, I am grateful he was not on his bicycle in front of that terrorist killer that his program let in.

In 2013, Uzbekistan, we had 5,101 come in from Uzbekistan. We did have 2,038 come from Poland that year.

In 2014, another 6,027 that we could not adequately vet coming from Iran. Some of them we could with relatives, but many of those people simply could not be vetted. We don't know if they were sent here by the Iranian Government to kill Americans or not.

In 2015, we have another 4,992 from Iran; Uzbekistan, we had another 4,368.

So we don't have the numbers from 2016 yet, unfortunately, but hopefully that gives some idea of what we are dealing with.

We also need to understand that government officials tell us: You know, we had no indication this guy was a terrorist.

There were even people from the government, the Feds, who were saying: Gee, you know, this was not a known person.

This New York terrorist, not a known person to the Federal authorities.

Well, it turns out, in 2015, they interviewed him. He had terrorist ties.

The thing people need to understand is—and I have been saying this for years, I have grilled Director Mueller on this issue. I was contacted by one media outlet that says: Why are you just bringing this up now about the purge of training materials?

My goodness. I have been talking about this for years, I have been made fun of about this for years, but I have been right about it for years, Michele Bachmann and I.

It should not have been classified what they took out of the FBI materials, but they classified it so we couldn't show America how stupid some of their purging was, how senseless, how, as some of our agents told me, we are blinding ourselves of the ability to see our enemy.

So I grilled Mueller some years ago over the fact that they got a heads-up twice that the older Tsarnaev brother was radicalized, he was a terrorist, he

was a threat to American lives. They didn't do anything; the CIA didn't do anything.

The FBI finally sends some agents out. They interviewed the older Tsarnaev, but they didn't know what to ask. They don't know what the signs are of someone who is radicalized, because they have had beat down their throats for so long, and this was the Obama administration, they had the FBI's Guiding Principles document on training. And this was the document that the FBI used to say: Oh, no. We have got to be politically correct. We can't teach people about how to find and spot a radical Islamist.

So there was a purge of FBI training materials.

There is a fantastic Judicial Watch special report, it can be found on their website, dated December 5 of 2013, "U.S. Government Purges of Law Enforcement Training Material Deemed 'Offensive' to Muslims."

Who was complaining? Well, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, the Islamic Society of North America, and they just happened to have known contacts who were named as coconspirators supporting terrorism in the Holy Land Foundation prosecution.

What did Mueller's FBI do under Mueller's specific direction? They created an outreach program. They called them their community outreach partner for these people who judges said: No. There is plenty of evidence to show that these people have ties supporting terrorism. No. We are not going to eliminate their names.

The Dallas Federal Court said that; the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans said that. It didn't make it to the Supreme Court, but two courts said: Yeah, there is plenty of evidence to see there are plenty of ties here, evidence of their ties to known terrorists.

So it wasn't until 2008, after years of having this evidence, that Director Mueller sent kind of an apologetic letter to CAIR, Council on American-Islamic Relations, saying: You know, we better suspend our community partnership for a while.

It is just unbelievable, but it was the political correctness during the Obama administration that has gotten people killed, because they purged our training material. And God bless Ken Jensen, FBI agent. He had prepared the 700-page training materials that Mueller ordered destroyed.

Somebody needed to study that material before they went out and talked to Tsarnaev. If they had, they would have recognized this guy has probably radicalized, and we better be on the alert. They could have saved lives at the Boston Marathon if Mueller had not prevented them from knowing how to do their job. And he is special counsel.

By the way, Madam Speaker, the former Director of the FBI who blinded

the FBI of their ability to see terrorists, why do we think he came out with the indictments exactly when he did? Well, I can tell you why, because he is as easy to read as anybody in the world. He came out with those indictments when he did because he had people starting to call for his resignation, starting to demand that he be removed, demanding that he recuse himself. Even *The Wall Street Journal*, that has been very sympathetic, they pointed out it was time for him to go. What did he do? He immediately comes out with indictments to show: No, no, no. You can't demand that I go. I am too relevant.

You look at those indictments, and I am for punishing anybody who has committed a crime, but there was no need for a special counsel to come up with what he did. The FBI could have done that. The Department of Justice could have done that. We didn't need Mueller and 20 lawyers, all of these Hillary Clinton sycophants, in there to come up with this. The DOJ could have done this. It was just a ridiculous couple of indictments to be spending all these millions of dollars for.

We also know that same kind of conduct occurred when Comey came to the Hill and testified there is no trace of evidence of collusion between President Trump and the Russians.

Well, Mueller had to be puckering up, because he knew: Uh-oh. Now there is testimony from the FBI Director that there is no basis for me to be special counsel and to have hired all these people. Wow. So the President could be in line to fire me, because now we have testimony from the FBI Director there is no basis for this investigation. Shut her down.

So that night, they leak out he is investigating President Trump for obstruction of justice. Excuse me? We all know what that so-called evidence was. They will never, ever get a conviction, because it was not obstruction of justice.

Obstruction of justice is when you do what Comey and Loretta Lynch did to prevent a proper investigation, and you make an agreement with potential defendants that if they will just give you their laptops and let you look at them, you will destroy all that you find, and you will never use any of that information to prosecute them, and you give them immunity from prosecution. That is not what you do if you are going to prosecute a case. No.

You get them in a bind and then you tell them: Here are the charges you are looking at unless you come clean and identify the person above you with whom you were working and what they did.

Then you work up the chain to the big fish, which is how organized criminal organizations have been prosecuted over the years. It would work in this case, but Director Comey was so busy figuring out how to explain how Hillary Clinton should not be prosecuted,

though the evidence was basically for a slam dunk case of conviction, that he overlooked properly pursuing the case.

We don't need Director Mueller. We need him gone, and we need a special prosecutor to get into this, clearly, since Jeff Sessions recused himself on anything involving Hillary Clinton and Russia. And we can't have Rod Rosenstein, for heaven's sake, now that we know that he and Mueller should not be involved in this special counsel situation, because they both were engaged in the coverup of the initial Russian investigation that revealed Russia was trying to corner the market on uranium, and they had to seal that, because if they hadn't sealed that and covered up that evidence and that investigation, then Hillary Clinton would not have been able to hit the Russian megamillions lottery by authorizing the sale of uranium to Uranium One that ends up in Russian hands.

Bill Clinton wouldn't have gotten \$500,000. He didn't hit the megamillions, except for the 145 or so that went into the Clinton Foundation.

Mueller cannot possibly investigate this. He is in it up to his eyeballs, and so is Rosenstein. They both ought to do the decent thing. I know it is not characteristic, but they ought to do the decent thing and resign and let somebody that is not completely submerged in the original coverup investigate this whole matter.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a funeral for a former Member of the House.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of conducting representational activities in her congressional district.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 304. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act with regard to the provision of emergency medical services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, November 6, 2017, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the third quarter of 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DEVIN WISER, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 29 AND AUG. 4, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Devin Wiser	7/29	7/31	Germany		331.60		(³)		139.07		470.67
	7/31	8/2	Lithuania		854.29		(³)		175.98		1,030.27
	8/2	8/4	Norway		584.00		(³)		808.69		1,395.78
Committee total					1,769.89				1,123.74		2,896.72

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

DEVIN WISER, Oct. 24, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SEAN GARD, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 30 AND JULY 8, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Sean Gard	7/1	7/2	Egypt		721.00		(³)				721.00
	7/3	7/4	Greece		616.00		(³)				616.00
	7/5	7/8	Belarus		702.00		(³)				702.00
Committee total					2,039.00						2,039.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

