United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 20, 2017 *No. 48*

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 20, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAN NEWHOUSE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

WHAT CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE SAYS ABOUT AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, after 7 years of railing against the Affordable Care Act, a little less than 2 weeks ago we finally got an opportunity to see what the Republican repeal-and-replace plan actually looks like.

President Trump described it on March 7, again, a little less than 2 weeks ago, as our wonderful new healthcare bill.

The new Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tom Price, solemnly promised that no one will be worse off financially as part of this bill known as the American Health Care Act.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as President John Adams once said a long time ago, facts are stubborn things; and over the last 2 weeks, we have had an opportunity to see what the Congressional Budget Office says about the American Health Care Act. Again, this is the neutral body that advises the Congress and the Nation with budgetary analysis both in terms of taxes and spending and also in terms of healthcare coverage.

What it has told us is that 24 million Americans will lose their health coverage between now and 2024. In fact, it will go up by 14 million just in the first couple of years under this bill, which, again, after 7 years, we never got a chance to see it, but now we are finally getting that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is a little sort of too much to talk about these large numbers and top-line numbers. What I want to share with you and my colleagues and also anyone watching this speech is that the Kaiser Family Foundation, which is, again, one of the most respected healthcare, nonprofit, educational institutions in our country, has produced an interactive website which basically gives any American the opportunity to scroll across a map of America, find the county where you live, punch in what their income level and age is, and then compare the existing law with the American Health Care Act. Again, that website is kff.org/interactive/tax-credits. Again, kff.org.

I had an opportunity to use that website for my district in eastern Connecticut, a district I proudly represent, the home of the UConn Women Huskies and the home of the Groton submarine base, the oldest submarine base in America. What it showed is that, for people living in New London County, in Windham County, in Tolland County, in Middlesex County, if you are 60 years old and you are making $50,000 a year, you lose $3,230—in terms of premium tax credits compared to existing law—in the proposal which, again, was finally unveiled 2 weeks ago.

If you make only $30,000 a year and you are 60 years old, you lose $5,850, a 59 percent reduction in terms of your income assistance to buy health coverage. Again, the prior number was 45 percent.

Unlike what Mr. Price said, this, in fact, is much worse off financially for people in those age groups and where they live. It is far worse off financially in terms of where they stand. In fact, it makes it impossible for people to afford health insurance.

That is why the Congressional Budget Office, looking at that kind of data, has made the conclusion that, if we pass this bill—and the vote is scheduled on Thursday—we will see, again, millions of Americans who will basically be priced out of the opportunity to buy health insurance.

And when you are 60 years old—as someone who is 63, I can tell you—that is not a good place to be in terms of your health status and the risk that you carry when you get older in life in terms of the need to be able to access healthcare coverage.

Mr. Speaker, it is that reason why, when you look at what the stakeholders that deliver health care in America—the American Nurses Association, the American Hospital Association, the AARP, and, finally, the American Medical Association—who have looked at this bill over the last 2 weeks, they have universally pleaded with Congress to block this measure, to slow down the rush to judgment which is going to deprive people of one of the most elemental, basic needs that all of us share.

We are not immortal. We are not immune to getting illness and disease. It

is something that affects every single American.

To pass a bill which will wreak that kind of havoc, again, is irresponsible and takes this country in the absolute wrong direction.

So, again, I would plead with Members and I would ask anybody watching this speech, go to the Kaiser Foundation website, find where you live, think about your uncle or your children or people that you know in your neighborhood, and really plug in that data and information and think about what, in fact, we are being told is, in fact, a wonderful healthcare bill and something that won't hurt people and won't make them worse off financially. Again, the opposite is true. CBO is telling us this, the doctors are telling us this, the nurses are telling us this, the hospitals are telling us this, those who advocate for older Americans are telling us this.

Again, it is not too late. This vote is coming up on Thursday. It is time to listen to the people who are closest to the system and stop this rush to harming millions of Americans.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of National Agriculture Day, I rise to honor and thank the men and women who feed our Nation.

Agriculture is one of the most important sectors in our economy. It is cultivated and maintained by our Nation's farmers who rise before the sun every day and work long hours 7 days a week so that Americans can have safe, quality food to feed their families. It is not an easy job, but it is certainly an important one.

In order to fully honor and appreciate our farmers and their devotion to the agriculture industry, we must do more than recognize their hard work 1 day a year. We must also invest in and work to better the agriculture industry every day of the year. That is why, for as long as I serve in Congress, I will continue to meet with, work for, and advocate on behalf of our farmers.

Happy National Agriculture Day, and a huge thank-you to every American farmer.

CELEBRATING JEFF AMACHER'S 20 YEARS OF SERVICE WITH THE CENTENNIAL FIRE DISTRICT

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Jeff Amacher of Circle Pines, Minnesota, for more than 20 years of service with the Centennial Fire District.

Fighting fires and protecting Minnesotans is not an easy job, but it is one that is absolutely crucial to our community and the safety of our citizens. It takes a special kind of person to rush into a burning building and to put themselves in harm's way to save the life of another.

I commend Jeff for exuding such bravery over the past 20 years. I not only would like to thank Jeff for his commitment to our community, but I want to congratulate him for being recognized for his brave work by the Circle Pines City Council.

Jeff, we wish you a happy and peaceful retirement spent with your family and friends. After a life of service, you deserve it.

RECOGNIZING U.S. BANCORP

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate U.S. Bancorp on being recently named the World's Most Admired Superregional Bank by Fortune Magazine. This is the seventh consecutive year they have received this honor, which is no small feat by any means.

U.S. Bancorp has also been recognized by Fortune Magazine for ranking among the top ten companies spanning across all industries for upholding four of Fortune's nine key characteristics of reputation. The characteristics that U.S. Bancorp has maintained include: quality of management, long-term investment value, use of corporate assets, and financial soundness.

Minnesotans can be proud of a Minnesota-based company that ranks as one of the world's best performers. This honor is undoubtedly due to the excellent work of the employees, as well as the extraordinary vision and leadership of those who run this fine company.

Congratulations on your incredible accomplishment.

RECOGNIZING THRIVENT FINANCIAL FOR HELPING MINNESOTANS ACQUIRE HOMES

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Thrivent Financial for this amazing organization's work to help Minnesota families acquire a home.

Thrivent Financial is a longtime partner of Habitat for Humanity. During the partnership, they have given more than $2 million in grants to build quality low-income housing so that 24 families in our community could afford to buy a home. This year, Thrivent has given another $66,000, which will be used to build the 25th home, this time for a family right here in St. Cloud, Minnesota.

As a result of their service to Minnesota families, Thrivent has been inducted into the Habitat for Humanity's Business Partner Hall of Fame.

I want to commend both Habitat for Humanity and Thrivent Financial on this excellent partnership, and thank them for their generous service to the residents of Minnesota.

RECOGNIZING RAY YOUNG AND CHARLES ''BUCK'' VANDERSTEEN

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two of my constituents, Ray Young of Wisner and Charles ''Buck'' Vandersteen of Alexandria, for their recent induction into the Louisiana Agriculture Hall of Distinction.

Since growing up on his family farm, Ray Young has dedicated his life and career to farming. After earning a degree in agriculture from Louisiana Tech and a master's in entomology from LSU, Ray went on to pioneer the stale seedbed conservation tillage system, known today as no-till, used across the South to enhance crop production.

In 1989, Ray presented to Congress an application to charter the Federal Land Bank of North Louisiana. He has served on the board of directors for the Federal Land Bank, as a board chairman of the Louisiana Land Bank, and as a leader of numerous State and Federal agricultural organizations.

Ray and his family still farm cotton, soybeans, sweet potatoes, Irish potatoes, corn, vegetables, cattle, hay, wheat, and pine trees.

He is a tremendous example of a Louisiana farmer making his life and a living off his land. His insight is always valuable to me when I am working on agricultural policy for our Nation.

Buck Vandersteen has spent 34 years presiding over the 4,000-plus members of the Louisiana Forestry Association, is a past president of the Southern Forest Heritage Museum and a past president of the National Council of Forestry executives.

During that time, Buck has helped pass the Forest Productivity Program to get part of the State's severance taxes distributed to forest landowners as cost share for replanting. It is recognized as one of the top programs in the Nation. He has been instrumental in advocating forestry education at the technical school and university levels so that we can have sustainable and productive working forests.

Buck continues to serve the forest industry today, and I look forward to working with him in my role on the Working Forest Caucus on behalf of foresters across the country.

Mr. Speaker, Louisiana is one of the top agricultural States in the Nation, and I am proud to serve on the Agriculture Committee here in Washington to represent our State's farmers, foresters, and ranchers.

But the real contributions to our State agricultural prowess can be traced back to folks like Ray Young and Buck Vandersteen, men who have spent their lives enhancing the industry that is so vital to Louisiana. Congratulations once again for being inducted into the Louisiana Agricultural Hall of Distinction. It is an honor that is well deserved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we thank You for giving us another day.

Send Your spirit upon the Members of this people's House to encourage them in their official tasks. As the Members approach the votes they are making in the days to come, may they be imbued with courage and leadership that looks to the health and vibrancy of our great Nation.

Assure them that, in the fulfillment of their responsibilities, You provide the grace to enable them to be faithful in their duties and the wisdom to be conscious of their obligations, and fulfill them with integrity.

May we be faithful stewards not only of Your creation, but also Your desire that all people would be free from whatever inhibits them to be fully alive.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina 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.

HONORING SHAWN T. ANDERSON

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a saddened heart for my friend and comrade Sergeant Shawn T. Anderson, a veteran and highly decorated police officer, who was shot dead on Saturday evening as he attempted to arrest a rape suspect.

Sergeant Anderson died as he lived: in honorable service to the people of his State, Louisiana, and his city, Baton Rouge, wearing the uniform of my comrade and friend Sheriff Sid Gautreaux of the East Baton Rouge Parish Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Speaker, there are 435 Members of this esteemed body. We wear a small badge upon our lapel to acknowledge our service to the citizens of the country we love.

One million of us across the country wear another badge, resembling this one, of various shapes and colors. We are the thin blue line. When we lose a brethren or sistren, we place a mourning band upon our badge. Over the course of the last decade, it has been difficult to remove my mourning badge because we wear them for 7 days, and I find myself never quite able to get the mourning band removed from the badge that I wear.

My soul and my heart delivers unto my lips constant prayer for the family of my brother Sergeant Anderson, for his fellow deputies, his community, and, indeed, for our Nation.

Our job begins with an oath. That oath is not an oath of allegiance to a sheriff or a chief or a marshal. It is an oath of allegiance to the institutional principles that our badges represent. Sergeant Anderson gave his last life's blood in service to all of us.

I thank the Speaker for allowing me to honor my fallen comrade.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR ERIKA PERRY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, an historic change of command ceremony was held for the South Carolina National Guard 51st Military Police Battalion. Lexington High School math teacher Major Erika Perry became the first female commander of this battalion.

Major Perry comes from a military family, with both her father and grandfather serving in the United States military. She was commissioned as a military police officer in 2001 and became a platoon leader in the 133rd Military Police Company in 2003, being deployed to Iraq.

A recent article in Cola Daily, edited by Terry Ward, detailed: ''During her years in the National Guard, Perry served in Iraq and Afghanistan and on the home front during times of crisis, like Hurricane Matthew. She appreciates the LHS administration's support of her military career throughout her 19 years at the school.''

Congratulations to the University of South Carolina men's and women's basketball teams on their victories last night, securing their place in the NCAA's Sweet 16 as one of the few universities to have teams in both tournaments simultaneously. Go, Gamecocks.

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

KIM JONG-UN IS A TERRORIST

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, incorrigible little Kim and his minions are rattling their sabers once again.

While U.S.-South Korean exercises were underway, North Korea launched four land-based missiles. The missiles traveled over 600 miles. North Korean Army bases are purposely positioned to strike U.S. bases in Japan and South Korea.

It is time to put an end to North Korea's mischiefmaking. The United States' hopeless appeasement policy with North Korea has not worked.

In 2008, the administration removed the warmonger from the State Sponsors of Terrorism list with little Kim's promise to stop their nuclear weapons program. Well, guess what? Kim Jong-un lied.

We must return North Korea to where it belongs: the State Sponsors of Terrorism list. Senator CRUZ and I have filed legislation to do just that. Then real sanctions and blocking of financial transactions are necessary.

The United States cannot underestimate the war-prone lunacy of Kim Jong-un. He needs a clear message from America to leave us alone and leave our allies alone.

And that is just the way it is.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Agriculture Week and the farmers and ranchers who have made Nebraska's Third District the top producing agriculture district in the country.

One in four Nebraska jobs is tied to agriculture. The hard work and innovative practices of our producers have made our State a leader in feeding the world.

For too long the heavy hand of the Federal Government has threatened agriculture's future. Thankfully, we have seen important victories under the Trump administration, including the beginning of the end for the EPA's dangerous waters of the U.S. rule, or WOTUS.

Nebraska's farmers and ranchers are committed stewards of our natural resources and take many steps to keep our water resources clean. President Trump ordered a reset on WOTUS, agreeing farmers and ranchers deserve better than to have Washington bureaucrats controlling the water puddles and irrigation ditches on their land.

As founder and co-chairman of the Modern Agriculture Caucus, I will continue to promote policies designed to get the government out of the way and

open more markets around the world for Nebraska producers.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILSON of South Carolina). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1532

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY) at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

PESTICIDE REGISTRATION ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1029) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve pesticide registration and other activities under the Act, to extend and modify fee authorities, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1029

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Pesticide Registration Enhancement Act of 2017''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF MAINTENANCE FEE AUTHORITY.

(a) MAINTENANCE FEE.—Section 4(i)(1) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(i)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''an aggregate amount of $27,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'' and inserting ''an average amount of $31,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2023'';

(2) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''$115,500 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'' and inserting ''$129,400 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2023''; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking ''$184,800 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'' and inserting ''$207,000 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2023'';

(3) in subparagraph (E)(i)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking ''$70,600 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'' and inserting ''$79,100 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2023''; and

(B) in subclause (II), by striking ''$122,100 for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2017'' and inserting ''$136,800 for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2023''; and

(4) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON OTHER FEES.—Section 4(i)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(i)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this section and ending on September 30, 2019'' and inserting ''until September 30, 2025''; and

(2) by inserting after ''registration of a pesticide under this Act'' the following: ''or any other action covered under a table specified in section 33(b)(3),''.

(c) EXTENSION OF PROHIBITION ON TOLERANCE FEES.—Section 408(m)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 346a(m)(3)) is amended by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''.

SEC. 3. REREGISTRATION AND EXPEDITED PROCESSING FUND.

(a) AUTHORIZED USE OF FUND.—Section 4(k)(2)(A) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking ''the fund'' and inserting ''the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund'';

(2) by striking ''paragraph (3),'' in the first sentence and all that follows through the second sentence and inserting the following: ''paragraph (3), to offset the costs of registration review under section 3(g), including the costs associated with any review under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et. seq.) required as part of the registration review, to offset the costs associated with tracking and implementing registration review decisions, including registration review decisions designed to reduce risk, for the purposes specified in paragraphs (4) and (5), and to enhance the information systems capabilities to improve the tracking of pesticide registration decisions.'';

(3) in clause (i), by striking ''are allocated solely'' and all that follows through ''3(g);'' and inserting the following: ''are allocated solely for the purposes specified in the first sentence of this subparagraph;''; and

(4) in clause (ii), by striking ''necessary to achieve'' and all that follows through ''3(g);'' and inserting the following: ''necessary to achieve the purposes specified in the first sentence of this subparagraph;''.

(b) SET-ASIDE FOR REVIEW OF INERT INGREDIENTS AND EXPEDITED PROCESSING OF SIMILAR APPLICATIONS.—Section 4(k)(3)(A) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)(3)(A)) is amended, in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''The Administrator shall use'' and all that follows through ''personnel and resources—'' and inserting the following: ''For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2023, the Administrator shall use between 1/9 and 1/8 of the maintenance fees collected in such fiscal year to obtain sufficient personnel and resources—''.

(c) SET-ASIDE FOR EXPEDITED RULEMAKING AND GUIDANCE DEVELOPMENT FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—Paragraph (4) of section 4(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) EXPEDITED RULEMAKING AND GUIDANCE DEVELOPMENT FOR CERTAIN PRODUCT PERFORMANCE DATA REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) SET-ASIDE.—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021, the Administrator shall use not more than $500,000 of the amounts made available to the Administrator in the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund for the activities described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) PRODUCTS CLAIMING EFFICACY AGAINST INVERTEBRATE PESTS OF SIGNIFICANT PUBLIC HEALTH OR ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE.—The Administrator shall use amounts made available under subparagraph (A) to develop, receive comments with respect to, finalize, and implement the necessary rulemaking and guidance for product performance data requirements to evaluate products claiming efficacy against the following invertebrate pests of significant public health or economic importance (in order of importance):

''(i) Bed bugs.

''(ii) Premise (including crawling insects, flying insects, and baits).

''(iii) Pests of pets (including pet pests controlled by spot-ons, collars, shampoos, powders, dips).

''(iv) Fire ants.

''(C) DEADLINES FOR GUIDANCE.—The Administrator shall develop, and publish guidance required by subparagraph (B) with respect to claims of efficacy against pests described in such subparagraph as follows:

''(i) With respect to bed bugs, issue final guidance not later than June 30, 2017.