GWEN MOORE, Oct. 27, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Frederica Wilson	8/25	8/27	Ghana		428.95		5,985.80				6,414.75
	8/27	8/31	Nigeria		1,671.77		(³)				1,671.77
	8/31	9/2	Cote d'Ivoire		673.60		(³)				673.60
	9/2	9/2	The Gambia		0		(³)				0
Udoch Onwubiko	8/25	8/27	Ghana		428.95		(³)				428.95
	8/27	8/31	Nigeria		1,299.18		(³)				1,299.18
	8/31	9/2	Cote d'Ivoire		673.60		(³)				673.60
	9/2	9/2	The Gambia				(³)				
Committee total					5,176.05		5,985.80				11,161.85

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX, Chairman, Oct. 30, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS, Chairman, Oct. 3, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Marc Alberts	8/8	8/14	Marshall Islands/Micronesia		906.00		3,667.25				4,573.25
Brian Modeste	8/8	8/14	Marshall Islands/Micronesia		906.00		3,636.13				4,542.13
Hon. Rob Bishop	7/28	8/4	Germany/Lithuania/Norway		1,819.89		(³)		1,123.74		2,943.63
Hon. Louie Gohmert	7/28	8/4	Germany/Lithuania/Norway		1,819.89		(³)		1,123.74		2,943.63
Hon. Paul Gosar	7/28	8/4	Germany/Lithuania/Norway		1,819.89		(³)		1,123.74		2,943.63
Hon. Amata Radewagen	7/28	8/4	Germany/Lithuania/Norway		1,819.89		(³)		1,123.74		2,943.63
Hon. Jennifer Gonzalez-Colón	7/28	8/4	Germany/Lithuania/Norway		1,819.89		(³)		1,123.74		2,943.63
Hon. Alan Lowenthal	7/28	8/4	Germany/Lithuania/Norway		1,819.89		(³)		1,123.74		2,943.63
Hon. Gregorio Sablan	7/28	8/4	Germany/Lithuania/Norway		1,819.89		(³)		1,123.74		2,943.63
Matt Schafie	7/28	8/4	Germany/Lithuania/Norway		1,769.89		(³)		1,123.74		2,893.63
Adam Stewart	7/28	8/4	Germany/Lithuania/Norway		1,769.89		(³)		1,123.74		2,893.63
Kate Juelis	7/28	8/4	Germany/Lithuania/Norway		1,769.89		(³)		1,123.74		2,893.63
Peter Gallagher	7/28	8/4	Germany/Lithuania/Norway		1,769.89		(³)		1,123.74		2,893.63
Sang Yi	7/28	8/6	Gabon/Tanzania/S. Africa		2,453.56		9,979.04		1,015.57		13,448.17

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2017—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Melissa Beaumont	7/28	8/6	Gabon/Tanzania/S. Africa		2,453.56		9,979.04		1,015.57		13,448.17
Hon. Amata Radewagen	9/15	9/24	Japan/S. Korea		1,719.50		13,182.19		984.29		15,885.98
Committee total					28,257.41		40,443.65		15,376.57		84,077.63

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. ROB BISHOP, Chairman, Oct. 24, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Ed Perlmutter	7/31	8/6	Australia		115.00		7,019.86				7,134.86
Committee total					115.00		7,019.86				7,134.86

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, Oct. 24, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Steve Chabot	8/27	8/29	Czech Republic		416.00		12,336.26				
	8/29	8/31	Slovakia		272.00						
	8/31	9/1	Slovenia		265.00						
Hon. Kevin Fitzpatrick	8/27	8/29	Czech Republic		416.00		12,220.16				
	8/29	8/31	Slovakia		272.00						
	8/31	9/1	Slovenia		265.00						
Hon. Jenniffer González-Colón	8/27	8/30	South Korea		1,034.00		12,335.66				
	8/30	9/2	Taiwan		802.00						
Committee total					3,742.00		36,892.08				40,634.08

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. STEVE CHABOT, Chairman, Oct. 26, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Douglas Presley	7/6	7/8	Europe		467.00				93.00		560.00
	7/8	7/11	Europe		1,289.15						1,289.15
Commercial airfare							6,586.08				6,586.08
Kashyap Patel	7/6	7/8	Europe		467.00				93.00		560.00
	7/8	7/11	Europe		1,289.14						1,289.14
Commercial airfare							6,586.08				6,586.08
William Flanigan	7/4	7/7	Europe		601.96						601.96
Commercial airfare							11,255.76				11,255.76
Lisa Major	7/4	7/7	Europe		276.00						276.00
Commercial airfare							11,255.76				11,255.76
Hon. Devin Nunes	7/29	7/29	Europe						320.88		320.88
	7/29	7/30	Europe		230.00				5,305.00		5,535.00
	7/30	7/30	Europe						171.29		171.29
	7/30	7/31	Europe		65.00				430.34		495.34
	8/1	8/2	Europe		469.00				225.50		694.50
	8/2	8/4	Europe		359.93				52.26		412.19
	8/4	8/6	Europe		713.00				295.00		1,008.00
	8/6	8/8	Europe		457.89				70.98		528.87
	8/8	8/9	Europe		394.70						394.70
	8/9	8/12	Europe		988.00				342.00		1,330.00
Commercial airfare							16,837.06				16,837.06
George Pappas	7/29	7/29	Europe						320.88		320.88
	7/29	7/30	Europe		230.00				5,305.00		5,535.00
	7/30	7/30	Europe						171.29		171.29
	7/30	7/31	Europe		65.00				430.34		495.34
	8/1	8/2	Europe		469.00				225.50		694.50
	8/2	8/4	Europe		371.75				52.26		412.19
	8/4	8/6	Europe		713.00				295.00		1,008.00
	8/6	8/8	Europe		457.88				70.98		528.87
	8/8	8/9	Europe		394.70						394.70
	8/9	8/12	Europe		874.00				342.00		1,330.00
Commercial airfare							9,894.96				9,894.96
Hon. Rick Crawford	8/1	8/2	Europe		469.00				225.50		694.50
	8/2	8/4	Europe		359.94				52.26		412.20
	8/4	8/6	Europe		713.00				295.00		1,008.00
Commercial airfare							11,483.86				11,483.86
Kashyap Patel	8/1	8/2	Europe		469.00				225.50		694.50
	8/2	8/4	Europe		359.94				52.26		412.20
	8/4	8/6	Europe		713.00				295.00		1,008.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND
SEPT. 30, 2017—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
	8/6	8/8	Europe		457.88				70.88		528.86
	8/8	8/9	Europe		338.70						338.70
	8/9	8/12	Europe		534.00				342.00		876.00
Commercial airfare							17,370.56				17,370.56
Hon. Frank LoBiondo	8/6	8/6	Europe		457.88				521.00		521.00
	8/6	8/8	Europe		457.88				70.98		528.86
	8/8	8/9	Europe		338.70						338.70
	8/9	8/12	Europe		534.00				342.00		876.00
Commercial airfare							13,767.76				13,767.76
Hon. Brad Wenstrup	8/2	8/6	Oceania		1,479.00		538.83		211.00		2,228.83
Commercial airfare							16,723.16				16,723.16
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	8/2	8/6	Oceania		1,479.00		538.83		211.00		2,228.83
Commercial airfare							15,825.66				15,825.66
Steve Keith	8/2	8/6	Oceania		1,479.00		538.83		211.00		2,228.83
Commercial airfare							14,834.36				14,834.36
William Flanagan	8/5	8/8	Asia		771.00				32.50		803.50
	8/8	8/10	Asia		698.00						698.00
	8/10	8/12	Asia		752.23						752.23
Commercial airfare							12,564.66				12,564.66
Lisa Major	8/5	8/8	Asia		771.00				32.50		803.50
	8/8	8/10	Asia		698.00						698.00
	8/10	8/12	Asia		752.23						752.23
Commercial airfare							12,564.86				12,564.86
Andrew House	8/6	8/7	Europe		392.00						392.00
	8/7	8/8	Europe		465.89				351.93		817.82
	8/9	8/11	Europe		836.33				21.22		857.55
	8/11	8/12	Europe		309.78						309.78
	8/12	8/17	Europe		1,471.14						1,471.14
Commercial airfare							13,434.66				13,434.66
Allen Souza	8/6	8/7	Europe		392.00						392.00
	8/7	8/8	Europe		465.89				351.93		817.82
	8/9	8/11	Europe		836.33				21.22		857.55
	8/11	8/12	Europe		309.78						309.78
	8/12	8/17	Europe		1,471.14						1,471.14
Commercial airfare							13,434.66				13,434.66
Shannon Stuart	8/6	8/7	Europe		392.00						392.00
	8/7	8/8	Europe		465.89				351.93		817.82
	8/9	8/11	Europe		836.33				21.22		857.55
	8/11	8/12	Europe		309.78						309.78
	8/12	8/17	Europe		889.08						889.08
Commercial airfare							9,886.66				9,886.66
Mark Stewart	8/6	8/7	Europe		392.00						392.00
	8/7	8/8	Europe		465.89				351.93		817.82
	8/9	8/11	Europe		836.33				21.22		857.55
	8/11	8/12	Europe		309.78						309.78
	8/12	8/17	Europe		1,471.14						1,471.14
Commercial airfare							9,805.66				9,805.66
Damon Nelson	8/9	8/12	Asia		853.12				18.35		871.47
	8/15	8/18	Asia		738.00				26.88		764.88
Commercial airfare							11,602.66				11,602.66
Angel Smith	8/9	8/12	Asia		853.12				18.35		871.47
	8/15	8/18	Asia		738.00				26.88		764.88
Commercial airfare							11,602.66				11,602.66
Steve Keith	8/9	8/12	Asia		568.75				18.34		587.09
	8/15	8/18	Asia		738.00				26.88		764.88
Commercial airfare							9,809.95				9,809.95
Marissa Skaggs	8/9	8/12	Asia		853.12				18.34		871.46
	8/15	8/18	Asia		738.00				26.87		764.87
Commercial airfare							12,421.16				12,421.16
Hon. Jackie Speier	8/9	8/10	Europe		293.00				125.00		418.00
	8/10	8/12	Europe		756.09				300.34		1,056.43
	8/12	8/14	Europe		540.03				207.96		747.99
Commercial airfare							15,041.66				15,041.66
Hon. Mike Quigley	8/9	8/10	Europe		293.00				125.00		418.00
	8/10	8/12	Europe		756.09				300.33		1,056.42
Commercial airfare							11,827.66				11,827.66
Linda Cohen	8/9	8/10	Europe		293.00				125.00		418.00
	8/10	8/12	Europe		756.09				300.33		1,056.42
	8/12	8/14	Europe		540.03				207.96		747.99
Commercial airfare							13,316.16				13,316.16
Chelsey Campbell	8/9	8/10	Europe		293.00				125.00		418.00
	8/10	8/12	Europe		756.09				300.33		1,056.42
	8/12	8/14	Europe		540.03				207.96		747.99
Commercial airfare							13,316.16				13,316.16
Jacqueline Tame	8/19	8/22	Asia		627.30				83.87		711.17
	8/23	8/27	Asia		1,408.00				394.00		1,802.00
	8/27	8/31	Asia		1,852.03				1,493.86		3,345.89
Commercial airfare							9,175.56				9,175.56
Timothy Bergreen	8/19	8/22	Asia		627.30				83.87		711.17
	8/23	8/27	Asia		1,408.00				394.00		1,802.00
	8/27	8/31	Asia		1,852.03				1,493.86		3,345.89
Commercial airfare							9,241.76				9,241.76
Kristin Jepson	8/19	8/22	Asia		627.30				83.87		711.17
	8/23	8/27	Asia		1,408.00				394.00		1,802.00
	8/27	8/31	Asia		1,852.03				1,493.85		3,345.88
Commercial airfare							9,175.56				9,175.56
Kimberlee Kerr	8/19	8/22	Asia		627.30				83.87		711.17
	8/23	8/27	Asia		1,408.00				394.00		1,802.00
	8/27	8/31	Asia		1,852.03				1,493.85		3,345.88
Commercial airfare							9,175.56				9,175.56
Hon. Terri Sewell	8/26	8/27	Africa		428.95		(9)		192.79		621.74
	8/28	8/30	Africa		1,671.77		(9)		0.00		1,671.77
	8/31	9/2	Africa		673.60		(9)		1,761.39		2,434.99
	9/2	9/2	Africa				(9)		77.56		77.56
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	8/28	9/1	Asia		984.00		(9)		71.63		1,055.63
Commercial airfare							11,036.96				11,036.96
Andrew House	8/28	9/1	Asia		984.00				71.63		1,055.63
Commercial airfare							12,221.16				12,221.16
Mark Stewart	8/28	9/1	Asia		984.00				71.63		1,055.63
Commercial airfare							9,371.56				9,371.56
Allen Souza	8/28	9/1	Asia		984.00				71.63		1,055.63
Commercial airfare							9,371.56				9,371.56
Wells Bennett	8/28	9/1	Asia		984.00				71.63		1,055.63
Commercial airfare							9,371.56				9,371.56
Hon. Michael Turner	8/31	9/5	Europe		2,234.00				1,631.00		3,865.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2017—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare							2,082.56				2,082.56
Douglas Presley	8/31	9/5	Europe		2,234.00				1,631.00		3,865.00
Commercial airfare							1,924.56				1,924.56
William Flanagan	9/13	9/15	Europe		331.08						331.08
	9/15	9/17	Europe		411.48						411.48
	9/17	9/18	Europe		264.42				30.25		294.67
	9/18	9/20	Europe		326.00				31.61		357.61
	9/20	9/22	Europe		742.97						742.97
Commercial airfare							11,096.76				11,096.76
Damon Nelson	9/13	9/15	Europe		331.08						331.08
	9/15	9/17	Europe		411.48						411.48
	9/17	9/18	Europe		264.42				30.25		294.67
	9/18	9/20	Europe		326.00				31.61		357.61
	9/20	9/22	Europe		742.97						742.97
Commercial airfare							11,096.76				11,096.76
Lisa Major	9/13	9/15	Europe		331.08						331.08
	9/15	9/17	Europe		411.48						411.48
	9/17	9/18	Europe		264.42				30.25		294.67
	9/18	9/20	Europe		326.00				31.61		357.61
	9/20	9/22	Europe		742.97						742.97
Commercial airfare							11,096.76				11,096.76
Timothy Bergreen	9/13	9/15	Europe		331.08						331.08
	9/15	9/17	Europe		411.48						411.48
	9/17	9/18	Europe		264.42				30.25		294.67
	9/18	9/20	Europe		326.00				31.61		357.61
	9/20	9/22	Europe		742.97						742.97
Commercial airfare							13,524.46				13,524.46
Shannon Green	9/13	9/15	Europe		331.08						331.08
	9/15	9/17	Europe		411.48						411.48
	9/17	9/18	Europe		264.42				30.25		294.67
	9/18	9/20	Europe		326.00				31.61		357.61
	9/20	9/22	Europe		742.97						742.97
Commercial airfare							13,403.06				13,403.06
Scott Glabe	9/15	9/17	Europe		184.23						184.23
	9/17	9/18	Europe		264.42				30.25		294.67
	9/18	9/20	Europe		326.00				31.61		357.61
	9/20	9/22	Europe		742.97						742.97
Commercial airfare							9,653.16				9,653.16
Angel Smith	9/16	9/19	Asia		1,066.20						1,066.20
Commercial airfare							11,066.86				11,066.86
Kashyap Patel	9/16	9/19	Asia		1,066.20						1,066.20
Commercial airfare							11,066.86				11,066.86
Douglas Presley	9/16	9/19	Africa		754.00						754.00
	9/19	9/20	Africa		261.00						261.00
	9/20	9/21	Africa		410.00						410.00
Commercial airfare							18,516.58				18,516.58
Chelsey Campbell	9/16	9/19	Africa		754.00						754.00
	9/19	9/20	Africa		261.00						261.00
	9/20	9/21	Africa		410.00						410.00
Commercial airfare							18,516.58				18,516.58
Kristin Jepson	9/16	9/19	Africa		754.00						754.00
	9/19	9/20	Africa		261.00						261.00
	9/20	9/21	Africa		410.00						410.00
Commercial airfare							18,516.58				18,516.58
Andrew House	9/18	9/22	Europe		1,926.85						1,926.85
Commercial airfare							12,033.96				12,033.96
Hon. Devin Nunes	9/19	9/20	Africa		805.14						805.14
	9/21	9/22	Asia		509.67				646.78		1,156.45
	9/22	9/24	Asia		874.62				555.24		1,429.86
Commercial airfare							12,153.56				12,153.56
George Pappas	9/19	9/20	Africa		805.14						805.14
	9/21	9/22	Asia		509.67				646.78		1,156.45
	9/22	9/24	Asia		874.62				555.23		1,429.85
Commercial airfare							8,965.76				8,965.76
Committee total					103,804.78		597,522.84		38,115.65		739,443.27