''(ii) With respect to pests specified in clause (ii) of such subparagraph—

''(I) submit draft guidance to the Scientific Advisory Panel and for public comment not later than June 30, 2018; and

''(II) complete any response to comments received with respect to such draft guidance and finalize the guidance not later than September 30, 2020.

''(iii) With respect to pests specified in clauses (iii) and (iv) of such subparagraph—

''(I) submit to the Scientific Advisory Panel and for public comment draft guidance not later than June 30, 2019; and

''(II) complete any response to comments received with respect to such draft guidance and finalize the guidance not later than March 31, 2021.

''(D) REVISION.—The Administrator shall revise the guidance required by subparagraph (B) from time-to-time, but shall permit applicants and registrants sufficient time to obtain data that meet the requirements specified in such revised guidance.

''(E) DEADLINE FOR PRODUCT PERFORMANCE DATA REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall, not later than September 30, 2021, issue regulations prescribing product performance data requirements for any pesticide intended for preventing, destroying, repelling, or mitigating any invertebrate pest of significant public health or economic importance specified in clauses (i) through (iv) of subparagraph (B).''.

(d) SET-ASIDE FOR GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICES INSPECTIONS.—Section 4(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(k)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

''(5) GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICES INSPECTIONS.—

''(A) SET-ASIDE.—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2023, the Administrator shall use not more than $500,000 of the amounts made available to the Administrator in the Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund for the activities described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) ACTIVITIES.—The Administrator shall use amounts made available under subparagraph (A) for enhancements to the good laboratory practices standards compliance monitoring program established under part 160 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), with respect to laboratory inspections and data audits conducted in support of pesticide product registrations under this Act. As part of such monitoring program, the Administrator shall make available to each laboratory inspected under such program in support of such registrations a preliminary summary of inspection observations not later than 60 days after the date on which such an inspection is completed.''; and

(3) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated, by striking '' paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)'' and inserting '' paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5)''.

SEC. 4. EXPERIMENTAL USE PERMITS FOR PESTICIDES.

Section 5(a) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136c(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''permit for a pesticide.'' and inserting ''permit for a pesticide. An application for an experimental use permit for a covered application under section 33(b) shall conform with the requirements of that section.''; and

(2) by inserting ''(or in the case of an application for an experimental use permit for a covered application under section 33(b), not later than the last day of the applicable timeframe for such application specified in such section)'' after ''all required supporting data''.

SEC. 5. PESTICIDE REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.

(a) EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF FEE AUTHORITY.—Section 33(b) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''PESTICIDE REGISTRATION''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''or for any other action covered by a table specified in paragraph (3)'' after ''covered by this Act that is received by the Administrator on or after the effective date of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003'';

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''PESTICIDE REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS'' and inserting ''COVERED APPLICATION''; and

(B) by striking ''pesticide registration application'' both places it appears and inserting ''covered application'';

(3) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''pesticide registration''; and

(ii) by striking ''October 1, 2013, and ending on September 30, 2015'' and inserting ''October 1, 2019, and ending on September 30, 2021'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''pesticide registration''; and

(ii) by striking ''2015'' both places in appears, and inserting ''2021''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''revised registration service fee schedules'' and inserting ''service fee schedules revised pursuant to this paragraph'';

(4) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''covered pesticide registration'' and inserting ''covered application''; and

(ii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that no waiver or fee reduction shall be provided in connection with a request for a letter of certification (commonly referred to as a Gold Seal letter)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (F)(i), by striking ''pesticide registration''; and

(5) in paragraph (8)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''pesticide registration'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking ''pesticide registration''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''pesticide registration'' and inserting ''covered''; and

(ii) in clause (ii)(I), by striking ''pesticide registration'' and inserting ''covered''.

(b) PESTICIDE REGISTRATION FUND SET-ASIDES FOR WORKER PROTECTION, PARTNERSHIP GRANTS, AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION.—Section 33(c)(3)(B) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(c)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting '', PARTNERSHIP GRANTS, AND PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION'' after ''WORKER PROTECTION'';

(2) in clause (i)—

(A) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following:'', with an emphasis on field-worker populations in the United States'';

(3) in clause (ii), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(4) in clause (iii), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''.

(c) REFORMS TO REDUCE DECISION TIME REVIEW PERIODS.—Section 33(e) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2012'' and inserting ''Pesticide Registration Enhancement Act of 2017''; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new sentence: ''Such reforms shall include identifying opportunities for streamlining review processes for applications for a new active ingredient or a new use and providing prompt feedback to applicants during such review process.''.

(d) DECISION TIME REVIEW PERIODS.—Section 33(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(f)(1)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2012'' and inserting ''Pesticide Registration Enhancement Act of 2017''; and

(B) by inserting after ''covered pesticide registration actions'' the following: ''or for any other action covered by a table specified in subsection (b)(3)'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(C) applications for any other action covered by a table specified in subsection (b)(3).''; and

(3) in paragraph (4)(A)—

(A) by striking ''a pesticide registration application'' and inserting ''a covered application''; and

(B) by striking ''covered pesticide registration application'' and inserting ''covered application''.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 33(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(k)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking clause (i) and inserting the following new clause:

''(i) the number of pesticides or pesticide cases reviewed and the number of registration review decisions completed, including—

''(I) the number of cases cancelled;

''(II) the number of cases requiring risk mitigation measures;

''(III) the number of cases removing risk mitigation measures;

''(IV) the number of cases with no risk mitigation needed; and

''(V) the number of cases in which risk mitigation has been fully implemented;'';

(B) in subparagraph (G)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking ''section 4(k)(4)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 4(k)''; and

(II) by striking ''that section'' and inserting ''such paragraphs'';

(ii) by striking clauses (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), and (vi);

(iii) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) implementing enhancements to—

''(I) the electronic tracking of covered applications;

''(II) the electronic tracking of conditional registrations;

''(III) the endangered species database;

''(IV) the electronic review of labels submitted with covered applications; and

''(V) the electronic review and assessment of confidential statements of formula submitted with covered applications; and''; and

(iv) by redesignating clause (vii) as clause (iii);

(C) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(D) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

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

''(K) a review of the progress made in developing, updating, and implementing product performance test guidelines for pesticide products that are intended to control invertebrate pests of significant public health importance and, by regulation, prescribing product performance data requirements for such pesticide products registered under section 3;

''(L) a review of the progress made in the priority review and approval of new pesticides to control vector-born public health pests for use in the United States, including each territory or possession of the United States, and United States military installations globally;

''(M) a review of the progress made in implementing enhancements to the good laboratory practices standards compliance monitoring program established under part 160 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations);

''(N) the number of approvals for active ingredients, new uses, and pesticide end use products granted in connection with the Design for the Environment program (or any successor program) of the Environmental Protection Agency; and

''(O) with respect to funds in the Pesticide Registration Fund reserved under subsection (c)(3), a review that includes—

''(i) a description of the amount and use of such funds—

''(I) to carry out activities relating to worker protection under clause (i) of subsection (c)(3)(B);

''(II) to award partnership grants under clause (ii) of such subsection; and

''(III) to carry out the pesticide safety education program under clause (iii) of such subsection;

''(ii) an evaluation of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the activities, grants, and program described in clause (i);

''(iii) a description of how stakeholders are engaged in the decision to fund such activities, grants, and program; and

''(iv) with respect to activities relating to worker protection carried out under subparagraph (B)(i) of such subsection, a summary of the analyses from stakeholders, including from worker community-based organizations, on the appropriateness and effectiveness of such activities.''.

(f) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—Section 33(m) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(m)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''FISCAL YEAR 2018.—During fiscal year 2018'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEAR 2024.—During fiscal year 2024''; and

(ii) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''FISCAL YEAR 2019.—During fiscal year 2019'' and inserting ''FISCAL YEAR 2025.—During fiscal year 2025''; and

(ii) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2023'';

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''SEPTEMBER 30, 2019.—Effective September 30, 2019'' and inserting ''SEPTEMBER 30, 2025.—Effective September 30, 2025''; and

(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''2017'' both places it appears and inserting ''2023''.

SEC. 6. REVISION OF TABLES REGARDING COVERED PESTICIDE REGISTRATION APPLICATIONS AND OTHER COVERED ACTIONS AND THEIR CORRESPONDING REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.

Paragraph (3) of section 33(b) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136w–8(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) SCHEDULE OF COVERED APPLICATIONS AND OTHER ACTIONS AND THEIR REGISTRATION SERVICE FEES.—Subject to paragraph (6), the schedule of registration applications and other covered actions and their corresponding registration service fees shall be as follows:

''TABLE 1. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
R010	1	New Active Ingredient, Food use. (2)(3)	24	753,082
R020	2	New Active Ingredient, Food use; reduced risk. (2)(3)	18	627,568
R040	3	New Active Ingredient, Food use; Experimental Use Permit application; establish temporary tolerance; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	18	462,502
R060	4	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor. (2)(3)	21	523,205
R070	5	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor; reduced risk. (2)(3)	16	436,004
R090	6	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; outdoor; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	16	323,690
R110	7	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor. (2)(3)	20	290,994
R120	8	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor; reduced risk. (2)(3)	14	242,495
R121	9	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	18	182,327
R122	10	Enriched isomer(s) of registered mixed-isomer active ingredient. (2)(3)	18	317,128
R123	11	New Active Ingredient, Seed treatment only; includes agricultural and non-agricultural seeds; residues not expected in raw agricultural commodities. (2)(3)	18	471,861
R125	12	New Active Ingredient, Seed treatment; Experimental Use Permit application; submitted before application for registration; credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient application that follows. (3)	16	323,690

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 2. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
R130	13	First food use; indoor; food/food handling. (2) (3)	21	191,444
R140	14	Additional food use; Indoor; food/food handling. (3) (4)	15	44,672
R150	15	First food use. (2)(3)	21	317,104

''TABLE 2. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW USES—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
R155	16 (new)	First food use, Experimental Use Permit application; a.i. registered for non-food outdoor use. (3)(4)	21	264,253
R160	17	First food use; reduced risk. (2)(3)	16	264,253
R170	18	Additional food use. (3) (4)	15	79,349
R175	19	Additional food uses covered within a crop group resulting from the conversion of existing approved crop group(s) to one or more revised crop groups. (3)(4)	10	66,124
R180	20	Additional food use; reduced risk. (3)(4)	10	66,124
R190	21	Additional food uses; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)	15	476,090
R200	22	Additional Food Use; 6 or more submitted in one application; Reduced Risk. (3)(4)	10	396,742
R210	23	Additional food use; Experimental Use Permit application; establish temporary tolerance; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	12	48,986
R220	24	Additional food use; Experimental Use Permit application; crop destruct basis; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	19,838
R230	25	Additional use; non-food; outdoor. (3) (4)	15	31,713
R240	26	Additional use; non-food; outdoor; reduced risk. (3)(4)	10	26,427
R250	27	Additional use; non-food; outdoor; Experimental Use Permit application; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	19,838
R251	28	Experimental Use Permit application which requires no changes to the tolerance(s); non-crop destruct basis. (3)	8	19,838
R260	29	New use; non-food; indoor. (3) (4)	12	15,317
R270	30	New use; non-food; indoor; reduced risk. (3)(4)	9	12,764
R271	31	New use; non-food; indoor; Experimental Use Permit application; no credit toward new use registration. (3)(4)	6	9,725
R273	32	Additional use; seed treatment; limited uptake into Raw Agricultural Commodities; includes crops with established tolerances (e.g., for soil or foliar application); includes food and/or non-food uses. (3)(4)	12	50,445
R274	33	Additional uses; seed treatment only; 6 or more submitted in one application; limited uptake into raw agricultural commodities; includes crops with established tolerances (e.g., for soil or foliar application); includes food and/or non-food uses. (3)(4)	12	302,663

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

''TABLE 3. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — IMPORT AND OTHER TOLERANCES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
R280	34	Establish import tolerance; new active ingredient or first food use. (2)	21	319,072
R290	35	Establish Import tolerance; Additional new food use.	15	63,816

''TABLE 3. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — IMPORT AND OTHER TOLERANCES—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
R291	36	Establish import tolerances; additional food uses; 6 or more crops submitted in one petition.	15	382,886
R292	37	Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase) and/or harmonize established tolerances with Codex MRLs; domestic or import; applicant-initiated.	11	45,341
R293	38	Establish tolerance(s) for inadvertent residues in one crop; applicant-initiated.	12	53,483
R294	39	Establish tolerances for inadvertent residues; 6 or more crops submitted in one application; applicant-initiated.	12	320,894
R295	40	Establish tolerance(s) for residues in one rotational crop in response to a specific rotational crop application; submission of corresponding label amendments which specify the necessary plant-back restrictions; applicant-initiated. (3) (4)	15	66,124
R296	41	Establish tolerances for residues in rotational crops in response to a specific rotational crop petition; 6 or more crops submitted in one application; submission of corresponding label amendments which specify the necessary plant-back restrictions; applicant-initiated. (3) (4)	15	396,742
R297	42	Amend 6 or more established tolerances (e.g., decrease or increase) in one petition; domestic or import; applicant-initiated.	11	272,037
R298	43	Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; submission of corresponding amended labels (requiring science review). (3) (4)	13	58,565
R299	44	Amend 6 or more established tolerances (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; submission of corresponding amended labels (requiring science review). (3) (4)	13	285,261

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) Amendment applications to add the revised use pattern(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the category. All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the amendment application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if an amendment application only proposes to register the amendment for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the base fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the category decision review time.

''TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
R300	45	New product; or similar combination product (already registered) to an identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; no data review on acute toxicity, efficacy or CRP – only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data, or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix. (2)(3)	4	1,582
R301	46	New product; or similar combination product (already registered) to an identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; selective data citation only for data on product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or public health pest efficacy (identical data citation and claims to cited product(s)), where applicant does not own all required data and does not have a specific authorization letter from data owner. (2)(3)	4	1,897

''TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
R310	47	New end-use or manufacturing-use product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s); includes products containing two or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3)	7	7,301
R314	48	New end use product containing up to three registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3)	8	8,626
R319	49	New end use product containing up to three registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for 4 to 7 target pests. (2)(3)	10	12,626
R318	50 (new)	New end use product containing four or more registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for up to 3 target pests. (2)(3)	9	13,252
R321	51 (new)	New end use product containing four or more registered active ingredients never before registered as this combination in a formulated product; new product label is identical or substantially similar to the labels of currently registered products which separately contain the respective component active ingredients; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; requires review of data package within RD only; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for 4 to 7 target pests. (2)(3)	11	17,252
R315	52	New end-use, on-animal product, registered source of active ingredient(s), with the submission of data and/or waivers for only: ● animal safety and ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) and/or ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging. (2) (3)	9	9,820

''TABLE 4. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
R316	53 (new)	New end-use or manufacturing product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s) including products containing two or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; and requires review of data and/or waivers for only: ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for greater than 3 and up to 7 target pests. (2)(3)	9	11,301
R317	54 (new)	New end-use or manufacturing product with registered source(s) of active ingredient(s) including products containing 2 or more registered active ingredients previously combined in other registered products; excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study; and requires review of data and/or waivers for only: ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging and/or ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) - for greater than 7 target pests. (2)(3)	10	15,301
R320	55	New product; new physical form; requires data review in science divisions. (2)(3)	12	13,226
R331	56	New product; repack of identical registered end-use product as a manufacturing-use product, or identical registered manufacturing-use product as an end use product; same registered uses only. (2)(3)	3	2,530
R332	57	New manufacturing-use product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; submission of completely new generic data package; registered uses only; requires review in RD and science divisions. (2)(3)	24	283,215
R333	58	New product; MUP or End use product with unregistered source of active ingredient; requires science data review; new physical form; etc. Cite-all or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data. (2)(3)	10	19,838
R334	59	New product; MUP or End use product with unregistered source of the active ingredient; requires science data review; new physical form; etc. Selective data citation. (2)(3)	11	23,100

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) For the purposes of classifying proposed registration actions into PRIA categories, ''pest(s) requiring efficacy'' are: public health pests listed in PR Notice 2002-1, livestock pests (e.g. Horn flies, Stable flies), wood-destroying pests (e.g. termites, carpenter ants, wood-boring beetles) and certain invasive species (e.g. Asian Longhorned beetle, Emerald Ashborer). This list may be updated/refined as invasive pest needs arise. To determine the number of pests for the PRIA categories, pests have been placed into groups (general; e.g., cockroaches) and pest specific (specifically a test species). If seeking a label claim against a pest group (general), use the group listing below and each group will count as 1. The general pests groups are: mites, dust mites, chiggers, ticks, hard ticks, soft ticks, cattle ticks, scorpions, spiders, centipedes, lice, fleas, cockroaches, keds, bot flies, screwworms, filth flies, blow flies, house flies, flesh flies, mosquitoes, biting flies, horse flies, stable flies, deer flies, sand flies, biting midges, black flies, true bugs, bed bugs, stinging bees, wasps, yellow jackets, hornets, ants (excluding carpenter ants), fire and harvester ants, wood destroying beetles, carpenter ants, termites, subterranean termites, dry wood termites, arboreal termites, damp wood termites and invasive species. If seeking a claim against a specific pest without a general claim then each specific pest will count as 1.

''TABLE 5. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
R340	60	Amendment requiring data review within RD (e.g., changes to precautionary label statements); includes adding/modifying pest(s) claims for up to 2 target pests, excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study. (2)(3)(4)	4	4,988
R341	61 (New)	Amendment requiring data review within RD (e.g., changes to precautionary label statements), includes adding/modifying pest(s) claims for greater than 2 target pests, excludes products requiring or citing an animal safety study. (2)(3)(4)	6	5,988

''TABLE 5. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — AMENDMENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
R345	62	Amending on-animal products previously registered, with the submission of data and/or waivers for only: ● animal safety and ● pest(s) requiring efficacy (4) and/or ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● child resistant packaging. (2)(3)	7	8,820
R350	63	Amendment requiring data review in science divisions (e.g., changes to REI, or PPE, or PHI, or use rate, or number of applications; or add aerial application; or modify GW/SW advisory statement). (2)(3)	9	13,226
R351	64	Amendment adding a new unregistered source of active ingredient. (2)(3)	8	13,226
R352	65	Amendment adding already approved uses; selective method of support; does not apply if the applicant owns all cited data. (2) (3)	8	13,226
R371	66	Amendment to Experimental Use Permit; (does not include extending a permit's time period). (3)	6	10,090

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4) For the purposes of classifying proposed registration actions into PRIA categories, ''pest(s) requiring efficacy'' are: public health pests listed in PR Notice 2002-1, livestock pests (e.g. Horn flies, Stable flies), wood-destroying pests (e.g. termites, carpenter ants, wood-boring beetles) and certain invasive species (e.g. Asian Longhorned beetle, Emerald Ashborer). This list may be updated/refined as invasive pest needs arise. To determine the number of pests for the PRIA categories, pests have been placed into groups (general; e.g., cockroaches) and pest specific (specifically a test species). If seeking a label claim against a pest group (general), use the group listing below and each group will count as 1. The general pests groups are: mites, dust mites, chiggers, ticks, hard ticks, soft ticks, cattle ticks, scorpions, spiders, centipedes, lice, fleas, cockroaches, keds, bot flies, screwworms, filth flies, blow flies, house flies, flesh flies, mosquitoes, biting flies, horse flies, stable flies, deer flies, sand flies, biting midges, black flies, true bugs, bed bugs, stinging bees, wasps, yellow jackets, hornets, ants (excluding carpenter ants), fire and harvester ants, wood destroying beetles, carpenter ants, termites, subterranean termites, dry wood termites, arboreal termites, damp wood termites and invasive species. If seeking a claim against a specific pest without a general claim then each specific pest will count as 1.

''TABLE 6. — REGISTRATION DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
R124	67	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Study Waivers; applicant-initiated.	6	2,530
R272	68	Review of Study Protocol applicant-initiated; excludes DART, pre-registration conference, Rapid Response review, DNT protocol review, protocol needing HSRB review.	3	2,530
R275	69	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	3	2,530
R370	70	Cancer reassessment; applicant-initiated.	18	198,250

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

''TABLE 7. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
A380	71	New Active Ingredient; Indirect Food use; establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. (2)(3)	24	137,841
A390	72	New Active Ingredient; Direct Food use; establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. (2)(3)	24	229,733
A410	73	New Active Ingredient Non-food use.(2)(3)	21	229,733
A431	74	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; low-risk. (2)(3)	12	80,225

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 8. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
A440	75	New Use, Indirect Food Use, establish tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)(4)	21	31,910
A441	76	Additional Indirect food uses; establish tolerances or tolerance exemptions if required; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)(5)	21	114,870
A450	77	New use, Direct food use, establish tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)(4)	21	95,724
A451	78	Additional Direct food uses; establish tolerances or tolerance exemptions if required; 6 or more submitted in one application. (3)(4)(5)	21	182,335
A500	79	New use, non-food. (4)(5)	12	31,910
A501	80	New use, non-food; 6 or more submitted in one application. (4)(5)	15	76,583

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

(4) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(5) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

''TABLE 9. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS AND AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
A530	81	New product, identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no data review or only product chemistry data; cite all data citation or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data; or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix. (2)(3)	4	1,278
A531	82	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient: selective data citation only for data on product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or public health pest efficacy, where applicant does not own all required data and does not have a specific authorization letter from data owner. (2)(3)	4	1,824
A532	83	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; cite-all data citation except for product chemistry; product chemistry data submitted. (2)(3)	5	5,107
A540	84	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; up to 25 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(6)	5	5,107

''TABLE 9. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS AND AMENDMENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
A541	85 (new)	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; 26-50 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(6)	7	8,500
A542	86 (new)	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only; ≥ 51 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)	10	15,000
A550	87	New end-use product; uses other than FIFRA §2(mm); non-FQPA product. (2)(3)(5)	9	13,226
A560	88	New manufacturing use product; registered active ingredient; selective data citation. (2)(3)	6	12,596
A565	89 (new)	New manufacturing-use product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; submission of new generic data package; registered uses only; requires science review. (2)(3)	12	18,234
A570	90	Label amendment requiring data review; up to 25 public health organisms. (3)(4)(5)(6)	4	3,831
A573	91 (new)	Label amendment requiring data review; 26-50 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(7)	6	6,350
A574	92 (new)	Label amendment requiring data review; ≥ 51 public health organisms. (2)(3)(5)(7)	9	11,000
A572	93	New Product or amendment requiring data review for risk assessment by Science Branch (e.g., changes to REI, or PPE, or use rate). (2)(3)(4)	9	13,226

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(4)(a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98–10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(5) The applicant must identify the substantially similar product if opting to use cite-all or the selective method to support acute toxicity data requirements.

(6) Once a submission for a new product with public health organisms has been submitted and classified in either A540 or A541, additional organisms submitted for the same product before expiration of the first submission's original decision review time period will result in reclassification of both the original and subsequent submission into the appropriate new category based on the sum of the number or organisms in both submissions. A reclassification would result in a new PRIA start date and require additional fees to meet the fee of the new category.

(7) Once a submission for a label amendment with public health organisms has been submitted and classified in either A570 or A573, additional organisms submitted for the same product before expiration of the first submission's original decision review time period will result in reclassification of both the original and subsequent submission into the appropriate new category based on the sum of the number or organisms in both submissions. A reclassification would result in a new PRIA start date and require additional fees to meet the fee of the new category.

''TABLE 10. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — EXPERIMENTAL USE PERMITS AND OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
A520	94	Experimental Use Permit application, non-food use. (2)	9	6,383
A521	95	Review of public health efficacy study protocol within AD, per AD Internal Guidance for the Efficacy Protocol Review Process; Code will also include review of public health efficacy study protocol and data review for devices making pesticidal claims; applicant-initiated; Tier 1.	4	4,726
A522	96	Review of public health efficacy study protocol outside AD by members of AD Efficacy Protocol Review Expert Panel; Code will also include review of public health efficacy study protocol and data review for devices making pesticidal claims; applicant-initiated; Tier 2.	12	12,156
A537	97 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Direct food use; Establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required. Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	18	153,156
A538	98 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Indirect food use; Establish tolerance or tolerance exemption if required Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	18	95,724
A539	99 (new)	New Active Ingredient/New Use, Experimental Use Permit application; Nonfood use. Credit 45% of fee toward new active ingredient/new use application that follows.	15	92,163
A529	100	Amendment to Experimental Use Permit; requires data review or risk assessment. (2)	9	11,429
A523	101	Review of protocol other than a public health efficacy study (i.e., Toxicology or Exposure Protocols).	9	12,156
A571	102	Science reassessment: Cancer risk, refined ecological risk, and/or endangered species; applicant-initiated.	18	95,724
A533	103 (new)	Exemption from the requirement of an Experimental Use Permit. (2)	4	2,482

''TABLE 10. — ANTIMICROBIALS DIVISION — EXPERIMENTAL USE PERMITS AND OTHER ACTIONS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
A534	104 (new)	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	4	4,726
A535	105 (new)	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Study Waiver or Data Bridging Argument; applicant-initiated.	6	2,409
A536	106 (new)	Conditional Ruling on Pre-application Direct Food, Indirect Food, Nonfood use determination; applicant-initiated.	4	2,482

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 11. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
B580	107	New active ingredient; food use; petition to establish a tolerance. (2)(3)	20	51,053
B590	108	New active ingredient; food use; petition to establish a tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	18	31,910
B600	109	New active ingredient; non-food use. (2)(3)	13	19,146
B610	110	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to establish a temporary tolerance or temporary tolerance exemption. (3)	10	12,764
B611	111	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to establish permanent tolerance exemption. (3)	12	12,764
B612	112	New active ingredient; no change to a permanent tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	10	17,550
B613	113	New active ingredient; petition to convert a temporary tolerance or a temporary tolerance exemption to a permanent tolerance or tolerance exemption. (2)(3)	11	17,550
B620	114	New active ingredient; Experimental Use Permit application; non-food use including crop destruct. (3)	7	6,383

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 12. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW USES

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
B630	115	First food use; petition to establish a tolerance exemption. (2)(4)	13	12,764
B631	116	New food use; petition to amend an established tolerance. (3)(4)	12	12,764
B640	117	First food use; petition to establish a tolerance. (2)(4)	19	19,146
B643	118	New Food use; petition to amend an established tolerance exemption. (3)(4)	10	12,764
B642	119	First food use; indoor; food/food handling. (2)(4)	12	31,910
B644	120	New use, no change to an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)(4)	8	12,764
B650	121	New use; non-food. (3)(4)	7	6,383

''TABLE 12. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW USES—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
B645	122 (new)	New food use; Experimental Use Permit application; petition to amend or add a tolerance exemption. (4)	12	12,764
B646	123 (new)	New use; non-food use including crop destruct; Experimental Use Permit application. (4)	7	6,383

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

(4) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 13. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
B652	124	New product; registered source of active ingredient; requires petition to amend established tolerance or tolerance exemption; requires 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	13	12,764
B660	125	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product. No data review, or only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data or authorization from data owner is demonstrated. Category includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission or data matrix. For microbial pesticides, the active ingredient(s) must not be re-isolated. (2)(3)	4	1,278
B670	126	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	7	5,107
B671	127	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); requires a petition to amend an established tolerance or tolerance exemption; requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	17	12,764
B672	128	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); non-food use or food use requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	13	9,118
B673	129	New product MUP/EP; unregistered source of active ingredient(s); citation of Technical Grade Active Ingredient (TGAI) data previously reviewed and accepted by the Agency. Requires an Agency determination that the cited data supports the new product. (2)(3)	10	5,107
B674	130	New product MUP; Repack of identical registered end-use product as a manufacturing-use product; same registered uses only. (2)(3)	4	1,278

''TABLE 13. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — NEW PRODUCTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
B675	131	New Product MUP; registered source of active ingredient; submission of completely new generic data package; registered uses only. (2)(3)	10	9,118
B676	132	New product; more than one active ingredient where one active ingredient is an unregistered source; product chemistry data must be submitted; requires: 1) submission of product specific data, and 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (2)(3)	13	9,118
B677	133	New end-use non-food animal product with submission of two or more target animal safety studies; includes data and/or waivers of data for only: ● product chemistry and/or ● acute toxicity and/or ● public health pest efficacy and/or ● animal safety studies and/or ● child resistant packaging. (2)(3)	10	8,820

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 14. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — AMENDMENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
B621	134	Amendment; Experimental Use Permit; no change to an established temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)	7	5,107
B622	135	Amendment; Experimental Use Permit; petition to amend an established or temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption. (3)	11	12,764
B641	136	Amendment of an established tolerance or tolerance exemption.	13	12,764
B680	137	Amendment; registered sources of active ingredient(s); no new use(s); no changes to an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. Requires data submission. (2)(3)	5	5,107
B681	138	Amendment; unregistered source of active ingredient(s). Requires data submission. (2)(3)	7	6,079
B683	139	Label amendment; requires review/update of previous risk assessment(s) without data submission (e.g., labeling changes to REI, PPE, PHI). (2)(3)	6	5,107
B684	140	Amending non-food animal product that includes submission of target animal safety data; previously registered. (2)(3)	8	8,820
B685	141 (new)	Amendment; add a new biochemical unregistered source of active ingredient or a new microbial production site. Requires submission of analysis of samples data and source/production site-specific manufacturing process description. (3)	5	5,107

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(3) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 15. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — SCLP

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
B690	142	New active ingredient; food or non-food use. (2)(6)	7	2,554
B700	143	Experimental Use Permit application; new active ingredient or new use. (6)	7	1,278
B701	144	Extend or amend Experimental Use Permit. (6)	4	1,278
B710	145	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no change in an established tolerance or tolerance exemption. No data review, or only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data or authorization from data owner is demonstrated. Category includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission or data matrix. (3)(6)	4	1,278
B720	146	New product; registered source of active ingredient(s); requires: 1) submission of product specific data; or 2) citation of previously reviewed and accepted data; or 3) submission or citation of data generated at government expense; or 4) submission or citation of a scientifically-sound rationale based on publicly available literature or other relevant information that addresses the data requirement; or 5) submission of a request for a data requirement to be waived supported by a scientifically-sound rationale explaining why the data requirement does not apply. (3)(6)	5	1,278
B721	147	New product; unregistered source of active ingredient. (3)(6)	7	2,676
B722	148	New use and/or amendment; petition to establish a tolerance or tolerance exemption. (4)(5)(6)	7	2,477
B730	149	Label amendment requiring data submission. (4)(6)	5	1,278

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) All requests for new uses (food and/or nonfood) contained in any application for a new active ingredient or a first food use are covered by the base fee for that new active ingredient or first food use application and retain the same decision time review period as the new active ingredient or first food use application. The application must be received by the agency in one package. The base fee for the category covers a maximum of five new products. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval that is submitted in the new active ingredient application package or first food use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new active ingredient or first food use decision review time. In the case of a new active ingredient application, until that new active ingredient is approved, any subsequent application for another new product containing the same active ingredient or an amendment to the proposed labeling will be deemed a new active ingredient application, subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a new active ingredient. In the case of a first food use application, until that first food use is approved, any subsequent application for an additional new food use or uses will be subject to the registration service fee and decision review time for a first food use. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screening, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new active ingredient or first food use application.

(3) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(4) (a) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged registration service fees. (b) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(c)(3)(B) and are not subject to registration service fees. (c) Registrant-initiated fast-track amendments handled by the Antimicrobials Division are to be completed within the timelines specified in FIFRA Section 3(h) and are not subject to registration service fees. (d) Registrant initiated amendments submitted by notification under PR Notices, such as PR Notice 98-10, continue under PR Notice timelines and are not subject to registration service fees. (e) Submissions with data and requiring data review are subject to registration service fees.

(5) Amendment applications to add the new use(s) to registered product labels are covered by the base fee for the new use(s). All items in the covered application must be submitted together in one package. Each application for an additional new product registration and new inert approval(s) that is submitted in the new use application package is subject to the registration service fee for a new product or a new inert approval. However, if a new use application only proposes to register the new use for a new product and there are no amendments in the application, then review of one new product application is covered by the new use fee. All such associated applications that are submitted together will be subject to the new use decision review time. Any application for a new product or an amendment to the proposed labeling (a) submitted subsequent to submission of the new use application and (b) prior to conclusion of its decision review time and (c) containing the same new uses, will be deemed a separate new-use application, subject to a separate registration service fee and new decision review time for a new use. If the new-use application includes non-food (indoor and/or outdoor), and food (outdoor and/or indoor) uses, the appropriate fee is due for each type of new use and the longest decision review time applies to all of the new uses requested in the application. Any information that (a) was neither requested nor required by the Agency, and (b) is submitted by the applicant at the applicant's initiative to support the application after completion of the technical deficiency screen, and (c) is not itself a covered registration application, must be assessed 25% of the full registration service fee for the new use application.