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.^{*} In accordance with title 22, United States Code, Section 1754(b)(2), information as would identify the foreign countries in which Committee Members and staff have traveled is omitted.

HON. DEVIN NUNES, Chairman, Oct. 26, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2017

Name of Member or Employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Chris Smith	7/5	7/8	Belarus	Ruble	912.00		3,744.16				4,656.16
	8/23	8/28	Italy (Holy See)	Euro	982.40		1,833.46				2,815.86
Hon. Alcee Hastings	7/1	7/3	Egypt	Pound	1,246.00						1,246.00
	7/3	7/5	Greece	Euro	1,020.00						1,020.00
	7/5	7/8	Belarus	Ruble	912.00						912.00
Hon. Steve Cohen	7/1	7/3	Egypt	Pound	1,246.00						1,246.00
	7/3	7/5	Greece	Euro	1,020.00						1,020.00
	7/5	7/8	Belarus	Ruble	912.00						912.00
Hon. Randy Hultgren	7/1	7/3	Egypt	Pound	1,246.00						1,246.00
	7/3	7/5	Greece	Euro	1,020.00						1,020.00
	7/5	7/8	Belarus	Ruble	912.00						912.00
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee	7/1	7/3	Egypt	Pound	1,246.00						1,246.00
	7/3	7/5	Greece	Euro	1,020.00						1,020.00
	7/5	7/8	Belarus	Ruble	912.00						912.00
Hon. Gwen Moore	7/1	7/3	Egypt	Pound	1,246.00						1,246.00
	7/3	7/5	Greece	Euro	1,020.00						1,020.00
	7/5	7/8	Belarus	Ruble	912.00						912.00
Hon. Richard Hudson	7/5	7/8	Belarus	Ruble	912.00		4,668.90				5,580.90
Mark Milosch	7/5	7/8	Belarus	Ruble	702.00		4,161.56				4,863.56
	8/23	8/28	Italy (Holy See)	Euro	982.40		1,833.46				2,815.86
Allison Hollibaugh	7/5	7/8	Belarus	Ruble	702.00		4,161.46				4,863.46

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2017—Continued

Name of Member or Employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Committee total					21,082.80		20,403.00				41,485.80

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Oct. 18, 2017.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3067. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Darryl L. Roberson, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3068. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report for fiscal years 2013-2014 on the Family Violence Prevention and Services Program, pursuant to Sec. 304 of the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3069. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2016 Annual Report to the Congress on the Native Hawaiian Revolving Loan Fund, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2991b-1(g)(1); Public Law 88-452, Sec. 803A (as amended by Public Law 102-375, Sec. 822(2)); (106 Stat. 1296); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3070. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-57, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3071. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0753; Product Identifier 2017-NE-25-AD; Amendment 39-19046; AD 2017-2017-19-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3072. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Defense and Space S.A. (Formerly Known as Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9386; Product Identifier 2016-NM-056-AD; Amendment 39-19055; AD 2017-19-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3073. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-

2017-0248; Product Identifier 2016-NM-088-AD; Amendment 39-19054; AD 2017-19-24] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3074. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0515; Product Identifier 2016-NM-171-AD; Amendment 39-19061; AD 2017-20-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3075. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0691; Product Identifier 2017-NM-029-AD; Amendment 39-19068; AD 2017-20-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3076. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0624; Product Identifier 2016-NM-135-AD; Amendment 39-19067; AD 2017-20-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3077. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PIAGGIO AERO INDUSTRIES S.p.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0648; Product Identifier 2017-CE-012-AD; Amendment 39-19070; AD 2017-20-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3078. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0244; Product Identifier 2016-NM-044-AD; Amendment 39-19071; AD 2017-20-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3079. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Canadian, TX; and Wheeler, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0458; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASW-8] received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3080. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Clarinda, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0536; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ACE-10] received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3081. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0034; Product Identifier 2016-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-19063; AD 2017-20-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3082. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0254; Product Identifier 2017-NE-10-AD; Amendment 39-19066; AD 2017-20-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3083. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9183; Product Identifier 2016-NM-059-AD; Amendment 39-19029; AD 2017-18-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3911. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to risk-based examinations of Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organizations (Rept. 115-384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 4236. A bill to ensure that the prescription drug monitoring program of each State receiving funds through the Account for the State Response to the Opioid Abuse Crisis meets certain minimum requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 4237. A bill to prohibit United States assistance to foreign countries that oppose the position of the United States in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 4238. A bill to impose terrorism-related sanctions with respect to As-Saib Ahl Al-Haq and Harakat Hizballah Al-Nujaba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCALISE (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 4239. A bill to distribute revenues from oil and gas leasing on the outer Continental Shelf to certain coastal States, to require sale of approved offshore oil and gas leases, to promote offshore wind lease sales, and to empower States to manage the development and production of oil and gas on available Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4240. A bill to protect Second Amendment rights, ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and provide a responsible and consistent background check process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H.R. 4241. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a pilot program to improve transportation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. BOST, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DUNN, Mr. WALZ, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CORREA, Mr. SABLON, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. PETERS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 4242. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a permanent VA Care in the Community Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. BOST, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, and Mr. DUNN):

H.R. 4243. A bill to establish a commission for the purpose of making recommendations regarding the modernization or realignment of facilities of the Veterans Health Administration, to improve construction and management leases of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to amend and appropriate funds for the Veterans Choice Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Vet-

erans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Appropriations, 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. COHEN (for himself and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4244. A bill to require the release of all records relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. BERGMAN):

H.R. 4245. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress certain documents relating to the Electronic Health Record Modernization Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN (for herself, Ms. LEE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 4246. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to create a buffer in between oil and gas drilling operations and homes, businesses, schools, and other buildings that require special protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 4247. A bill to repeal title VIII of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 4248. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to repeal certain disclosure requirements related to conflict minerals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 4249. A bill to provide housing and Medicaid assistance to families affected by a major disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 4250. A bill to promote category management principles within the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4251. A bill to promote the use of resilient energy systems to rebuild infrastructure following disasters; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 4252. A bill to expand geothermal production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOV-

ERN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 4253. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for certain protections for aliens granted temporary protected status or deferred enforced departure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. HURD, Mr. BABIN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BARTON, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H. Res. 605. A resolution congratulating the Houston Astros on winning the 2017 Major League Baseball World Series; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GAETZ (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H. Res. 606. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Robert Mueller should resign from his special counsel position; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

142. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 14, to memorialize the Congress of the United States to award a posthumous Medal of Honor to Sergeant Thomas Henry Sheppard for his actions during the Civil War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

143. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3, urging the Congress of the United States to properly fund the Department of Veterans Affairs Board of Veterans' Appeals and to urge the Board to streamline its process so that appeals are decided in a more timely manner; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 4236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H.R. 4237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all

Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. SCALISE:

H.R. 4239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I

By Ms. ESTY of Connecticut:

H.R. 4241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 4242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 4243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 4245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 4246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: "The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular state."