(6) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 16. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — OTHER ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
B614	150	Pre-application; Conditional Ruling on rationales for addressing a data requirement in lieu of data; applicant-initiated; applies to one rationale at a time.	3	2,530
B615	151	Rebuttal of agency reviewed protocol, applicant initiated.	3	2,530
B682	152	Protocol review; applicant initiated; excludes time for HSRB review.	3	2,432

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

''TABLE 17. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — PIP

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
B740	153	Experimental Use Permit application; no petition for tolerance/tolerance exemption. Includes: 1. non-food/feed use(s) for a new (2) or registered (3) PIP (12); 2. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP with crop destruct (12); 3. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP in which an established tolerance/tolerance exemption exists for the intended use(s). (4)(12)	6	95,724
B741	154 (new)	Experimental Use Permit application; no petition for tolerance/tolerance exemption. Includes: 1. non-food/feed use(s) for a new (2) or registered (3) PIP; 2. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP with crop destruct; 3. food/feed use(s) for a new or registered PIP in which an established tolerance/tolerance exemption exists for the intended use(s); SAP Review. (12)	12	159,538
B750	155	Experimental Use Permit application; with a petition to establish a temporary or permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. Includes new food/feed use for a registered (3) PIP. (4)(12)	9	127,630
B770	156	Experimental Use Permit application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient; credit 75% of B771 fee toward registration application for a new active ingredient that follows; SAP review. (5)(12)	15	191,444
B771	157	Experimental Use Permit application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient; credit 75% of B771 fee toward registration application for a new active ingredient that follows. (12)	10	127,630
B772	158	Application to amend or extend an Experimental Use Permit; no petition since the established tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient is unaffected. (12)	3	12,764
B773	159	Application to amend or extend an Experimental Use Permit; with petition to extend a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. (12)	5	31,910
B780	160	Registration application; new (2) PIP; non-food/feed. (12)	12	159,537
B790	161	Registration application; new (2) PIP; non-food/feed; SAP review. (5)(12)	18	223,351
B800	162	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. (12)	13	172,300
B810	163	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. SAP review. (5)(12)	19	236,114
B820	164	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish or amend a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption of an active ingredient. (12)	15	204,208
B840	165	Registration application; new (2) PIP; with petition to establish or amend a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption of an active ingredient. SAP review. (5)(12)	21	268,022
B851	166	Registration application; new event of a previously registered PIP active ingredient(s); no petition since permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (12)	9	127,630
B870	167	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product; new use; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (4) (12)	9	38,290
B880	168	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product or new terms of registration; additional data submitted; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (6) (7) (12)	9	31,910
B881	169	Registration application; registered (3) PIP; new product or new terms of registration; additional data submitted; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). SAP review. (5)(6)(7)(12)	15	95,724
B882	170 (new)	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption; SAP Review. (8)(12)	15	191,444
B883	171	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption. (8) (12)	9	127,630
B884	172	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. (8)(12)	12	159,537
B885	173	Registration application; registered (3) PIP, seed increase; breeding stack of previously approved PIPs, same crop; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (9)(12)	6	31,910
B886	174 (new)	Registration application; new (2) PIP, seed increase with negotiated acreage cap and time-limited registration; with petition to establish a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption for the active ingredient. SAP Review. (8) (12)	18	223,351

''TABLE 17. — BIOPESTICIDES DIVISION — PIP—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
B890	175	Application to amend a seed increase registration; converts registration to commercial registration; no petition since permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption is already established for the active ingredient(s). (12)	9	63,816
B891	176	Application to amend a seed increase registration; converts registration to a commercial registration; no petition since a permanent tolerance/tolerance exemption already established for the active ingredient(s); SAP review. (5)(12)	15	127,630
B900	177	Application to amend a registration, including actions such as extending an expiration date, modifying an IRM plan, or adding an insect to be controlled. (10)(11)(12)	6	12,764
B901	178	Application to amend a registration, including actions such as extending an expiration date, modifying an IRM plan, or adding an insect to be controlled. SAP review. (10) (11) (12)	12	76,578
B902	179	PIP Protocol review.	3	6,383
B903	180	Inert ingredient tolerance exemption; e.g., a marker such as NPT II; reviewed in BPPD.	6	63,816
B904	181	Import tolerance or tolerance exemption; processed commodities/food only (inert or active ingredient).	9	127,630
B905	182 (new)	SAP Review.	6	63,816
B906	183 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients.	3	31,907
B907	184 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients based on an existing temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption.	3	12,764
B908	185 (new)	Petition to establish a temporary tolerance/tolerance exemption for one or more active ingredients or inert ingredients.	3	44,671

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.
(2) New PIP = a PIP with an active ingredient that has not been registered.
(3) Registered PIP = a PIP with an active ingredient that is currently registered.
(4) Transfer registered PIP through conventional breeding for new food/feed use, such as from field corn to sweet corn.
(5) The scientific data involved in this category are complex. EPA often seeks technical advice from the Scientific Advisory Panel on risks that pesticides pose to wildlife, farm workers, pesticide applicators, non-target species, as well as insect resistance, and novel scientific issues surrounding new technologies. The scientists of the SAP neither make nor recommend policy decisions. They provide advice on the science used to make these decisions. Their advice is invaluable to the EPA as it strives to protect humans and the environment from risks posed by pesticides. Due to the time it takes to schedule and prepare for meetings with the SAP, additional time and costs are needed.
(6) Registered PIPs stacked through conventional breeding.
(7) Deployment of a registered PIP with a different IRM plan (e.g., seed blend).
(8) The negotiated acreage cap will depend upon EPA's determination of the potential environmental exposure, risk(s) to non-target organisms, and the risk of targeted pest developing resistance to the pesticidal substance. The uncertainty of these risks may reduce the allowable acreage, based upon the quantity and type of non-target organism data submitted and the lack of insect resistance management data, which is usually not required for seed-increase registrations. Registrants are encouraged to consult with EPA prior to submission of a registration application in this category.
(9) Application can be submitted prior to or concurrently with an application for commercial registration.
(10) For example, IRM plan modifications that are applicant-initiated.
(11) EPA-initiated amendments shall not be charged fees.
(12) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

''TABLE 18. — INERT INGREDIENTS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
I001	186	Approval of new food use inert ingredient. (2)(3)	13	27,000
I002	187	Amend currently approved inert ingredient tolerance or exemption from tolerance; new data. (2)	11	7,500
I003	188	Amend currently approved inert ingredient tolerance or exemption from tolerance; no new data. (2)	9	3,308
I004	189	Approval of new non-food use inert ingredient. (2)	6	11,025
I005	190	Amend currently approved non-food use inert ingredient with new use pattern; new data. (2)	6	5,513
I006	191	Amend currently approved non-food use inert ingredient with new use pattern; no new data. (2)	3	3,308
I007	192	Approval of substantially similar non-food use inert ingredients when original inert is compositionally similar with similar use pattern. (2)	4	1,654
I008	193	Approval of new or amended polymer inert ingredient, food use. (2)	5	3,749
I009	194	Approval of new or amended polymer inert ingredient, non-food use. (2)	4	3,087
I010	195	Petition to amend a single tolerance exemption descriptor, or single non-food use descriptor, to add ≤ 10 CASRNs; no new data. (2)	6	1,654

''TABLE 18. — INERT INGREDIENTS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
I011	196 (new)	Approval of new food use safener with tolerance or exemption from tolerance. (2)(8)	24	597,683
I012	197 (new)	Approval of new non-food use safener. (2)(8)	21	415,241
I013	198 (new)	Approval of additional food use for previously approved safener with tolerance or exemption from tolerance. (2)	15	62,975
I014	199 (new)	Approval of additional non-food use for previously approved safener. (2)	15	25,168
I015	200 (new)	Approval of new generic data for previously approved food use safener. (2)	24	269,728
I016	201 (new)	Approval of amendment(s) to tolerance and label for previously approved safener. (2)	13	55,776

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) If another covered application is submitted that depends upon an application to approve an inert ingredient, each application will be subject to its respective registration service fee. The decision review time line for both submissions will be the longest of the associated applications. If the application covers multiple ingredients grouped by EPA into one chemical class, a single registration service fee will be assessed for approval of those ingredients.

(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

(4) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the HSRB review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review times for the associated actions run concurrently, but will end at the date of the latest review time.

(5) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the SAP review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review time for the associated action will be extended by the decision review time for the SAP review.

(6) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(7) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(8) If a new safener is submitted in the same package as a new active ingredient, and that new active ingredient is determined to be reduced risk, then the safener would get the same reduced timeframe as the new active ingredient.

''TABLE 19. — EXTERNAL REVIEW AND MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
M001	202	Study protocol requiring Human Studies Review Board review as defined in 40 CFR Part 26 in support of an active ingredient. (4)	9	7,938
M002	203	Completed study requiring Human Studies Review Board review as defined in 40 CFR Part 26 in support of an active ingredient. (4)	9	7,938
M003	204	External technical peer review of new active ingredient, product, or amendment (e.g., consultation with FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel) for an action with a decision timeframe of less than 12 months. Applicant initiated request based on a requirement of the Administrator, as defined by FIFRA § 25(d), in support of a novel active ingredient, or unique use pattern or application technology. Excludes PIP active ingredients. (5)	12	63,945
M004	205	External technical peer review of new active ingredient, product, or amendment (e.g., consultation with FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel) for an action with a decision timeframe of greater than 12 months. Applicant initiated request based on a requirement of the Administrator, as defined by FIFRA § 25(d), in support of a novel active ingredient, or unique use pattern or application technology. Excludes PIP active ingredients. (5)	18	63,945
M005	206	New Product: Combination, Contains a combination of active ingredients from a registered and/or unregistered source; conventional, antimicrobial and/or biopesticide. Requires coordination with other regulatory divisions to conduct review of data, label and/or verify the validity of existing data as cited. Only existing uses for each active ingredient in the combination product. (6)(7)	9	22,050
M006	207	Request for up to 5 letters of certification (Gold Seal) for one actively registered product (excludes distributor products). (8)	1	277
M007	208	Request to extend Exclusive Use of data as provided by FIFRA Section 3(c)(1)(F)(ii).	12	5,513
M008	209	Request to grant Exclusive Use of data as provided by FIFRA Section 3(c)(1)(F)(vi) for a minor use, when a FIFRA Section 2(II)(2) determination is required.	15	1,654
M009	210 (new)	Non-FIFRA Regulated Determination: Applicant initiated, per product.	4	2,363
M010	211 (new)	Conditional ruling on pre-application, product substantial similarity.	4	2,363

''TABLE 19. — EXTERNAL REVIEW AND MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS—Continued

EPA No.	New CR No.	Action	Decision Review Time (Months)(1)	FY'17 & FY'18 Registration Service Fee ($)
M011	212 (new)	Label amendment to add the DfE logo; requires data review; no other label changes. (9)	4	3,648

(1) A decision review time that would otherwise end on a Saturday, Sunday, or federal holiday, will be extended to end on the next business day.

(2) If another covered application is submitted that depends upon an application to approve an inert ingredient, each application will be subject to its respective registration service fee. The decision review time line for both submissions will be the longest of the associated applications. If the application covers multiple ingredients grouped by EPA into one chemical class, a single registration service fee will be assessed for approval of those ingredients.

(3) If EPA data rules are amended to newly require clearance under section 408 of the FFDCA for an ingredient of an antimicrobial product where such ingredient was not previously subject to such a clearance, then review of the data for such clearance of such product is not subject to a registration service fee for the tolerance action for two years from the effective date of the rule.

(4) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the HSRB review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review times for the associated actions run concurrently, but will end at the date of the latest review time.

(5) Any other covered application that is associated with and dependent on the SAP review will be subject to its separate registration service fee. The decision review time for the associated action will be extended by the decision review time for the SAP review.

(6) An application for a new end-use product using a source of active ingredient that (a) is not yet registered but (b) has an application pending with the Agency for review, will be considered an application for a new product with an unregistered source of active ingredient.

(7) Where the action involves approval of a new or amended label, on or before the end date of the decision review time, the Agency shall provide to the applicant a draft accepted label, including any changes made by the Agency that differ from the applicant-submitted label and relevant supporting data reviewed by the Agency. The applicant will notify the Agency that the applicant either (a) agrees to all of the terms associated with the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests that it be issued as the accepted final Agency-stamped label; or (b) does not agree to one or more of the terms of the draft accepted label as amended by the Agency and requests additional time to resolve the difference(s); or (c) withdraws the application without prejudice for subsequent resubmission, but forfeits the associated registration service fee. For cases described in (b), the applicant shall have up to 30 calendar days to reach agreement with the Agency on the final terms of the Agency-accepted label. If the applicant agrees to all of the terms of the accepted label as in (a), including upon resolution of differences in (b), the Agency shall provide an accepted final Agency-stamped label to the registrant within 2 business days following the registrant's written or electronic confirmation of agreement to the Agency.

(8) Due to low fee and short time frame this category is not eligible for small business waivers. Gold seal applies to one registered product.

(9) This category includes amendments the sole purpose of which is to add DfE (or equivalent terms that do not use ''safe'' or derivatives of ''safe'') logos to a label. DfE is a voluntary program. A label bearing a DfE logo is not considered an Agency endorsement because the ingredients in the qualifying product must meet objective, scientific criteria established and widely publicized by EPA.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, and the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), my good friend and colleague, I rise in strong support as the author of H.R. 1029, the Pesticide Registration Enhancement Act of 2017, also known as PRIA. It is not every day in Washington that we see a bipartisan bill come to the House floor that is supported by both industry and industry advocates, but PRIA is that bill, Madam Speaker.

PRIA initially passed in 2003, establishing a new section of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or FIFRA, which put in place a fee schedule for registering pesticides with the EPA. More specifically, PRIA constructed time frames for when the EPA was required to make a determination on pesticide registrations. The goal of PRIA was to create a more predictable and effective evaluation process for pesticide decisionmaking by coupling the collection of fees with specific decision review periods. It also promoted shorter decision review periods for reduced-risk pesticides.

The nature of PRIA is very technical, but the widespread benefits across industries has gained it consistent bipartisan support. PRIA is backed by a broad coalition comprised of the companies that rely on the registration process and also labor and environmental advocates. Each member of this broad coalition had a seat at the table when the Committee on Agriculture held a roundtable discussing the merits of the bill last month before it passed unanimously out of our House Committee on Agriculture.

This reauthorization bill that we are considering also provides a few modifications, including reasonable increases in registration fees, funding for good laboratory practices, and added efforts to promote transparency. Although it has generally been a 5-year authorization, this bill would extend PRIA for 7 years. A lengthened reauthorization, we believe, is appropriate because PRIA has been proven effective, it has enjoyed widespread, bipartisan support, and to date each reauthorization has only involved minor adjustments.

PRIA expires on September 30 of this year, and I am glad to be presenting this bill well in advance of that expiration date because we need to provide folks with the certainty they need to conduct their business, educate farmworkers, and keep the communication with EPA open and transparent. This is the fourth time PRIA has come before Congress for reauthorization, and that is because it is working for everyone. It has always been a bipartisan effort, and we hope to continue that tradition. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense reauthorization.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2017.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CONAWAY: I write in regard to H.R. 1029, Pesticide Registration Enhancement Act of 2017, which was referred in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I wanted to notify you that the Committee will forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1029, the Committee does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation and will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward to address any remaining issues within the Committee's jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1029 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee's report on the legislation or the Congressional Record during its consideration on the House floor.

Sincerely,

GREG WALDEN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2017.

GREG WALDEN,
Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WALDEN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1029, the ''Pesticide Registration Enhancement Act of 2017.'' I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Agriculture concurs in the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of the bill at this time, the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Energy and Commerce represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work the Committee on Energy and Commerce as this bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of H.R. 1029, the Pesticide Registration Enhancement Act of 2017.

Once again, Madam Speaker, I stand before you to urge the passage of H.R. 1029. As we know, the Environmental Protection Agency is responsible for regulating the sale, use, and distribution of pesticides. To facilitate and expedite that pesticide approval process, pesticide manufacturers have long supplemented the EPA's annual budget. This system allows the products to be reviewed in a timely manner, without sacrificing environmental and safety protections. It is truly a win-win for both manufacturers and consumers, and, as you heard Mr. DAVIS speak about, it is a clear example of government at its best. It is exactly why I enjoy working on the Committee on Agriculture. It is exactly why I enjoy working with people such as RODNEY DAVIS. We have a bipartisan, effective, public-private legislative solution for a more predictable pesticide evaluation process that literally helps everybody.

The Pesticide Registration Enhancement Act, H.R. 1029, is an exceptional piece of legislation not only because it is supported by a unique coalition of pesticide registrants, environmental groups, and agricultural labor representatives, but H.R. 1029 provides a more effective, predictable, and transparent pesticide evaluation process. It promotes shorter review periods for reduced-risk pesticides and enhances scientific and regulatory activities related to farmworker protection.

My district on the central coast of California is not only bountiful in its agriculture, it is absolutely beautiful with its environment. Therefore, we on the central coast work hard to find that balance of being known as the salad bowl of the world and one of the most scenic places in the world. That is why our agriculture producers are the most thoughtful stewards of the land and recognize the need to protect the environment and the natural resources.

This legislation facilitates that balance. This legislation provides a unique coalition building and encourages the agriculture industry to work with environmentalists. Thus, H.R. 1029 helps all of us who live and work in our community and, ultimately, our country. That is why I am absolutely honored to speak in this debate, humbled to share the floor with Representative DAVIS, and why I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this is exactly why we are here today in a bipartisan way. The gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) said it right: this affects his industry, and it affects his home area. As he likes to say, it is the salad bowl of America. I have been there, and I have seen the crops they grow. The crops I grow are much different in central Illinois, the crops that are grown by the farmers that I am proud to represent, but they all have to have a successful PRIA reauthorization to be able to grow those foods that we here in America continue to feed the world with and that we see in our grocery stores and on our supermarket shelves.

Madam Speaker, I want to say thank you because this bill is essential, as we in central Illinois go out and take care of things such as making sure the weeds don't pop up in our yards. Every single small business that decides to put down product and pesticides to ensure that lawns in central Illinois continue to prosper as the spring and summer unfold, this is essential to their success.

This is essential to our farmers, who are looking to get their fields ready to go plant, the stewards of the land, the best stewards of the land, as Congressman PANETTA said. It assures them that they are going to be able to get that seed into the ground and, with the hope and prayers of rain and moisture, that it is going to grow and that we are still going to have a marketplace for those products.

The risk that our farmers take every single year, when they risk and leverage their family incomes in many cases, in hopes that a seed is going to grow and a plant is going to grow, and they are going to be able to sell that, they need the certainty that this bill will actually give them. That is why I am proud to be here as the author, proud to stand with my colleagues.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1029, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

100 YEARS OF WOMEN IN CONGRESS ACT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 382) to amend the Department of Agriculture program for research and extension grants to increase participation by women and underrepresented minorities in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics to redesignate the program as the ''Jeannette Rankin Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program''.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 382

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 ''100 Years of Women in Congress Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The first woman elected to Congress, Representative Jeannette Rankin from Montana, was elected on November 7, 1916, almost four years prior to ratification of the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution giving women the right to vote.

(2) Jeannette Rankin was not only a pioneer in national electoral politics, she was also a pioneer as a woman in science, graduating from the University of Montana in 1902 with a Bachelor of Science degree in biology.

(3) 100 years after the swearing-in of Jeannette Rankin, 109 women serve in the 115th Congress, more than at any other time in our Nation's history. While this improvement is commendable, women hold only 20 percent of the seats in Congress, far below their relative share of the American electorate.

(4) According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, women make up 47 percent of the total U.S. workforce. Gains have been made in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields over time, but women still comprise only 39 percent of chemists and material scientists, 28 percent of environmental scientists and geoscientists, 16 percent of chemical engineers, and 12 percent of civil engineers.

(5) More must be done to encourage women to run for elected office and to enter STEM fields.

SEC. 3. JEANNETTE RANKIN WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN STEM FIELDS PROGRAM.

Paragraph (7) of section 1672(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925(d)(7)) is amended to read as follows:

''(7) JEANNETTE RANKIN WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN STEM FIELDS PROGRAM.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section to increase participation by women and underrepresented minorities from rural areas in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, with priority given to eligible institutions that carry out continuing programs funded by the Secretary. Any grant made under this paragraph shall be known and designated as a 'Jeannette Rankin Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program Grant'.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am glad to stand here with the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER), another one of our new colleagues on the House Committee on Agriculture, in support of H.R. 382, the 100 Years of Women in Congress Act.

This legislation would honor a true pioneer of American politics by naming an important agricultural research program at the U.S. Department of Agriculture as the Jeannette Rankin Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program. This competitive research grant program is designed to increase participation by women and underrepresented minorities from rural areas in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. I can think of no better person to identify with this important program than former Representative Rankin, who was the first woman to serve in this great institution, the United States House of Representatives, an achievement made even more significant by the fact that Ms. Rankin was elected to Congress several years prior to the ratification of the 19th Amendment granting women the right to vote.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 382, the ''100 Years of Women in Congress Act,'' which was introduced on January 9, 2017.

H.R. 382 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. In order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, March 16, 2017.

Hon. LAMAR S. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 382, the ''100 Years of Women in Congress Act.'' I agree that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has a valid jurisdictional claim to provisions in this legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, I will include a copy of our exchange in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the State of New York (Ms. MENG), the sponsor of this legislation.

□ 1545

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, I am so pleased to be here today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of women serving in Congress.

I thank the Speaker for allowing this legislation to come to the floor. And I thank my good friend and former colleague, Secretary Zinke, for authoring this legislation with me. His support has been instrumental in ensuring the consideration of this bill, and I am deeply grateful to him.

One hundred years ago, Jeannette Rankin was sworn in as a Member of the United States House of Representatives. She was the first woman elected to Congress, and was elected before passage of the 19th amendment which granted women the right to vote.

Jeannette Rankin was a trailblazer her entire life. In 1902, she graduated from the University of Montana with a degree in biology. Afterward, she became active in the women's suffrage movement, moving to New York City and assisting in the founding of the New York Women's Suffrage Party and working for the National American Woman Suffrage Association.

Rankin would eventually return to her home State of Montana, and was elected to office in the congressional election of 1916. Upon winning, she declared: ''I may be the first woman Member of Congress, but I won't be the last.''

I am happy to say that she was right.

In recognition of Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin's many accomplishments, and in celebration of the centennial anniversary of her service in Congress, Secretary Zinke and I introduced the 100 Years of Women in Congress Act.

Because Jeannette Rankin was a woman of science more than 100 years before our current push to have more women enter STEM fields, we felt it appropriate to rename the Department of Agriculture's Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program after her.

This program currently supports collaborative research projects at institutions of higher education, and seeks to increase the participation of women and minorities from rural areas in STEM fields. It will continue to do so in the future, but now it will also recognize the many contributions Jeannette Rankin made to American life.

Madam Speaker, thank you again for allowing this legislation to the floor today, and thank you again to Secretary Zinke for partnering with me on it.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 382, the 100 Years of Women in Congress Act.

This bipartisan legislation will recognize the work that Jeannette Rankin, the first woman elected to Congress in 1916, accomplished fighting for women's rights. It will rename the USDA's Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program to the Jeannette Rankin Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Grant Program. In our time, it is critical that we encourage more women to enter STEM fields across this country. In receiving a bachelor's degree in biology before women even had the right to vote, she set an example for those who followed her to follow their passions for science and to achieve impactful leadership roles.

As I travel through Delaware, one of the consistent messages that I hear from businesses and universities is the need for more engineers. We have a wealth of knowledge in our young girls who are demanding rigorous programs that put them in place for rewarding careers. These types of programs match the boundless enthusiasm with concrete steps towards achieving meaningful career goals that benefit our entire country.

My sister, Thea, demonstrates the impact of successful STEM education from organizations like the Forum to Advance Minority Engineers—FAME—for schoolchildren in Delaware, to her attending an HBCU as an engineering major, and in her career spent serving our country as an engineer with the Army.

My late husband Charles received undergraduate and graduate degrees in mechanical and aerospace engineering. Those degrees gave him the opportunity to travel the world as an engineer and give back to the energy sector.

However, my family and I know that the answer doesn't simply end with STEM. It is also about incorporating the arts into one's education in the form of STEAM, where we can see the balance that a quality education provides.

In my experiences, as the first woman elected to Congress from Delaware, I understand the challenges that come with trying to break through barriers. That is why this legislation and the impact of getting more young women to pursue STEM and STEAM careers is so deeply personal to me.

As Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin said before taking her oath of office in 1917—nearly 4 years before women had even gained the right to vote through the 19th Amendment—as you heard before, she said: ''I may be the first woman to be a Member of Congress, but I won't be the last.''

I am honored to serve as one of the more than 300 women to follow her lead. When we look to history to guide us in challenging moments, we will look to people like Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin, and I am confident she would be honored to have her name associated with this legislation and its aims.

I thank the sponsors, and I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for this bipartisan work.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would be remiss if I didn't thank my colleague, who I was sworn in with in January of 2013 when she raised her right hand, as I did, on this floor to join this great institution, my colleague, GRACE MENG, for being the sponsor of this piece of legislation. I thank GRACE for her leadership, and also Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, the first woman elected to serve in this institution from the State of Delaware. It is humbling and an honor for me to be able to stand here and help manage this piece of legislation. She should be very proud of what she is doing today.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Speaker, I urge all Members as well to support passage of H.R. 382, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 382.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TSA ADMINISTRATOR MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1309) to streamline the office and term of the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1309

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 ''TSA Administrator Modernization Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002 AND TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002.—Paragraph (1) of section 103(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''12'' and inserting ''11''; and

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

''(L) An Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, in accordance with section 114 of title 49, United States Code.''.

(b) INCLUSION IN EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE.—Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security.''.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 49, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 114 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''Department of Transportation'' and inserting ''Department of Homeland Security'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''Under Secretary of Transportation for Security'' and inserting ''Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration'';

(3) by striking ''Under Secretary'' each place it appears and inserting ''Administrator'';

(4) in subsection (b), in the heading, by striking ''UNDER SECRETARY'' and inserting ''ADMINISTRATOR'';

(5) in subsection (e)(4), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security'';

(6) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking ''Federal Security Managers'' and inserting ''Federal Security Directors''; and

(B) in paragraph (14), by inserting ''air carriers or'' before ''foreign air carriers'';

(7) in subsection (g)—

(A) by striking ''the Secretary'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Secretary of Homeland Security''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''The Secretary of Homeland Security'';

(8) in subsection (j)(1)(D), by striking ''the Secretary'' and inserting ''the Secretary of Homeland Security'';

(9) in subsection (l)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''the Secretary'' and inserting ''the Secretary of Homeland Security''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking ''the Administrator under subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration under subparagraph (A)'';

(10) in subsection (m)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''UNDER SECRETARY'' and inserting ''ADMINISTRATOR''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), in the heading, by striking ''UNDER SECRETARY'' and inserting ''ADMINISTRATOR'';

(11) in subsection (n), by striking ''Department of Transportation'' and inserting ''Department of Homeland Security'';

(12) in subsection (o), by striking ''Department of Transportation'' and inserting ''Department of Homeland Security''; and

(13) in subsection (p)(4), by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House to support H.R. 1309, the TSA Administrator Modernization Act of 2017.

TSA was created within the Department of Transportation in 2001 to address the security vulnerabilities that were exposed in the attacks of 9/11. At that time, the administrator was given a 5-year term. However, when TSA and its functions transferred to the Department of Homeland Security a year later, the 5-year term officially terminated by statute.

Many of the issues and bureaucratic challenges that TSA faces today stem from a lack of consistent leadership at the top. Since I came to Congress in January 2015, TSA has had no less than five different individual administrators, both as appointees and as acting administrators. This is a staggering number in such a brief period of time.

A revolving door of leadership has further exacerbated the numerous problems that plague this young agency. It is unacceptable that this has gone on for more than a decade. The American people deserve better, and that is why we are here today with this bill.

This bill addresses these issues by re-establishing the administrator's position, level, and 5-year term, just as Congress originally intended when it created TSA in the wake of 9/11. Additionally, this bill updates Federal statute to reflect current policy by clarifying TSA's proper role within the Department of Homeland Security.

While this is only one step in addressing the many challenges at TSA, this legislation will provide for more consistent leadership at such a critical security agency.

Ensuring the effectiveness of Federal agencies and the security of the American people is a bipartisan task, and one of which I am happy to be part of. I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for coming together to support this bill. This is exactly what the American people expect from us.

I especially want to thank Chairman MCCAUL and Ranking Member THOMPSON for moving this bill swiftly through committee to the floor today. I also thank Congresswoman RICE, who is supporting this bill as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCCAUL: I write concerning H.R. 1309, the ''TSA Administrator Modernization Act of 2017.'' This legislation includes matters that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In order to expedite Floor consideration of H.R. 1309, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will forgo action on this bill. However, this is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest in the Congressional Record during House Floor consideration of the bill. I look forward to working with the Committee on Homeland Security as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, March 15, 2017.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1309, the ''TSA Administrator Modernization Act of 2017''. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives. I understand that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to the extent it may have a jurisdictional claim, will not seek a sequential referral on the bill; and therefore, there has been no formal determination as to its jurisdiction by the Parliamentarian. We appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that the absence of a decision on this bill at this time does not prejudice any claim the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure may have held or may have on similar legislation in the future.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman,
Committee on Homeland Security.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 1309, the ''TSA Administrator Modernization Act of 2017.'' This bill amends positions included in executive service (5 U.S.C. §5315) which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. As a result of your having consulted with me concerning the provision of the bill that falls within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree not to seek a sequential referral so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

The Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1309 at this time we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. We will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Further, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Homeland Security, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, March 15, 2017.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1309, the ''TSA Administrator Modernization Act of 2017.'' I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will not seek a sequential referral on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral of this bill at this time, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform represented on the conference committee.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman,
Committee on Homeland Security.

Miss RICE of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1309, the TSA Administrator Modernization Act of 2017.

When the Transportation Security Administration was created after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, Congress intended for the administrator to serve a 5-year term, like the administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

However, since TSA moved from the Department of Transportation to the Department of Homeland Security in 2003, there has been a lack of clarity about the length of the administrator's term. The measure before us today clarifies Congress' expectation that TSA administrators serve for 5 years.

In TSA's short history, it has had six Senate-confirmed administrators. None has served more than 4 years. The last TSA administrator, Peter Neffenger, served just 2 years.

Stability at the top is critically important as we push TSA to improve its performance and address ongoing challenges.

For example, after recent covert testing carried out by the Department's inspector general revealed alarming weaknesses in checkpoint screening operations, Administrator Neffenger focused TSA's attention on addressing its detection rate failures, improving training, and reducing vulnerabilities associated with commercial aviation screening. At the same time, Administrator Neffenger worked with Congress to increase TSA staffing levels in response to long wait times at security checkpoints during the peak travel season last summer. Under his leadership, TSA successfully reduced wait times that had reached as long as 3 hours at some airplanes, without compromising the effectiveness of security measures. And while confronting those urgent short-term challenges, Administrator Neffenger was also focused on addressing TSA's longer-term challenges related to employee recruitment, retention, and morale.

I regret, as I know my colleague, Mr. KATKO, does, that Administrator Neffenger did not have the opportunity to stay on and continue making progress within the administration. But I think we can all agree that TSA needs steady leadership in order to continue to evolve and fulfill its mission to protect the traveling public.

We can help ensure that TSA will have that stability and sustained focus at the top by passing this bill today.

I thank my colleague from New York, Representative KATKO, for introducing this bipartisan legislation, and I urge all of our colleagues to give it their full support.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for H.R. 1309. This bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Homeland Security earlier this month.

Enacting H.R. 1309 will provide TSA with stable, sustained leadership the administration needs to chart a more consistent course and overcome its longstanding challenges.

I would also like to commend my colleague, Mr. KATKO, who has been absolutely dogged in his support of TSA and ensuring that it has the support and the resources that it needs. I thank him for his work on this bill.

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

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

I want to recognize Congresswoman RICE's comments. I thought they were excellent, and not just because they were nice for me.

Her comments about Admiral Neffenger, in particular, were very poignant because he was doing a great job at TSA and he was only there 2

years. What he did in 2 years really made a big difference in the trajectory of that agency. Much like other Federal agencies that are empowered to do very important things, like the FBI who has a long-term tenure, I think the same thing needs to be done here.

Admiral Neffenger and people like him should be in control of the agency for extended periods of time because then, and only then, can we make the true changes that we are going to need.

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

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1309.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPARENCY IN TECHNOLOGICAL ACQUISITIONS ACT OF 2017

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1353) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require certain additional information to be submitted to Congress regarding the strategic 5-year technology investment plan of the Transportation Security Administration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1353

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 ''Transparency in Technological Acquisitions Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS UNDER THE STRATEGIC 5-YEAR TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT PLAN OF THE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED.—Section 1611 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 563) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''biennially'' and inserting ''annually'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'';

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

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

''(3) information about acquisitions completed during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year during which the report is submitted.''; and

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

''(h) NOTICE OF COVERED CHANGES TO PLAN.—

''(1) NOTICE REQUIRED.—The Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives notice of any covered change to the Plan by not later than 90 days after the date on which the change is made.

''(2) DEFINITION OF CHANGE.—In this subsection, the term 'covered change' means an increase or decrease in the dollar amount allocated to the procurement of a technology or an increase or decrease in the number of a technology.''.

(b) REPORT ON EQUIPMENT IN OPERATION POST-LIFE-CYCLE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report describing any equipment of the Transportation Security Administration that is in operation after—

(1) the end of the life-cycle of the equipment specified by the manufacturer of the equipment; or

(2) the end of the useful life projection for the equipment under the strategic 5-year technology investment plan of the Transportation Security Administration, as required by section 1611 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 563).

(c) NOTICE TO AIRPORTS AND AIRLINES.—Upon the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall notify airports and airlines of any changes to the 5-year technology investment plan of the Transportation Security Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1353, the Transparency in Technological Acquisitions Act of 2017. I commend the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) for introducing this very important bill.

Over the course of the last Congress, the Transportation and Protective Security Subcommittee conducted rigorous oversight of TSA's technology and equipment acquisition process, and they found it fraught with waste and inefficiencies. The committee also found that TSA fails to effectively communicate its procurement needs with the private sector.

Our government relies upon private sector innovation to develop security technologies. However, that innovation comes with a price tag, and we cannot reasonably expect the private sector to spend millions of dollars in research and development of new emerging technologies without greater transparency and communication, both with the TSA and the Department of Homeland Security, as to exactly what their future needs and technology investments will be in the future.

This bill will provide greater transparency into TSA's acquisition plan, allowing for industry to better meet emerging needs, and enable better congressional oversight.

I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

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

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of H.R. 1353, the Transparency in Technological Acquisitions Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, last Congress, I served as the ranking member of the Transportation and Protective Security Subcommittee, and we held multiple hearings on TSA's acquisition processes.

In the course of conducting oversight and engaging with stakeholders, we learned that deficiencies in TSA's planning for technology investments were causing serious issues for technology companies who produce products to meet the Agency's needs.

Under the Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act, TSA was required to develop a 5-year technology investment plan. Stakeholders widely supported this strategy and welcomed the release of TSA's first 5-year plan in August of 2015, but that support eroded when the budget request for the same year did not align with the acquisition schedule in the 5-year plan.

The purpose of the plan was to give businesses the time and certainty they need to align their resources and planning to meet TSA's technology needs. Security technology manufacturers looked at the plan and invested significant resources in the technology that TSA planned to acquire, but then they saw the budget request and found that TSA had shifted direction and no longer planned to procure that technology.

That lost investment of time and resources hurts all technology manufacturers, but it can completely destroy small businesses and discourage small-business owners from working with the Federal Government.

My bill, H.R. 1353, will help solve this problem by requiring TSA to report to Congress on their 5-year plan annually instead of biennially, and it will require TSA to notify Congress and all relevant stakeholders of any changes or updates to the plan.

These commonsense steps will help ensure that there is ongoing engagement between TSA and industry stakeholders so that manufacturers of all sizes can continue to meet TSA's technological needs and continue to innovate and address security vulnerabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this legislation.

I want to thank Subcommittee Ranking Member BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN, Congressman KEATING, and Subcommittee Chairman JOHN KATKO for

being original cosponsors of this bipartisan legislation.

H.R. 1353 was unanimously approved by the full Committee on Homeland Security earlier this month. Enacting my bill will ensure that TSA's technology objectives are more closely aligned with the industry's stakeholders that produce technologies to help TSA meet those objectives.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for his support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I first want to congratulate my colleague, Miss RICE, for what I think is a great bill that is going to bring some accountability to TSA.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security I rise in support of H.R. 1353, the "Transparency in Technological Acquisitions Act."