Article I, Section 8: "To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 4247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, providing the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several states."

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 4248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution this power.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 4250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 4251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that Congress shall have the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 4252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution

The Congress shall have the Power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 113: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 392: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 548: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 747: Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 807: Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1178: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 1192: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1267: Mr. KING of New York and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1270: Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1318: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1437: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1456: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1475: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1478: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 1496: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. ROHR-ABACHER.

H.R. 1511: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1566: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1708: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 1730: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 1836: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1953: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2004: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2123: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2197: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2198: Mr. COHEN and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 2234: Mr. KATKO and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2259: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. FASO.

H.R. 2358: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 2401: Mr. KATKO and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2505: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 2601: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 2633: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 2740: Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 2832: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 2851: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 2887: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 2948: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. TENNEY.

H.R. 3117: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 3121: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 3179: Mr. BARR and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 3222: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 3227: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 3273: Mr. PASCARELL.

H.R. 3274: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 3314: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 3316: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 3349: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3352: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3378: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 3489: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3502: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 3513: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 3530: Mr. EVANS and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 3596: Mr. GIBBS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 3712: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3738: Mr. KHANNA and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 3759: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 3760: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 3768: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 3773: Mr. COHEN and Mr. PASCARELL.

H.R. 3782: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3784: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 3792: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 3798: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 3806: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 3867: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 3897: Mr. POLIQUIN and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 3913: Mr. BARR and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 3916: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 3976: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. LONG, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 3979: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 3980: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 4013: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 4058: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 4082: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 4101: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 4114: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 4131: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 4143: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4155: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 4173: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 4177: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. FASO, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 4222: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H. Con. Res. 59: Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. HECK and Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 21: Mr. POSEY.
H. Res. 58: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. HULTGREN.
H. Res. 188: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 313: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 319: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 393: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. ROSEN.

H. Res. 495: Mr. KATKO.
H. Res. 575: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H. Res. 576: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MAST, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

65. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, Texas, relative to requesting that Congress propose for ratification, by special conventions to be held within the several states, pursuant to Article V, an amendment to the United States Constitution which would establish a Bill of Rights for victims of crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMEMORATING NATIONAL ADOPTION DAY

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the National Adoption Day celebration that is taking place today in Odessa. Throughout the day, local courts in Ector County will open their doors and finalize the adoption process for families in the community.

It is fitting that National Adoption Awareness Month occurs in the month of November, a time of family and Thanksgiving. During this time of the year, we reflect on what we are most thankful for in our lives, such as our families. Each of our families provide us with unconditional love, help shape our character, provide a lifetime of precious memories and motivate us through challenging times.

Unfortunately, not everyone is afforded this opportunity in life. Thankfully, God has blessed our world with selfless individuals who open their hearts and homes to these children. Many of these children have various medical, developmental, and emotional needs that requires special nurturing from devoted parents and families. These special individuals who elect to take on full responsibility for their care, upbringing, and overall well-being provide an important service not only to these children, but also to our communities and country.

I am particularly gratified to recognize these new families because I am adopted myself. My father adopted my little brother, sister, and me, so seeing other children who have the benefit of a loving family warms my heart.

I want to thank CASA of the Permian Basin and the other organizations across the nation who help make National Adoption Day possible. I also want to thank the dedicated individuals who make a powerful difference in the lives of children through adoption.

LEGISLATION TO COMPEL THE RELEASE OF ALL JFK ASSASSINATION DOCUMENTS

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation I introduced today that would require President Trump to immediately meet his obligation to release all documents that can and should be released pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

Despite the 1992 passage of a Congressionally-mandated October 26, 2017 deadline requiring the President of the United States make a determination about what documents can and should be released to the public regarding President John F. Kennedy's assassina-

tion, the current President failed to comply.

The President's failure to execute this requirement before the established deadline raises long-held concerns that the U.S. government continues to withhold critical information about the former President's assassination.

As a result, it is now up to Congress to enforce this deadline and deliver to the American public the certainty it deserves.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to exert the authority of this body's intent when it passed the 1992 President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act and enact this important measure to enforce the required release of all appropriate documents concerning the assassination of the late, and Honorable, President John F. Kennedy.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF CAROL JACKMAN

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Carol Jackman, who turns 80 years young on December 4th.

Carol's dedication to our veterans stretches back to her childhood. Growing up on army bases, she developed a keen awareness of the important work our servicemembers do every single day. Not only is she the daughter of a U.S. veteran, but she is the sister, wife, mother, grandmother, sister-in-law, and aunt of U.S. veterans.

Volunteerism has been an important theme in Carol's life. For over 50 years, Carol has been a proud member of the American Legion Auxiliary. She has served as unit president, district director, state president, and the chair of many different programs. During the 1970s Carol worked to ensure no veteran was forgotten. She created and delivered homemade Easter baskets for sick and homebound veterans. Carol has also spent decades volunteering at the West Roxbury and Brockton VA hospitals.

Honoring veterans is her passion. To this day she plants flowers in the Highland Cemetery, a tradition she has kept up longer than she can remember. She also serves on the Memorial Day committee in Dover, working to ensure each year's celebration properly honors our servicemembers.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Carol Jackman on this joyous occasion of her 80th birthday. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing her many more years of health and happiness.

COMMEMORATING THE HONORABLE LYNN C. WOOLSEY ON HER 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate former United States Representative Lynn C. Woolsey on her 80th Birthday. She represented California's 6th congressional district, including Marin County and most of Sonoma County from 1993 to 2013.

Lynn was born in Seattle, Washington on November 3, 1937. A graduate of Lincoln High School, she attended the University of Washington from 1955 to 1957. Lynn received her Bachelor of Science degree in 1980.

As a working single mother in Northern California, Lynn spent several years receiving public assistance to help make ends meet. During her 20-year career in the House of Representatives, she focused on issues facing children and families. She describes herself as the "first former welfare mom to serve in Congress." Prior to entering public service, Lynn opened her own human resources consulting and employment agency, Woolsey Personnel Service, and taught at the College of Marin and the Dominican University of California.

Lynn won her first election in 1984, when she ran for a city council seat in Petaluma. She served on the Petaluma City Council until 1992, her last year as Vice Mayor. The people of Sonoma and Marin Counties elected Lynn to Congress in 1992 and continued to elect her to eight more terms.

In Congress, Lynn served as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Chair of the Committee on Education and Labor's Workforce Protections Subcommittee and as a senior member of the House Committee on Science and Technology. Lynn had many proud moments in federal public service. She secured federal funds for her district for a variety of projects, including funds for the Petaluma River flood control project and for the seismic retrofit of the Golden Gate Bridge. She voted against authorizing the invasion of Iraq and consistently voted to suspend funding for the wars. She was one of Congress' foremost advocates on education issues, offering legislation to expand school breakfast programs, expand childcare programs and encourage young girls to study science and math. Her measure to provide job-protected leave for family members of injured soldiers was incorporated into the FY 2008 defense authorization bill. Lynn's former colleagues, staff and constituents admire her immeasurably and continue to benefit from her dedicated years of service.