This bipartisan bill requires the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to provide more frequent and detailed updates on its strategy to invest in security technology.

The five-year investment plan includes information such as:

1. Transportation security risks and gaps that could be addressed by technology

2. Current and expected trends in domestic and international travel

3. Opportunities for public-private partnerships and collaboration with small and disadvantaged companies, other government agencies, university centers of excellence and national laboratories

4. Resources required to protect technology from cyber theft, diversion, sabotage or attack

5. Potential effects on commercial airline passengers.

This bill would require the updates to be submitted annually and to include information on acquisitions made during the previous fiscal year.

Requiring TSA to provide annual updates on the acquisition plan and to notify Congress and industry stakeholders about any changes to the plan which will provide much-needed clarity, certainty, and transparency.

In 2015, TSA screened more than 708 million passengers, which is more than 1.9 million per day.

Of the 2,653 firearms discovered in carry-on bags, 82.8 percent were loaded.

Houston George Bush Intercontinental Airport ranked 3rd among airports with the most firearms discovered in 2015.

This last January, Esteban Santiago shot and killed five people inside Fort Lauderdale airport using a firearm stored in his luggage.

Terrorism and cyberattacks are likely to remain a reality for the transportation industry for the foreseeable future.

It is absolutely critical that we invest in minimizing transportation safety security risks to keep our citizens safe.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1353.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1353.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REDUCING DHS ACQUISITION COST GROWTH ACT

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1294) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for congressional notification regarding major acquisition program breaches, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1294

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 ''Reducing DHS Acquisition Cost Growth Act''.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION FOR MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 836. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS FOR MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAM BREACH.

''(a) REQUIREMENTS WITHIN DEPARTMENT IN EVENT OF BREACH.—

''(1) NOTIFICATIONS.—

''(A) NOTIFICATION OF BREACH.—If a breach occurs in a major acquisition program, the program manager for such program shall notify the Component Acquisition Executive for such program, the head of the component concerned, the Executive Director of the Program Accountability and Risk Management division, the Under Secretary for Management, and the Deputy Secretary not later than 30 calendar days after such breach is identified.

''(B) NOTIFICATION TO SECRETARY.—If a breach occurs in a major acquisition program and such breach results in a cost overrun greater than 15 percent, a schedule delay greater than 180 days, or a failure to meet any of the performance thresholds from the cost, schedule, or performance parameters specified in the most recently approved acquisition program baseline for such program, the Component Acquisition Executive for such program shall notify the Secretary and the Inspector General of the Department not later than five business days after the Component Acquisition Executive for such program, the head of the component concerned, the Executive Director of the Program Accountability and Risk Management Division, the Under Secretary for Management, and the Deputy Secretary are notified of the breach pursuant to subparagraph (A).

''(2) REMEDIATION PLAN AND ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If a breach occurs in a major acquisition program, the program manager for such program shall submit to the head of the component concerned, the Executive Director of the Program Accountability and Risk Management division, and the Under Secretary for Management in writing a remediation plan and root cause analysis relating to such breach and program. Such plan and analysis shall be submitted at a date established at the discretion of the Under Secretary for Management.

''(B) REMEDIATION PLAN.—The remediation plan required under this subparagraph (A) shall—

''(i) explain the circumstances of the breach at issue;

''(ii) provide prior cost estimating information;

''(iii) include a root cause analysis that determines the underlying cause or causes of shortcomings in cost, schedule, or performance of the major acquisition program with respect to which such breach has occurred, including the role, if any, of—

''(I) unrealistic performance expectations;

''(II) unrealistic baseline estimates for cost or schedule or changes in program requirements;

''(III) immature technologies or excessive manufacturing or integration risk;

''(IV) unanticipated design, engineering, manufacturing, or technology integration issues arising during program performance;

''(V) changes to the scope of such program;

''(VI) inadequate program funding or changes in planned out-year funding from one 5-year funding plan to the next 5-year funding plan as outlined in the Future Years Homeland Security Program required under section 874;

''(VII) legislative, legal, or regulatory changes; or

''(VIII) inadequate program management personnel, including lack of sufficient number of staff, training, credentials, certifications, or use of best practices;

''(iv) propose corrective action to address cost growth, schedule delays, or performance issues;

''(v) explain the rationale for why a proposed corrective action is recommended; and

''(vi) in coordination with the Component Acquisition Executive for such program, discuss all options considered, including the estimated impact on cost, schedule, or performance of such program if no changes are made to current requirements, the estimated cost of such program if requirements are modified, and the extent to which funding from other programs will need to be reduced to cover the cost growth of such program.

''(3) REVIEW OF CORRECTIVE ACTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Management shall review the remediation plan required under paragraph (2). The Under Secretary may approve such plan or provide an alternative proposed corrective action within 30 days of the submission of such plan under such paragraph.

''(B) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days after the review required under subparagraph (A) is completed, the Under Secretary for Management shall submit to the congressional homeland security committees the following:

''(i) A copy of the remediation plan and the root cause analysis required under paragraph (2).

''(ii) A statement describing the corrective action or actions that have occurred pursuant to paragraph (2)(b)(iv) for the major acquisition program at issue, with a justification for such action or actions.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION IF BREACH OCCURS.—

''(1) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—If a notification to the Secretary is made under subsection (a)(1)(B) relating to a breach in a major acquisition program, the Under Secretary for Management shall notify the congressional homeland security committees of such breach in the next quarterly Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report, as required by title I of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, (Public Law

114–113) following receipt by the Under Secretary of notification under such subsection.

''(2) SIGNIFICANT VARIANCES IN COSTS OR SCHEDULE.—If a likely cost overrun is greater than 20 percent or a likely delay is greater than 12 months from the costs and schedule specified in the acquisition program baseline for a major acquisition program, the Under Secretary for Management shall include in the notification required in paragraph (1) a written certification, with supporting explanation, that—

''(A) such program is essential to the accomplishment of the Department's mission;

''(B) there are no alternatives to the capability or asset provided by such program that will provide equal or greater capability in both a more cost-effective and timely manner;

''(C) the new acquisition schedule and estimates for total acquisition cost are reasonable; and

''(D) the management structure for such program is adequate to manage and control cost, schedule, and performance.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ACQUISITION.—The term 'acquisition' has the meaning given such term in section 131 of title 41, United States Code.

''(2) ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term 'acquisition program' means the process by which the Department acquires, with any appropriated amounts, by contract for purchase or lease, property or services (including construction) that support the missions and goals of the Department.

''(3) ACQUISITION PROGRAM BASELINE.—The term 'acquisition program baseline', with respect to an acquisition program, means a summary of the cost, schedule, and performance parameters, expressed in standard, measurable, quantitative terms, which must be met in order to accomplish the goals of such program.

''(4) BEST PRACTICES.—The term 'best practices', with respect to acquisition, means a knowledge-based approach to capability development that includes—

''(A) identifying and validating needs;

''(B) assessing alternatives to select the most appropriate solution;

''(C) clearly establishing well-defined requirements;

''(D) developing realistic cost assessments and schedules;

''(E) securing stable funding that matches resources to requirements;

''(F) demonstrating technology, design, and manufacturing maturity;

''(G) using milestones and exit criteria or specific accomplishments that demonstrate progress;

''(H) adopting and executing standardized processes with known success across programs;

''(I) establishing an adequate workforce that is qualified and sufficient to perform necessary functions; and

''(J) integrating the capabilities described in subparagraphs (A) through (I) into the Department's mission and business operations.

''(5) BREACH.—The term 'breach', with respect to a major acquisition program, means a failure to meet any cost, schedule, or performance threshold specified in the most recently approved acquisition program baseline.

''(6) CONGRESSIONAL HOMELAND SECURITY COMMITTEES.—The term 'congressional homeland security committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

''(7) COMPONENT ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE.—The term 'Component Acquisition Executive' means the senior acquisition official within a component who is designated in writing by the Under Secretary for Management, in consultation with the component head, with authority and responsibility for leading a process and staff to provide acquisition and program management oversight, policy, and guidance to ensure that statutory, regulatory, and higher level policy requirements are fulfilled, including compliance with Federal law, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and Department acquisition management directives established by the Under Secretary for Management.

''(8) MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term 'major acquisition program' means a Department acquisition program that is estimated by the Secretary to require an eventual total expenditure of at least $300,000,000 (based on fiscal year 2017 constant dollars) over its life cycle cost.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 835 the following new item:

''Sec. 836. Congressional notification and other requirements for major acquisition program breach.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) and the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) each will control 20 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1294, the Reducing DHS Acquisition Cost Growth Act.

The Department of Homeland Security, DHS, spends over $7 billion, annually, on major acquisition programs. These programs secure our borders, protect our shores, safeguard our airports, and defend our cyber networks, among other critical missions. Unfortunately, the Government Accountability Office has reported that DHS acquisition management is on its high-risk list, since 2003, of areas most susceptible to waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement. Recent watchdog reports have revealed alarming findings regarding DHS' acquisition efforts.

For example, in just 2016 alone, 8 out of 25 major acquisition programs experienced cost growth, schedule slips, or both. These program cost estimates increased by $1.7 billion, and their schedules slipped by an average of 11 months. Given the enormous threats that are facing our homeland, it is unacceptable to make our frontline operators wait for the tools that they need to secure the homeland.

My bill will require much-needed oversight of DHS' acquisition programs to safeguard tax dollars and hold program managers accountable. When programs incur significant cost, schedule, or requirement problems, my bill requires that DHS leadership be informed. These programs will be required to put a remediation plan in place that corrects the problem and also analyzes the root causes of why the problems occurred in the first place.

The Homeland Security Committee in Congress must also be informed of such significant problems. No longer will the people's representatives in Congress be kept in the dark. These requirements are similar to those used in the Department of Defense and will help DHS better safeguard tax dollars and more effectively secure our homeland.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1294, the Reducing DHS Acquisition Cost Growth Act. Since the Department began its operations in 2002, it has spent tens of billions of dollars to procure goods, services, and supplies in support of DHS' national security efforts. The agency's major acquisitions investments, those that cost at least $300 million, represent a significant portion of such purchasing.

The Department has worked to improve its acquisition programs in recent years, but DHS still struggles when it comes to major acquisitions. Take, for example, the SBInet—a southwest border infrastructure project—that ballooned in cost to about $1 billion before it was canceled in 2011, after GAO found that it was ineffective.

More recently, there is the case of the Electronic Immigration System, an automated immigration benefits processing system. According to the Department's inspector general, this U.S. citizenship immigration services program is now on course to be completed 4 years later than originally estimated and at a cost of $1 billion more than estimated.

The importance and complexity of DHS' mission demands effective oversight of the Department's investments, particularly its major acquisitions. H.R. 1294 seeks to ensure greater congressional oversight of such acquisition programs by requiring the Department to report to Congress when cost, schedule, and performance requirements are not met. Additionally, when such requirements are not met, this bill requires DHS to provide Congress with an analysis explaining the root cause of the failures as well as a remediation plan to mitigate the problems.

The Committee on Homeland Security unanimously approved this measure earlier this month, and similar language was approved by the House in October 2015 as a part of comprehensive DHS acquisition legislation.

I commend my colleague from Florida for his work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, effective oversight of the Department's acquisitions programs is essential to ensuring optimal program performance. Given DHS' limited budgetary resources and the gravity of its mission, it is critically important that DHS get its major acquisitions right. Enacting this legislation would require a greater level of accountability from DHS and give Congress a greater level of oversight to intercede before programs go off the rails.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 1294, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, once again, I just urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1294.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1294.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1615

QUADRENNIAL HOMELAND SECURITY REVIEW TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2017

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1297) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make technical corrections to the requirement that the Secretary of Homeland Security submit quadrennial homeland security reviews, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1297

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 ''Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Corrections Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO QUADRENNIAL HOMELAND SECURITY REVIEW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 707 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 347) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

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

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

''(C) representatives from appropriate advisory committees established pursuant to section 871, including the Homeland Security Advisory Council and the Homeland Security Science and Technology Advisory Committee, or otherwise established, including the Aviation Security Advisory Committee established pursuant to section 44946 of title 49, United States Code; and'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''based on the risk assessment required pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)'';

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by inserting '', to the extent practicable,'' after ''describe''; and

(ii) by striking ''budget plan'' and inserting ''resources required'';

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by inserting '', to the extent practicable,'' after ''identify'';

(ii) by striking ''budget plan required to provide sufficient resources to successfully'' and inserting ''resources required to''; and

(iii) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting the following: '', including any resources identified from redundant, wasteful, or unnecessary capabilities or capacities that may be redirected to better support other existing capabilities or capacities, as the case may be; and'';

(D) in paragraph (5), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(E) by striking paragraph (6);

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''December 31 of the year'' and inserting ''60 days after the date of the submission of the President's budget for the fiscal year after the fiscal year'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''description of the threats to'' and inserting ''risk assessment of'';

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting '', as required under subsection (b)(2)'' before the semicolon at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by inserting ''to the extent practicable,'' before ''a description''; and

(II) by striking ''budget plan'' and inserting ''resources required'';

(iv) in subparagraph (F)—

(I) by inserting ''to the extent practicable,'' before ''a discussion''; and

(II) by striking ''the status of'';

(v) in subparagraph (G)—

(I) by inserting ''to the extent practicable,'' before ''a discussion'';

(II) by striking ''the status of'';

(III) by inserting ''and risks'' before ''to national homeland''; and

(IV) by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon at the end;

(vi) by striking subparagraph (H); and

(vii) by redesignating subparagraph (I) as subparagraph (H);

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) DOCUMENTATION.—The Secretary shall retain and, upon request, provide to Congress the following documentation regarding each quadrennial homeland security review:

''(A) Records regarding the consultation carried out the pursuant to subsection (a)(3), including—

''(i) all written communications, including communications sent out by the Secretary and feedback submitted to the Secretary through technology, online communications tools, in-person discussions, and the interagency process; and

''(ii) information on how feedback received by the Secretary informed each such quadrennial homeland security review.

''(B) Information regarding the risk assessment required under subsection (c)(2)(B), including—

''(i) the risk model utilized to generate such risk assessment;

''(ii) information, including data used in the risk model, utilized to generate such risk assessment;

''(iii) sources of information, including other risk assessments, utilized to generate such risk assessment; and

''(iv) information on assumptions, weighing factors, and subjective judgments utilized to generate such risk assessment, together with information on the rationale or basis thereof.'';

(4) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(5) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) REVIEW.—Not later than 90 days after the submission of each report required under subsection (c)(1), the Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate information on the degree to which the findings and recommendations developed in the quadrennial homeland security review that is the subject of such report were integrated into the acquisition strategy and expenditure plans for the Department.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to a quadrennial homeland security review conducted after December 31, 2021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1297, the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Corrections Act of 2017.

Congress mandated through the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 that the Department of Homeland Security conduct a quadrennial Homeland Security review every 4 years. This review is intended to outline DHS' vision and strategy to effectively implement its mission to protect the homeland. Given the threats that we face from terrorists, it is vital that DHS has a sound strategy to help keep the American public safe.

Last year, the Government Accountability Office reported on opportunities for DHS to improve the QHSR process, and the GAO made four recommendations for executive action. This legislation leverages GAO's findings to enhance the QHSR and make it better.

Specifically, this legislation requires DHS to conduct a risk assessment to

better inform the QHSR, and the bill also mandates that the DHS maintain a paper trail of communications related to the QHSR. This should allow Congress and watchdogs to conduct more effective oversight of DHS.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for introducing this legislation, and I urge all Members to join me in supporting this commonsense legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1297.

The Department of Homeland Security's mission is complex and diverse. Not only is DHS charged with preventing terrorism, but it is the lead Federal agency for immigration enforcement, emergency management, cybersecurity, and border, maritime, and transportation security.

Given the breadth of DHS' responsibilities, it is essential that its limited resources be aligned with its mission to meet the ever-changing threat landscape. As such, the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review, which DHS undertakes every 4 years, is a critical tool to ensure that the Department is positioned to effectively carry out its multifaceted mission.

To date, DHS has issued two such reviews and is expected to release its third such review in 2018. My legislation seeks to make refinements to the law to address weaknesses identified by the Government Accountability Office in the prior reviews.

Specifically, my bill seeks to ensure more robust consultation with Homeland Security stakeholders, including State and local governments and academic institutions.

It also seeks to ensure that DHS undertakes and documents our risk analysis to inform its policy positions. GAO emphasized that documentation of the review process, including the risk analysis, is essential to ensuring the repeatability of the review process.

Last Congress, this House unanimously approved this measure in July 2016; however, the Senate did not act on the bill. Last week the Committee on Homeland Security, on a bipartisan basis, voted to favorably report this measure to the House.

My legislation is intended to ensure that the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review is a driving vision for the Department of Homeland Security. By enacting this legislation, Congress can guard against it becoming a paperwork exercise that fails to influence the Department's policies, programs, and priorities.

Given the criticalness of the DHS mission and the increasingly scarce availability of resources, it is essential that DHS produce a risk-informed review that takes into account the diverse views of its Homeland Security partners.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 1297, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN on a very commonsensical bill here that is really going to help protect tax dollars and help keep our country safe.

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 1297, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1297.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

DHS MULTIYEAR ACQUISITION STRATEGY ACT OF 2017

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1249) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require a multiyear acquisition strategy of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1249

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 ''DHS Multiyear Acquisition Strategy Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. MULTIYEAR ACQUISITION STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 836. MULTIYEAR ACQUISITION STRATEGY.

''(a) MULTIYEAR ACQUISITION STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the Comptroller General of the United States a multiyear acquisition strategy to guide the overall direction of the acquisitions of the Department while allowing flexibility to deal with ever-changing threats and risks, and to help industry better understand, plan, and align resources to meet the future acquisition needs of the Department. Such strategy shall be updated and included in each Future Years Homeland Security Program required under section 874.

''(2) FORM.—The strategy required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex for any sensitive or classified information if necessary. The Secretary shall publish such strategy in an unclassified format that is publicly available.

''(b) CONSULTATION.—In developing the strategy required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall, as the Secretary determines appropriate, consult with headquarters, components, employees in the field, and individuals from industry and the academic community.

''(c) CONTENTS OF STRATEGY.—The strategy shall include the following:

''(1) PRIORITIZED LIST.—A systematic and integrated prioritized list developed by the Under Secretary for Management in coordination with all of the Component Acquisition Executives of Department major acquisition programs that Department and component acquisition investments seek to address, including the expected security and economic benefit of the program or system that is the subject of acquisition and an analysis of how the security and economic benefit derived from such program or system will be measured.

''(2) INVENTORY.—A plan to develop a reliable Department-wide inventory of investments and real property assets to help the Department—

''(A) plan, budget, schedule, and acquire upgrades of its systems and equipment; and

''(B) plan for the acquisition and management of future systems and equipment.

''(3) FUNDING GAPS.—A plan to address funding gaps between funding requirements for major acquisition programs and known available resources, including, to the maximum extent practicable, ways of leveraging best practices to identify and eliminate overpayment for items to—

''(A) prevent wasteful purchasing;

''(B) achieve the greatest level of efficiency and cost savings by rationalizing purchases;

''(C) align pricing for similar items; and

''(D) utilize purchase timing and economies of scale.

''(4) IDENTIFICATION OF CAPABILITIES.—An identification of test, evaluation, modeling, and simulation capabilities that will be required to—

''(A) support the acquisition of technologies to meet the needs of such strategy;

''(B) leverage to the greatest extent possible emerging technological trends and research and development trends within the public and private sectors; and

''(C) identify ways to ensure that appropriate technology is acquired and integrated into the Department's operating doctrine to improve mission performance.

''(5) FOCUS ON FLEXIBLE SOLUTIONS.—An assessment of ways the Department can improve its ability to test and acquire innovative solutions to allow needed incentives and protections for appropriate risk-taking in order to meet its acquisition needs with resiliency, agility, and responsiveness to assure homeland security and facilitate trade.

''(6) FOCUS ON INCENTIVES TO SAVE TAXPAYER DOLLARS.—An assessment of ways the Department can develop incentives for program managers and senior Department acquisition officials to—

''(A) prevent cost overruns;

''(B) avoid schedule delays; and

''(C) achieve cost savings in major acquisition programs.

''(7) FOCUS ON ADDRESSING DELAYS AND BID PROTESTS.—An assessment of ways the Department can improve the acquisition process to minimize cost overruns in—

''(A) requirements development;

''(B) procurement announcements;

''(C) requests for proposals;

''(D) evaluation of proposals;

''(E) protests of decisions and awards; and

''(F) the use of best practices.

''(8) FOCUS ON IMPROVING OUTREACH.—An identification and assessment of ways to increase opportunities for communication and collaboration with industry, small and disadvantaged businesses, intra-government entities, university centers of excellence, accredited certification and standards development organizations, and national laboratories to ensure that the Department understands the market for technologies, products, and innovation that is available to

meet its mission needs and to inform the Department's requirements-setting process before engaging in an acquisition, including—

''(A) methods designed especially to engage small and disadvantaged businesses, a cost-benefit analysis of the tradeoffs that small and disadvantaged businesses provide, information relating to barriers to entry for small and disadvantaged businesses, and information relating to unique requirements for small and disadvantaged businesses; and

''(B) within the Department Vendor Communication Plan and Market Research Guide, instructions for interaction by acquisition program managers with such entities to—

''(i) prevent misinterpretation of acquisition regulations; and

''(ii) permit, within legal and ethical boundaries, interacting with such entities with transparency.

''(9) COMPETITION.—A plan regarding competition under subsection (d).

''(10) ACQUISITION WORKFORCE.—A plan regarding the Department acquisition workforce under subsection (e).

''(d) COMPETITION PLAN.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall also include a plan to address actions to ensure competition, or the option of competition, for major acquisition programs. Such plan may include assessments of the following measures in appropriate cases if such measures are cost effective:

''(1) Competitive prototyping.

''(2) Dual-sourcing.

''(3) Unbundling of contracts.

''(4) Funding of next-generation prototype systems or subsystems.

''(5) Use of modular, open architectures to enable competition for upgrades.

''(6) Acquisition of complete technical data packages.

''(7) Periodic competitions for subsystem upgrades.

''(8) Licensing of additional suppliers, including small businesses.

''(9) Periodic system or program reviews to address long-term competitive effects of program decisions.

''(e) ACQUISITION WORKFORCE PLAN.—

''(1) ACQUISITION WORKFORCE.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall also include a plan to address Department acquisition workforce accountability and talent management that identifies the acquisition workforce needs of each component performing acquisition functions and develops options for filling such needs with qualified individuals, including a cost-benefit analysis of contracting for acquisition assistance.

''(2) ADDITIONAL MATTERS COVERED.—The acquisition workforce plan under this subsection shall address ways to—

''(A) improve the recruitment, hiring, training, and retention of Department acquisition workforce personnel, including contracting officer's representatives, in order to retain highly qualified individuals who have experience in the acquisition life cycle, complex procurements, and management of large programs;

''(B) empower program managers to have the authority to manage their programs in an accountable and transparent manner as such managers work with the acquisition workforce;

''(C) prevent duplication within Department acquisition workforce training and certification requirements through leveraging already-existing training within the Federal Government, academic community, or private industry;

''(D) achieve integration and consistency with Government-wide training and accreditation standards, acquisition training tools, and training facilities;

''(E) designate the acquisition positions that will be necessary to support the Department acquisition requirements, including in the fields of—

''(i) program management;

''(ii) systems engineering;

''(iii) procurement, including contracting;

''(iv) test and evaluation;

''(v) life cycle logistics;

''(vi) cost estimating and program financial management; and

''(vii) additional disciplines appropriate to Department mission needs;

''(F) strengthen the performance of contracting officers' representatives (as defined in subpart 1.602–2 and subpart 2.101 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation), including by—

''(i) assessing the extent to which such representatives are certified and receive training that is appropriate;

''(ii) assessing what training is most effective with respect to the type and complexity of assignment; and

''(iii) implementing actions to improve training based on such assessments; and

''(G) identify ways to increase training for relevant investigators and auditors of the Department to examine fraud in major acquisition programs, including identifying opportunities to leverage existing Government and private sector resources in coordination with the Inspector General of the Department.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ACQUISITION.—The term 'acquisition' has the meaning given such term in section 131 of title 41, United States Code.

''(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

''(3) BEST PRACTICES.—The term 'best practices', with respect to acquisition, means—

''(A) a knowledge-based approach to capability development that includes identifying and validating needs;

''(B) assessing alternatives to select the most appropriate solution;

''(C) clearly establishing well-defined requirements;

''(D) developing realistic cost assessments and schedules;

''(E) securing stable funding that matches resources to requirements;

''(F) demonstrating technology, design, and manufacturing maturity;

''(G) using milestones and exit criteria or specific accomplishments that demonstrate progress;

''(H) adopting and executing standardized processes with known success across programs;

''(I) establishing an adequate workforce that is qualified and sufficient to perform necessary functions; and

''(J) integrating into the mission and business operations of the Department of Homeland Security the capabilities described in subparagraphs (A) through (I).

''(4) COMPONENT ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE.—The term 'Component Acquisition Executive' means the senior acquisition official within a component who is designated in writing by the Under Secretary for Management, in consultation with the component head, with authority and responsibility for leading a process and staff to provide acquisition and program management oversight, policy, and guidance to ensure that statutory, regulatory, and higher level policy requirements are fulfilled, including compliance with Federal law, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and Department acquisition management directives established by the Under Secretary for Management.

''(5) MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term 'major acquisition program' means a Department acquisition program that is estimated by the Secretary to require an eventual total expenditure of at least $300,000,000 (based on fiscal year 2017 constant dollars) over its life cycle cost.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 835 the following new item:

''Sec. 836. Multiyear acquisition strategy.''.

SEC. 3. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REVIEW OF MULTIYEAR ACQUISITION STRATEGY.

(a) REVIEW.—After submission of the first multiyear acquisition strategy in accordance with section 836 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (as added by section 2 of this Act) after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of such plan within 180 days to analyze the viability of such plan's effectiveness in the following:

(1) Complying with the requirements of such section 836.

(2) Establishing clear connections between Department of Homeland Security objectives and acquisition (as such term is defined in such section) priorities.

(3) Demonstrating that Department acquisition policy reflects program management best practices (as such term is defined in such section) and standards.

(4) Ensuring competition or the option of competition for major acquisition programs (as such term is defined in such section).

(5) Considering potential cost savings through using already-existing technologies when developing acquisition program requirements.

(6) Preventing duplication within Department acquisition workforce training requirements through leveraging already-existing training within the Federal Government, academic community, or private industry.

(7) Providing incentives for acquisition program managers to reduce acquisition and procurement costs through the use of best practices and disciplined program management.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report on the review conducted under this section. Such report shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1249, the DHS Multiyear Acquisition Strategy Act of 2017.

The Department of Homeland Security spends billions of taxpayer dollars annually on a variety of systems to secure our borders, protect our aviation system, safeguard our shores, and shield our cyberspace, among other critical missions. Unfortunately, watchdogs at the Government Accountability Office and the DHS Office of Inspector General have found longstanding problems with how DHS has managed these programs. DHS continues to be on GAO's high-risk list for acquisition management, meaning these programs are susceptible to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement.

In addition, the Department has failed to have a strategic vision for its major purposes. The result has been wasted effort and taxpayer money gone, with little to show for it. Look at the TSA puffer machines from a few years ago as a past example.

Without a comprehensive strategy, industry also does not have the needed information to best support DHS in making smart investments in executing its mission.

My bill will require DHS to establish this much-needed strategy to ensure taxpayer dollars are safeguarded and frontline operators receive the tools they need to successfully protect Americans.

My bill will also ensure that DHS works collaboratively with the private sector to fully leverage their innovative solutions. As a former FBI agent, I know how important it is to get critical tools out to the field to help agents and officers secure our Nation.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1249, the DHS Multiyear Acquisition Strategy Act of 2017, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Safeguarding our country and the American people is the Department of Homeland Security's most solemn responsibility.

Today, Homeland Security threats are multidimensional and changing at an unprecedented pace. As such, it is critical that DHS' acquisition programs be targeted to meet the demands of an ever-evolving threat environment. To ensure long-term strategic planning, H.R. 1249 directs DHS to develop a multiyear acquisition strategy as is currently required at the Transportation Security Administration.

The bill is intended to foster a more strategic approach to how DHS executes and manages procurement. Specifically, it directs DHS, in consultation with industry stakeholders and academia, to develop a prioritized list of major acquisitions together with information on the expected security and economic benefits of these programs.

To guard against wasteful spending on redundant programs, it also directs DHS to work towards developing a DHS-wide inventory of investments and real property. Once DHS has such an inventory, I believe it will find areas for greater efficiency and be able to redirect limited Homeland Security resources to vital programs.

One of the critical features of the strategy is the requirement that DHS have a plan to address funding gaps that may exist in major acquisition programs.

Given that the Trump administration's 2018 budget prioritizes funding the border wall that the President promised during the campaign and amplifying immigration enforcement, there is a real concern that important programs that are desperately needed within DHS will get short shrift.

H.R. 1249 was approved unanimously by the Committee on Homeland Security earlier this month, and similar legislation was approved by a voice vote by the House in October of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of the Department-wide acquisition strategy, as H.R. 1249 requires, has the potential of helping the Department achieve economies of scale that result in cost savings and better use of limited Homeland Security resources.

I am particularly pleased that the legislation directs the Department to assess ways it can better test and acquire innovative technologies. Some of the most vexing Homeland Security challenges can only be fully addressed when DHS partners with innovators, particularly small businesses.

I want to congratulate the gentleman, my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the support of H.R. 1249, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1249, and I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for her bipartisan leadership on a bill that will surely help keep our country safe.

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

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1249, the DHS Multiyear Acquisition Strategy Act of 2017. I thank Representative FITZPATRICK for his leadership in championing this important legislation. I also want to commend the other Committee Members, especially the freshmen, on their key bipartisan legislation being considered today.

We are in dangerous times and our homeland faces significant threats. The tools we provide our frontline personnel securing our borders, protecting our airports, and defending our cyber networks need to be delivered on time and properly designed to meet their needs.

Far too often, DHS has mismanaged major acquisition programs and the result has been systems that are late, do less, and cost more to the taxpayer. Representative FITZPATRICK's bill, along with Representatives RUTHERFORD and HIGGINS' bills, is critical in ensuring that DHS better manages these vital acquisition programs. These bills put important safeguards into place to guard against waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement.

As we move forward with our Committee's work to reauthorize DHS for the first time ever, we will continue our focus on draining the waste from the Department to ensure our homeland is secured efficiently and effectively. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1249.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Committee on Homeland Security I rise in support of H.R. 1249, the ''DHS Multiyear Acquisition Strategy Act of 2017'', which requires the Department of Homeland Security to develop a multiyear acquisition strategy.

H.R. 1249 seeks to streamline the Department of Homeland Security's acquisition process to promote strategic investment as well as cost savings for taxpayers.

DHS would be required to provide Congress with the new strategy which needs to include:

1. A prioritized list of major acquisition programs
2. An inventory of investments and real estate assets
3. A plan to address funding gaps, prevent wasteful purchases, achieve efficiency, align prices for similar items, and use purchase timing and economies of scale
4. An identification of tests to support the acquisition of technology, leverage emerging trends and incorporate technology into DHS's operating doctrine
5. An assessment of how DHS could encourage appropriate risk-taking and minimize cost overruns, including when the department identifies needs, Develops cost assessments, Secures funding, Demonstrates technology maturity, and establishes its workforce
6. An assessment to improve collaboration with industry, small and disadvantaged businesses, intra-government offices, university centers of excellence, certification organizations, and national laboratories

Although the DHS has taken measures to improve acquisition management, DHS programs still cost taxpayers over $7 billion per year.

In its 2017 list of ''high-risk'' areas, GAO reported DHS needed to improve the affordability of its major acquisition programs and address staffing shortfalls.

DHS acquisition programs may continue to be at high risk for waste, fraud, and abuse.

This bill will assist oversight committees in better preparing men and women on the frontlines securing our borders, protecting our airports, and defending our shores by making sure we know what works and what is needed before taxpayer dollars are spent.

Efficient use of resources within the Department of Homeland Security is crucial to the safety of all Texans, and all Americans especially in regards to border security.

The Texas-Mexico border makes up 1,254 miles of the 1,900-mile-long U.S.-Mexico border.

The more money wasted on unnecessary overhead costs, the less resources the Department has to fulfill its key mission of protecting our border and our homeland.

By passing this bipartisan measure, we can ensure that the DHS operates in a more efficient manner and can better stay ahead of threats to our country.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1249.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1249, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1630

DHS ACQUISITION AUTHORITIES ACT OF 2017

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1252) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for certain acquisition authorities for the Under Secretary of Management of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1252

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 ''DHS Acquisition Authorities Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. ACQUISITION AUTHORITIES FOR UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

Section 701 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341) is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (e) and (f); and

(2) inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

''(d) ACQUISITION AND RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 1702(b) of title 41, United States Code, the Under Secretary for Management is the Chief Acquisition Officer of the Department. As Chief Acquisition Officer, the Under Secretary shall have the authorities and perform the functions specified in section 1702(b) of such title, and perform all other functions and responsibilities delegated by the Secretary or described in this subsection.

''(2) FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—In addition to the authorities and functions specified in section 1702(b) of title 41, United States Code, the functions and responsibilities of the Under Secretary for Management related to acquisition (as such term is defined in section 710) include the following:

''(A) Advising the Secretary regarding acquisition management activities, taking into account risks of failure to achieve cost, schedule, or performance parameters, to ensure that the Department achieves its mission through the adoption of widely accepted program management best practices (as such term is defined in section 710) and standards and, where appropriate, acquisition innovation best practices.

''(B) Leading the Department's acquisition oversight body, the Acquisition Review Board, and exercising the acquisition decision authority (as such term is defined in section 710) to approve, pause, modify (including the rescission of approvals of program milestones), or cancel major acquisition programs (as such term is defined in section 710), unless the Under Secretary delegates such authority to a Component Acquisition Executive (as such term is defined in section 710) pursuant to paragraph (3).

''(C) Establishing policies for acquisition that implement an approach that takes into account risks of failure to achieve cost, schedule, or performance parameters that all components of the Department shall comply with, including outlining relevant authorities for program managers to effectively manage acquisition programs.

''(D) Ensuring that each major acquisition program has a Department-approved acquisition program baseline (as such term is defined in section 710), pursuant to the Department's acquisition management policy.

''(E) Ensuring that the heads of components and Component Acquisition Executives comply with Federal law, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and Department acquisition management directives.