Mr. Speaker, former United States Representative Lynn C. Woolsey served her constituents diligently for ten consecutive terms. Her career is an excellent model of principled and dedicated leadership for members of this

• 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.

body. It is therefore fitting and proper that we commemorate her on her 80th birthday and send her our best wishes here today.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE REV. DR.
THOMAS L. WALKER

HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to congratulate my constituent and friend, Rev. Dr. Thomas L. Walker, for 50 faithful years in ministry, and 47 years as pastor of Ebenezer Missionary Baptist Church.

Dr. Walker, a native of Edgecombe County, North Carolina, was called to the ministry in 1970. At the age of 22, he and his wife Joyce, and their two children, Timothy and Teresa, began a ministry that would inspire and uplift the faithful for decades. Today, under his leadership, the church's community outreach includes TV and radio ministries, a daycare center, a tutorial program, and ministerial trainings.

The church also has a non-profit corporation called the EBC "ATOM" Project, Inc., whose objective is to improve the quality of life for low and middle-income citizens. Dr. Walker has committed his life to serving both his community and fellow man. One of Pastor Walker's many talents is his success as a gospel recording artist. Through song, his messages and voice have uplifted and inspired countless individuals. His signature, "One Day at a Time," continues to inspire hearts across the nation.

In 1996, Dr. Walker received troubling news when he was diagnosed with prostate cancer. Yet, he would not sit idly by or be sidelined. His perseverance led him to write, "Brother to Brother—You Don't Have to Die of Prostate Cancer." A thoughtful and informative book, Dr. Walker presents an honest account of his challenges and frustrations, with the goal of empowering men and their families. In April of 2014, First Lady Joyce Walker, having battled sickness for many years, was called home to be with the Lord. Dr. Walker remained steadfast and continues to stand as a pillar of strength, persistence, and a living testament of the Gospel.

Mr. Speaker, I celebrate this great North Carolinian and ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in expressing sincere appreciation for Dr. Walker's fortitude, faithfulness, and servant leadership on this historic milestone.

RECOGNIZING BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM
"ROBBIE" ROBERTSON ON HIS
PROMOTION IN THE ILLINOIS
AIR NATIONAL GUARD

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize Brig. Gen. William "Robbie"

Robertson on his promotion in rank and to Chief of Staff of the Illinois Air National Guard.

In 1983, Brig. Gen. Robertson became an officer in the 182nd Airlift Wing of the Illinois Air National Guard. Over his years of service, Brig. Gen. Robertson defended our nation in Operations Desert Shield, Desert Storm, Southern Watch, Joint Forge, Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. As a command pilot, he has flown over 4,800 hours in various aircraft. Brig. Gen. Robertson's leadership was critical to the conversion of the unit from the OA-37 Dragonfly to F-16 Fighting Falcon and to the C-130 Hercules, which equipped our Armed forces with tools they need to combat our nation's enemies.

In 2004, Brig. Gen. Robertson took over command of the 182nd Airlift Wing. Under his command, the 182nd Airlift Wing maintained the highest mission capability rates for ten of the past eleven years for all C-130 units. As commander, he is responsible for maintaining the combat readiness of eight C-130 aircraft and over 1,200 Illinois Air National Guardsmen. The 182nd Airlift Wing received the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award five times during his tenure.

Brig. Gen. Robertson has committed his life to serving our nation. I am grateful for his leadership and sacrifice in the Illinois Air National Guard. This country is blessed to have servicemen like William Robertson and I extend my sincere congratulations to him on his promotion to Brigadier General.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LOUIS
PAPIA

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Louis Papia, 92, of Agoura Hills, California, a constituent of mine who was laid to rest at Arlington National Cemetery on Monday, October 30, 2017. Mr. Papia was a decorated World War II veteran who fought in the D-Day invasion with the 1st Battalion, 314th Regiment, 79th Infantry Division. He was a recipient of the Bronze Star and eight other citations, including the Good Conduct Medal, the Presidential Unit Emblem, the American Campaign Medal, the European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the Army of Occupation Medal with German Clasp, the Combat Infantryman Badge and the Honorable Service Lapel Button for WWII. Mr. Papia was also a recipient of the French Jubilee Medal, for his service at Utah Beach during the Invasion. Mr. Papia received his Bronze Star when helping an Army medic save the life of a fellow soldier while under heavy fire.

Mr. Papia landed at Utah Beach with the 79th, and took part in the Battle of Cherbourg. His initial mission was to battle his way southwest, across the Cherbourg Peninsula. One of the critical missions was to capture the port city so the Army Corp of Engineers could quickly erect a working port big enough to accommodate large U.S. supply ships. The 79th fought in Normandy, Northern France, Rhineland, Ardennes-Alsace and in Central Europe,

including Germany. Mr. Papia was under the command of Colonel Olin E. Teague, who later became the 16-term Congressman from Texas's 6th Congressional District. After serving his country abroad in Germany, and as the war in Europe was drawing to a close, Mr. Papia was shipped back to the U.S. where he began to prepare to do his part in Operation Downfall, the planned U.S. invasion of Japan.

Louis Papia is survived by his wife of 65 years, Kay Papia, of Agoura Hills, California, and four sons: Louie, Russell, Mark, and Todd. Mark and Melissa Papia reside in Calabasas, California, with two of Papia's five grandchildren.

Mr. Papia will be remembered for his selfless service to our country, and we are forever grateful to him.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call No. 604 I was absent on account of personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

HONORING THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CLAVERACK REFORMED DUTCH CHURCH

HON. JOHN J. FASO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. FASO. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to recognize the 250th anniversary of the Reformed Dutch Church in Claverack. Reverend John Gabriel Gebhard dedicated this historic sanctuary on November 8, 1767, adorning the church with the text, "Stand in the gate of the Lord's House, and proclaim there His Word . . . enter in at these gates to worship the Lord." Reverend Gebhard headed the church for the next fifty years until his death, laying the foundation for what would be two more centuries of continued worship and community in central Columbia County.

Listed on the National Register of Historic Places, Claverack's Reformed Dutch Church is a historic treasure. During the Revolutionary War, this building served as a refuge for soldiers and officers. Surrounding the church is the Claverack Cemetery, where Claverack residents connect to the community's earliest members.

The church continues to serve as a center for religious, educational, and community activities. On November 5, 2017, Claverack will come together to celebrate this incredible milestone. I thank Pastor Linda Miles, Vice President and Senior Elder Louise Bliss, Senior Deacon Donna Lynk Campion, and all members of the local Reformed Dutch Church for their contributions to this special community. I am proud to honor the Reformed Dutch Church in Claverack for fostering 250 years of prayer and kinship.

COMMEMORATING LISA STONE
FOR RECEIVING THE 2017 STATE
JOURNAL REGISTER FIRST CIT-
IZEN AWARD

HON. DARIN LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to honor Lisa Stone of Springfield, Illinois for receiving the 2017 State Journal Register First Citizen Award.

Since 1963, the State Journal Register has been awarding the First Citizen award to a resident who goes above and beyond their commitment to making Springfield a better place. For over four decades, Lisa has volunteered countless hours and raised money for numerous organization in the Springfield community. Lisa's many contributions to the community include: fundraising for the Sojourn House, a domestic violence shelter; fund-raising for the Jewish Federation; and helping Russian refugees resettle in America. Additionally, Lisa served as an original board member of Habitat for Humanity of Sangamon County.

Lisa's commitment to the Springfield community is unmatched. Her years of volunteering and fundraising have made a true difference in Springfield. I applaud her for her efforts to make our community a better place.

I extend my sincere congratulations to Lisa Stone on receiving the State Journal Register First Citizen award, and I wish her much success as she continues to lead a life of service to the community.

DELAY MEDICAID DSH CUTS

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Congress to delay the cuts to Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) payments that went into effect on October 1, and to protect our nation's safety net hospitals from financial ruin.

Medicaid DSH hospitals serve a high proportion of Medicaid recipients as well as underinsured or completely uninsured Americans. These hospitals bear the risk of caring for the most vulnerable members of our districts because they recognize the inextricable value of healthy communities: when we are healthy together, we thrive together. It is our duty to return the favor to the hospitals that ensure our communities have a secure health care safety net.

If Congress does not act soon to delay Medicaid DSH cuts, safety net hospitals across the country will face a twenty percent cut in federal funding. In my home district in Queens and the Bronx, Medicaid DSH hospitals stand to lose over \$409 million over the next ten years. I cannot stand by as Congress throws our safety net hospitals into an economic upheaval.

However, I also cannot stand by as Congress brings forth a proposal—the CHAMPIONING HEALTHY KIDS Act (H.R. 3922)—to pay for a delay of Medicaid DSH cuts for two

years by imposing steeper cuts on those same hospitals in future years, among other flaws.

This legislation is an example of how this Republican-led Congress has championed partisan gridlock that threatens the vitality of our safety net hospitals. Within a package to delay Medicaid DSH cuts and extend federal funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and community health centers, Republicans proposed several problematic offsets that would ultimately set our health care system back. For example, certain changes to Medicaid would inhibit access to pediatric providers, and cuts to the ACA's Prevention and Public Health Fund would undermine the value of preventive services delivered at community health centers. Furthermore, the package would lead to higher premiums for certain seniors receiving Medicare benefits and shorter grace periods for individuals who receive their health coverage through the individual market. In other words, this package would slash benefits and protections for one group of beneficiaries to extend services for another. Democrats will not stand for any packages that would rob Peter to pay Paul.

I cannot in good conscience vote for a package that starts a food fight amongst different groups of beneficiaries. And I cannot in good conscience vote for a bill that would be so irresponsible to the long-term financial viability of the hospitals that are a flagship for the most vulnerable constituents in my district.

I urge my Republican colleagues to drop this partisan exercise and work with us on a compromise to extend these long-standing, successful, bipartisan federal health programs. The job of our nation's safety net hospitals is much too important to bear the brunt of needless political games.

HONORING NORTHEAST GEORGIA
EFFORTS TO END DOMESTIC VIO-
LENCE

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my northeast Georgia neighbors for their efforts in raising awareness surrounding domestic violence.

Nearly 25 million Americans have been victims of domestic violence at some point in their lives, and more than 65,000 Georgians have reported experiencing domestic violence.

Recently, the community of Clarkesville held a vigil to remember local victims of domestic abuse. By rallying around each other, they demonstrated their commitment to helping neighbors who may be suffering in silence.

Tricia Hise is one Clarkesville neighbor whose dedication to addressing this scourge head-on stands out. Hise, a local attorney, has invested countless hours in pro-bono litigation to amplify the voices of domestic abuse victims. Through her work, Hise has inspired victims to take a stand on behalf of themselves and their loved ones.

My neighbors in Clarkesville serve as an encouragement to us all. As we continue to oppose and address domestic abuse, I encourage everyone here today to find opportunities to work for the well-being of Americans who are impacted by domestic abuse.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF REX
E. GOLDEN

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Rex Earl Golden, age 95 of Machesney Park, Illinois who passed away peacefully surrounded by family on Tuesday, October 31, 2017.

Rex was born on September 3, 1922 in Walnut Ridge, Arkansas to Luther M. & Mettie Golden (Hislip). A Veteran of the U.S. Army Air Corps, he served his country with distinction in Europe during World War II on D-Day. He was a proud 50-year member of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 364, and a former member of the Ancient Free & Accepted Masons, Rockford Lodge No. 102.

Rex was a beloved father, grandfather, and brother who will be dearly missed by his friends and family. He is survived by his sons, Darrin (Tracy) Golden and Alan (Nikki) Golden; grandchildren, Kiley, Brayden, Brant, Cassidy, and Jack; brother, James "Bud" Golden; sister, Jeanette (Bob) Pace and Pat (Frank) Todd; and brother-in-law, Thomas Neton Sr. He is predeceased by his wife, Jean C. Golden (Edwards); siblings, Edward (Edna) Golden, Georgia Gatewood and Ruby Neton.

His son Darrin and I are good friends, and it is with deep respect that I extend my most sincere and heartfelt condolences to all the family and friends of Rex Golden.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUBEN GALLEGO

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I cast a vote in error. On the Roll Call Vote No. 598, I had intended to vote in the following manner: Roll Call Vote No. 598—Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017—No.

HONORING THE MILITARY
SERVICE OF LEONARD SWARTZ

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember WWII veteran, Leonard "Lenny" Swartz of Beaumont, TX who died peacefully in his own bed on October 30, 2017.

Lenny was born on April 17, 1919 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In 1930, the Great Depression forced the Swartz family to move to Atlantic City in hopes of a better living. After High School, Mr. Swartz moved back to Philadelphia until December of 1941. When WWII began for the United States, Lenny felt the call to serve his country and immediately enlisted in the United States Army. After graduating Officer's Candidate School in Ft. Jackson, South Carolina Lenny was next stationed at Camp Polk, in Deridder, Louisiana. While he

was stationed at Camp Polk, Lenny took a trip to Beaumont, TX on leave and met a woman named Marie “Mongie” Eisen. In March of 1943, the two entered into a marriage that would last over 74 years. Mongie died just ten weeks ago in August. The couple lived in Deridder until Lenny was sent to Ft. Ord California for training before he boarded a ship headed to fight in the Pacific.

Lenny was a captain in the 536th Amphibious Tank Battalion that played an important role in the Battle of Leyte Gulf that began the invasion of the Philippine Islands. It was while fighting during the invasion of Okinawa that Lenny was wounded badly and received his battlefield recognition. When the war ended, Lenny left the military as a Major and returned with Mongie to Beaumont. After working for his father-in-law in the produce business, Lenny opened his own produce business.

Lenny was very active in the American Legion, Jewish War Veterans and the Masons. He always set an example for his sons and community by working hard every day and being active at his synagogue. After retiring, Lenny worked in his flower gardens around his home and watched his favorite football team, the Dallas Cowboys. Mr. Swartz loved his family dearly and truly lived a life worth living.

It is always an honor for me to recognize those American heroes who sacrificed so much defending and preserving our freedom in World War II. This truly was the greatest generation. We thank Mr. Swartz—as well as his entire family—for their bravery and sacrifice to our great nation.

CONGRATULATING HESLER
CARDENAS

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hesler Cardenas, a visually impaired senior at Gainesville High School who recently placed second in a nationwide art competition.

Hesler submitted a painting titled “Blossom Petal” to the 2017 American Printing House for Blind Insights Art Competition. Out of nearly 400 entries, Hesler’s painting surpassed all but one and earned a spot on the walls of the American Printing House in Kentucky.

Hesler stands out among his peers by pursuing his goals despite his visual limitations.

Mr. Speaker, Hesler’s success reminds us that with tenacity, hard work and determination often take us closer to our dreams than we could imagine.

As Hesler continues to inspire his fellow northeast Georgians, I look forward to seeing where his talent will take him next.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE RESIDENTS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO WHO HAVE COMPLETED THE IDAHO STEP CHALLENGE TO IMPROVE THEIR HEALTH AND WELLNESS BY MEASURING THEIR DAILY STEP COUNT

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of several constituents in my district who have taken it upon themselves to improve their health and wellness by incorporating exercise and a balanced diet into their daily routine.

Last year, my staff and I created the Idaho STEP Challenge. The goal of the challenge was to encourage residents from across the state of Idaho to get fit and healthy by walking virtually across the United States, while collecting data on a wearable activity tracker and pedometer. Beginning on June 1, 2016, a group of more than 300 residents and several workplace teams set out on the virtual walk across the United States starting at the U.S. Capitol Building in Washington D.C. and arriving at the Idaho Statehouse in Boise, Idaho more than a year later.

The nearly 3,000 mile route took participants through 18 iconic American cities, national parks, and spacious heartlands. The event was documented on social media under the #hikewithMike hashtag, and through regular email newsletters sent to participants. Residents also shared their encouraging weight loss and fitness stories online, and uploaded their mileage counts to a special section of my website. The event was devised to be a non-partisan, non-political interactive event open to all Idaho residents.

The Idaho STEP Challenge officially concluded on October 23, 2017. Those who participated demonstrated their commitment to healthy living and a spirited stand for fitness within our state. I would like to acknowledge the following participants for joining me on the virtual road to Boise and I thank them for promoting healthy lifestyles in our community.

Nick Abshire, Jeff Daniels, Kathy Parks, Lisa Lane, Susan Littlefield, Miranda Collins, Jeannette Barnes, Jessica Padour, Suelynn Williams, Pat Mills, Kellie Gough, Carolyn Simpson, Maryl Fisher, Penny Handley, Fred Hughes, Carolee McKenzie, Patrick Kole, Dana Flatter, Miranda Smith Collins, Bart & Julie Harwood, Gerald Simpson, Wendy Jaquet, Celia R. Gould, Sheila Woods, Gina Martin, Ray Simpson, Jan Simpson Rhoades, Dennis & Sheila Conley, Toni Orth, Ron Fisher, Connie Pond, Angela Degni, Sheila Ames, Elizabeth Criner, Elaine M. & James Long, Glen Tait, Cheryl Hardy, Shelby C. Sommer, Judy Slayton.

Once again, thanks to all the participants in the Idaho STEP Challenge and I congratulate them on their commitment to a better Idaho.

ETHIOPIA RESOLUTION

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 3, 2017

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the Government of Ethiopia’s continued pattern of repression and violence against its own people, and I urge the House of Representatives to vote on House Resolution 128, the “Supporting Respect for Human Rights and Encouraging Inclusive Governance in Ethiopia Resolution.” This resolution calls on the Government of Ethiopia to take clear, decisive, steps toward becoming more inclusive, more democratic, and more respectful of the basic human rights of its own people.

This resolution has overwhelming bipartisan support with more than 70 cosponsors, and it passed out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously on July 27.

The ongoing human rights crisis in Ethiopia is extremely troubling to me, to the resolution’s other co-sponsors, the many Americans of Ethiopian heritage, and to numerous human rights groups. I firmly believe that the passage of this resolution will encourage the Ethiopian government to end its practice of violence and repression and provide a strong basis of an inclusive government.

Specifically, this resolution condemns: the excessive use of force by Ethiopian security forces; the killing of peaceful protestors; the arrest and detention of journalists, students, activists, and political leaders, and; the Ethiopian government’s abuse of the Anti-Terrorism Proclamation to stifle political and civil dissent.

The resolution does not simply highlight the Ethiopian government’s increasingly authoritarian acts, but it also encourages the United States to support efforts to improve democracy and governance in Ethiopia. I believe that the United States can take actions that will positively influence the Ethiopian government and use our existing institutions to further democracy and effective governance in Ethiopia. Critically, the resolution calls on the Ethiopian government to admit UN human rights observers so they can conduct an independent and thorough examination of the current state of human rights in Ethiopia.

On March 9 of this year, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, held a hearing to discuss specific steps the United States can take to bring about positive changes for the Ethiopian government and their people. Among those who testified was Deacon Yoseph Tafari, of the St. Mary’s Ethiopian Orthodox Church located in Aurora, Colorado. Deacon Yoseph was raised in Ethiopia and has experienced the daily struggles too many Ethiopians have faced living in abject poverty under an oppressive government.

Deacon Yoseph fled from Ethiopia in 1976, and came to the United States as a refugee. He and many of the members of the Ethiopian community in my Congressional district in Colorado—including the Oromo and Amharas—have worked diligently to organize and assist those still suffering from repression in their home country.

Oromo Community President of Colorado, Jamal Said, has also shared his concerns with me, and both of these gentlemen have no motives other than a concern about the safety

and state of democracy in Ethiopia. I appreciate their leadership in the community as they continue to fight for democracy in their homeland.

Unfortunately, stories like this are not uncommon in my district and I am disappointed that the House has not yet scheduled a floor vote on House Resolution 128. I note that on two prior occasions a vote was tentatively scheduled. In both of these instances it is my understanding that the vote was postponed due to pressure from the Ethiopian government who continues to make promises to curb human rights abuses against their own people but fail to deliver. Additionally, it has been brought to my attention that the Ethiopian Government has threatened to cut off security

cooperation with the United States should we proceed with House Resolution 128.

I am particularly dismayed that rather than solving their problems and moving towards becoming a more democratic country, the Ethiopian government has chosen instead to hire a D.C. lobbying firm, at a cost of \$150,000 a month, to “work with the [Ethiopian Government] to develop and execute a public affairs plan to enhance the dialogue and relationships with policymakers, media, opinion leaders and business leaders . . .” in addition to “meetings with members of Congress, their staffs, and executive branch officials.”

The issue the Ethiopian government needs to address is the repression of democracy and its citizens in Ethiopia. The solution to what-

ever negative perception it has in the halls of the U.S. Congress is not a public affairs one, but rather what concrete steps are being taken against democracy in Ethiopia. That is why I remain committed to working with House leadership to have a vote scheduled on House Resolution 128.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage leadership to schedule a vote and I call on my colleagues to vote in favor and pass House Resolution 128. I will continue working with local Ethiopian community leaders in Colorado and across the country to raise awareness of the human rights abuses occurring in Ethiopia and to bring relief from oppression to the Ethiopian people.

Friday, November 3, 2017

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 3 p.m., on Monday, November 6, 2017.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 4236–4253; and 2 resolutions, H. Res. 605, 606 were introduced. **Pages H8494–95**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H8496–97**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 3911, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 with respect to risk-based examinations of Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organizations (H. Rept. 115–384). **Page H8494**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Pages H8447, H8475**

Community Health And Medical Professionals Improve Our Nation Act of 2017: The House passed H.R. 3922, to extend funding for certain public health programs, by a yea-and-nay vote of 242 yeas to 174 nays, Roll No. 606. **Pages H8449–75**

Rejected the Clyburn motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 187 yeas to 231 nays, Roll No. 605.

Pages H8466–74

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 115–382, modified by the amendment printed in part B of H. Rept. 115–382, shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill. **Page H8449**

H. Res. 601, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3922) was agreed to yesterday, November 2nd.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, November 6th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H8479**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H8473–74 and H8474. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:31 p.m.

Committee Meetings

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE SMALL BUSINESSES' AND COMMUNITIES' ACCESS TO CAPITAL

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Securities, and Investment held a hearing entitled "Legislative Proposals to Improve Small Businesses' and Communities' Access to Capital". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY,

NOVEMBER 6, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 3043, the “Hydropower Policy Modernization Act of 2017”; and H.R. 3441, the “Save Local Business Act”, 5 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 1, the “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act”, 12 noon, 1100 Longworth.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, November 6

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, November 6

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Steven Andrew Engel, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination at 5:30 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Babin, Brian, Tex., E1503
 Butterfield, G.K., N.C., E1502
 Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1504
 Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1501

Collins, Doug, Ga., E1503, E1504
 Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E1501
 Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E1503
 Faso, John J., N.Y., E1502
 Gallego, Ruben, Ariz., E1503
 Keating, William R., Mass., E1501

LaHood, Darin, Ill., E1502, E1503
 Lieu, Ted, Calif., E1502
 Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E1503
 Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E1502, E1504
 Thompson, Mike, Calif., E1501



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.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are