''(F) Ensuring that grants and financial assistance are provided only to individuals and organizations that are not suspended or debarred.

''(G) Distributing guidance throughout the Department to ensure that contractors involved in acquisitions, particularly contractors that access the Department's information systems and technologies, adhere to relevant Department policies related to physical and information security as identified by the Under Secretary for Management.

''(H) Overseeing the Component Acquisition Executive organizational structure to ensure Component Acquisition Executives have sufficient capabilities and comply with Department acquisition policies.

''(3) DELEGATION OF ACQUISITION DECISION AUTHORITY.—

''(A) LEVEL 3 ACQUISITIONS.—The Under Secretary for Management may delegate acquisition decision authority in writing to the relevant Component Acquisition Executive for an acquisition program that has a life cycle cost estimate of less than $300,000,000.

''(B) LEVEL 2 ACQUISITIONS.—The Under Secretary for Management may delegate acquisition decision authority in writing to the relevant Component Acquisition Executive for a major acquisition program that has a life cycle cost estimate of at least $300,000,000 but not more than $1,000,000,000 if all of the following requirements are met:

''(i) The component concerned possesses working policies, processes, and procedures that are consistent with Department-level acquisition policy.

''(ii) The Component Acquisition Executive concerned has adequate, experienced, and dedicated professional employees with program management training, as applicable, commensurate with the size of the acquisition programs and related activities delegated to such Component Acquisition Executive by the Under Secretary for Management.

''(iii) Each major acquisition program concerned has written documentation showing that it has a Department-approved acquisition program baseline and it is meeting agreed-upon cost, schedule, and performance thresholds.

''(4) RELATIONSHIP TO UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this subsection shall diminish the authority granted to the Under Secretary for Science and Technology under this Act. The Under Secretary for Management and the Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall cooperate in matters related to the coordination of acquisitions across the Department so that investments of the Directorate of Science and Technology are able to support current and future requirements of the components of the Department.

''(B) OPERATIONAL TESTING AND EVALUATION.—The Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall—

''(i) ensure, in coordination with relevant component heads, that major acquisition programs—

''(I) complete operational testing and evaluation of technologies and systems;

''(II) use independent verification and validation of operational test and evaluation implementation and results; and

''(III) document whether such programs meet all performance requirements included in their acquisition program baselines;

''(ii) ensure that such operational testing and evaluation includes all system components and incorporates operators into the testing to ensure that systems perform as intended in the appropriate operational setting; and

''(iii) determine if testing conducted by other Federal agencies and private entities is relevant and sufficient in determining whether systems perform as intended in the operational setting.''.

SEC. 3. ACQUISITION AUTHORITIES FOR CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

Paragraph (2) of section 702(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 342(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(J) Oversee the costs of acquisition programs and related activities to ensure that actual and planned costs are in accordance with budget estimates and are affordable, or can be adequately funded, over the life cycle of such programs and activities.''.

SEC. 4. ACQUISITION AUTHORITIES FOR CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

Section 703 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 343) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

''(b) ACQUISITION RESPONSIBILITIES.—Notwithstanding section 11315 of title 40, United States Code, the acquisition responsibilities of the Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the Under Secretary for Management, shall include the following:

''(1) Oversee the management of the Homeland Security Enterprise Architecture and ensure that, before each acquisition decision event (as such term is defined in section 710), approved information technology acquisitions comply with departmental information technology management processes, technical requirements, and the Homeland Security Enterprise Architecture, and in any case in which information technology acquisitions do not comply with the Department's management directives, make recommendations to the Acquisition Review Board regarding such noncompliance.

''(2) Be responsible for providing recommendations to the Acquisition Review Board regarding information technology programs, and be responsible for developing information technology acquisition strategic guidance.''.

SEC. 5. ACQUISITION AUTHORITIES FOR PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY AND RISK MANAGEMENT (PARM).

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 710. ACQUISITION AUTHORITIES FOR PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY AND RISK MANAGEMENT.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE.—Within the Management Directorate, there shall be a Program Accountability and Risk Management office to—

''(1) provide consistent accountability, standardization, and transparency of major acquisition programs of the Department; and

''(2) serve as the central oversight function for all Department acquisition programs.

''(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The Program Accountability and Risk Management office shall be led by an Executive Director to oversee the requirement under subsection (a). The Executive Director shall report directly to the Under Secretary for Management, and shall carry out the following responsibilities:

''(1) Monitor regularly the performance of Department acquisition programs between acquisition decision events to identify problems with cost, performance, or schedule that components may need to address to prevent cost overruns, performance issues, or schedule delays.

''(2) Assist the Under Secretary for Management in managing the Department's acquisition programs and related activities.

''(3) Conduct oversight of individual acquisition programs to implement Department acquisition program policy, procedures, and guidance with a priority on ensuring the data the office collects and maintains from Department components is accurate and reliable.

''(4) Serve as the focal point and coordinator for the acquisition life cycle review process and as the executive secretariat for the Acquisition Review Board.

''(5) Advise the persons having acquisition decision authority in making acquisition decisions consistent with all applicable laws and in establishing clear lines of authority, accountability, and responsibility for acquisition decisionmaking within the Department.

''(6) Engage in the strategic planning and performance evaluation process required under section 306 of title 5, United States Code, and sections 1105(a)(28), 1115, 1116, and 9703 of title 31, United States Code, by supporting the Chief Procurement Officer in developing strategies and specific plans for hiring, training, and professional development in order to rectify any deficiency within the Department's acquisition workforce.

''(7) Develop standardized certification standards in consultation with the Component Acquisition Executives for all acquisition program managers.

''(8) In the event that an acquisition program manager's certification or actions need review for purposes of promotion or removal, provide input, in consultation with the relevant Component Acquisition Executive, into the relevant acquisition program manager's performance evaluation, and report positive or negative experiences to the relevant certifying authority.

''(9) Provide technical support and assistance to Department acquisitions and acquisition personnel in conjunction with the Chief Procurement Officer.

''(10) Prepare the Department's Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report, as required by title I of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114–113), and make such report available to the congressional homeland security committees.

''(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF COMPONENTS.—Each head of a component shall comply with Federal law, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and Department acquisition management directives established by the Under Secretary for Management. For each major acquisition program, each head of a component shall—

''(1) define baseline requirements and document changes to such requirements, as appropriate;

''(2) establish a complete life cycle cost estimate with supporting documentation, including an acquisition program baseline;

''(3) verify each life cycle cost estimate against independent cost estimates, and reconcile any differences;

''(4) complete a cost-benefit analysis with supporting documentation;

''(5) develop and maintain a schedule that is consistent with scheduling best practices as identified by the Comptroller General of the United States, including, in appropriate cases, an integrated master schedule; and

''(6) ensure that all acquisition program information provided by the component is complete, accurate, timely, and valid.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) ACQUISITION.—The term 'acquisition' has the meaning given such term in section 131 of title 41, United States Code.

''(2) ACQUISITION DECISION AUTHORITY.—The term 'acquisition decision authority' means the authority, held by the Secretary acting through the Deputy Secretary or Under Secretary for Management to—

''(A) ensure compliance with Federal law, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and Department acquisition management directives;

''(B) review (including approving, pausing, modifying, or canceling) an acquisition program through the life cycle of such program;

''(C) ensure that acquisition program managers have the resources necessary to successfully execute an approved acquisition program;

''(D) ensure good acquisition program management of cost, schedule, risk, and system performance of the acquisition program at issue, including assessing acquisition program baseline breaches and directing any corrective action for such breaches; and

''(E) ensure that acquisition program managers, on an ongoing basis, monitor cost, schedule, and performance against established baselines and use tools to assess risks to an acquisition program at all phases of the life cycle of such program to avoid and mitigate acquisition program baseline breaches.

''(3) ACQUISITION DECISION EVENT.—The term 'acquisition decision event', with respect to an acquisition program, means a predetermined point within each of the acquisition phases at which the acquisition decision authority determines whether such acquisition program shall proceed to the next acquisition phase.

''(4) ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term 'acquisition program' means the process by which the Department acquires, with any appropriated amounts, by contract for purchase or lease, property or services (including construction) that support the missions and goals of the Department.

''(5) ACQUISITION PROGRAM BASELINE.—The term 'acquisition program baseline', with respect to an acquisition program, means a summary of the cost, schedule, and performance parameters, expressed in standard, measurable, quantitative terms, which must be met in order to accomplish the goals of such program.

''(6) BEST PRACTICES.—The term 'best practices', with respect to acquisition, means a knowledge-based approach to capability development that includes—

''(A) identifying and validating needs;

''(B) assessing alternatives to select the most appropriate solution;

''(C) clearly establishing well-defined requirements;

''(D) developing realistic cost assessments and schedules;

''(E) securing stable funding that matches resources to requirements;

''(F) demonstrating technology, design, and manufacturing maturity;

''(G) using milestones and exit criteria or specific accomplishments that demonstrate progress;

''(H) adopting and executing standardized processes with known success across programs;

''(I) establishing an adequate workforce that is qualified and sufficient to perform necessary functions; and

''(J) integrating the capabilities described in subparagraphs (A) through (I) into the Department's mission and business operations.

''(7) BREACH.—The term 'breach', with respect to a major acquisition program, means a failure to meet any cost, schedule, or performance threshold specified in the most recently approved acquisition program baseline.

''(8) CONGRESSIONAL HOMELAND SECURITY COMMITTEES.—The term 'congressional homeland security committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

''(9) COMPONENT ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE.—The term 'Component Acquisition Executive' means the senior acquisition official within a component who is designated in writing by the Under Secretary for Management, in consultation with the component head, with authority and responsibility for leading a process and staff to provide acquisition and program management oversight, policy, and guidance to ensure that statutory, regulatory, and higher level policy requirements are fulfilled, including compliance with Federal law, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, and Department acquisition management directives established by the Under Secretary for Management.

''(10) MAJOR ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—The term 'major acquisition program' means a Department acquisition program that is estimated by the Secretary to require an eventual total expenditure of at least $300,000,000 (based on fiscal year 2017 constant dollars) over its life cycle cost.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 709 the following new item:

''Sec. 710. Acquisition authorities for Program Accountability and Risk Management.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1252, the Department of Homeland Security Acquisition Authorities Act of 2017.

The Department of Homeland Security has been routinely criticized over the years by watchdogs at the Government Accountability Office and DHS Office of Inspector General for failing to responsibly manage its major acquisition programs. These programs, which secure our borders, safeguard our cyber networks, protect air travelers, defend our shores, among other critical missions, and cost taxpayers billions of dollars every year.

Watchdogs have previously reported how DHS leadership has failed to hold programs accountable to its own acquisition policies. In some cases, these programs have spent billions of dollars of American treasure without having to show what they will ultimately cost, when they will be complete, and what benefits they will deliver to frontline operators. DHS' Under Secretary for Management has not had the force of law to hold these programs accountable until now.

My bill establishes a top cop in the Under Secretary for Management as Chief Acquisitions Officer to oversee these billion-dollar programs. It requires thoughtful management of major acquisition programs based on private sector best practices. My bill requires strong accountability measures to oversee major acquisition programs so that these critical tools get into the hands of those defending our homeland on time and on budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in supporting this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TEHCNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2017.

Hon. MICHAEL MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1252, the ''DHS Acquisition Authorities Act of 2017,'' which your Committee ordered reported on March 8, 2017.

H.R. 1252 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. In order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2017.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1252, the ''DHS Acquisition Authorities Act of 2017.'' I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will not seek a sequential referral on the bill.

The Committee on Homeland Security concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing a sequential referral of this bill at this time, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this bill or similar legislation in the future. In addition, should a conference on this bill be necessary, I would support a request by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology for conferees on those provisions within your jurisdiction.

I will insert copies of this exchange in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. I thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1252, the DHS Acquisition Authorities Act of 2017. The Department of Homeland Security has limited acquisition resources and must be effective stewards of taxpayer dollars. As such, DHS' procurement practices must be sound, effective, and adhered to throughout the organization.

Although DHS has come a long way since its inception in 2002, acquisition management remains a challenge for the Department. In fact, a 2015 assessment by the GAO of DHS' largest acquisition programs determined that only 2 of the 22 reviewed programs were on track to meet their initial schedule and cost parameters.

Responsibility for addressing weaknesses in acquisitions management and increasing effectiveness of DHS' major acquisitions begins at the top, with the DHS leadership. To that end, H.R. 1252 codifies that acquisition decision authority rests with the Under Secretary for Management as the Department's Chief Acquisition Officer.

H.R. 1252 authorizes the Under Secretary for Management to mandate acquisition policies, establishes the Under Secretary as lead of the Department's acquisition oversight body, and charges the Under Secretary with advising the Secretary regarding acquisition management activities.

To ensure greater oversight of the Department's procurement activities, H.R. 1252 also establishes acquisition management functions for DHS' Chief Financial Officer, Chief Information Officer, and the Program Accountability and Risk Management Office.

This legislation is intended to clarify roles and responsibilities within DHS acquisition management activities and increase accountability of the Department's procedures, particularly those classified as underperforming.

H.R. 1252 was approved by the House in October 2015, and was approved unanimously by the Committee on Homeland Security just a few weeks ago.

Given the complexity of the organization, it is incumbent upon the Department to tackle its diverse procurement challenges from the top down.

H.R. 1252 codifies the acquisition management roles within the Department and supports enhanced accountability in management of DHS' acquisitions.

By passing this legislation, Congress can take another important step toward increasing efficiency and improving outcomes of DHS' major acquisition programs.

I join in congratulating the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) on the good work that he has done here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 1252, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey. I, once again, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1252, as amended.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1252, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings

will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1294, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1249, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1252, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

REDUCING DHS ACQUISITION COST GROWTH ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1294) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for congressional notification regarding major acquisition program breaches, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 0, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—408

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—21

Barr
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Comer
Deutch
Duncan (SC)
Fortenberry
Gutiérrez
Hoyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Payne
Renacci
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sinema
Slaughter
Suozzi
Titus
Tsongas
Valadao

□ 1851

Messrs. WELCH and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intention to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall immediately disclose his tax return information to Congress and the American people.

Whereas, in the United States' system of checks and balances, Congress has a responsibility to hold the executive branch of government to the highest standard of transparency to ensure the public interest is placed first;

Whereas, according to the Tax History Project, every President since Gerald Ford has disclosed their tax return information to the public;

Whereas, tax returns provide an important baseline disclosure because they contain highly instructive information including whether the candidate can be influenced by foreign entities and reveal any conflicts of interest;

Whereas, Article I, section 9 of the Constitution states that no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of Congress, accept any present, emolument, Office or Title, of any kind whatever from any King, Prince, or foreign State;

Whereas, disclosure of the President's tax returns is important towards investigating Russian influence in the 2016 election, understanding the President's financial ties to the Russian Federation and Russian citizens, including debts owed and whether he shares any partnership interests, equity interests, joint ventures, or licensing agreements with Russia or Russian nationals, formally or informally associated with Vladmir Putin;

Whereas, The New York Times has reported that President Trump's close senior advisers, including Carter Page, Paul Manafort, Roger Stone, and General Michael Flynn, have been under investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for their ties to the Russian Federation;

Whereas, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov told Interfax, a Russian media outlet, on November 10, 2016, that ''there were contacts''

with Donald Trump's 2016 campaign, and it has been reported that members of President Trump's inner circle were in contact with senior Russian officials throughout the 2016 campaign;

Whereas, General Michael Flynn, former national security adviser of President Trump, received almost $68,000 in fees and expenses from Russian entities in 2015, including by an entity recognized by U.S. intelligence agencies as an arm of the Russian Government;

Whereas, FBI Director Comey stated in the Select Intelligence Committee hearing on the Russian interference with the November 2016 election that ''there is no information to support those tweets,'' relating to President's Trump allegations that President Obama illegally wiretapped the Trump campaign;

Whereas, distracting investigators with dead-end leads and outrageous statements is a common tactic from those with a guilty conscience or in a deliberate effort to throw off investigators;

Whereas, according to his 2016 candidate filing with the Federal Election Commission, the President has 564 financial positions in companies located in the United States and around the world;

Whereas, according to The Washington Post, the Trump International Hotel in Washington, D.C., has hired a ''director of diplomatic sales'' to generate high-priced business among foreign leaders and diplomatic delegations;

Whereas, the chairman on the Ways and Means Committee, Joint Committee on Taxation, and Senate Finance Committee have the authority to request the President's tax returns under section 6103 of the tax code;

Whereas, the Ways and Means Committee used IRC 6103 authority in 2014 to make public the confidential tax information of 51 taxpayers;

Whereas, the American people have the right to know whether or not their President is operating under conflicts of interest related to international affairs, tax reform, government contracts, or otherwise:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the House of Representatives shall:

One, immediately request the tax return information of Donald J. Trump for tax years 2006 through 2015 for review in closed executive session by the Committee on Ways and Means, as provided under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code, and vote to report the information therein to the full House of Representatives;

Two, support transparency in government and the longstanding tradition of Presidents and Presidential candidates disclosing their tax returns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Colorado will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, previous motions by Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. CROWLEY were ruled upon immediately. What is different about today's resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will inform the gentleman of the scheduling, as stated earlier, within the limits of rule IX.

Mr. POLIS. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, does today's hearing of the Select Committee on Intelligence provide additional relevant information to the Speaker in order to make this decision?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The leadership will give the gentleman timely notice of the scheduling of his resolution.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, one additional parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, does delaying consideration of this resolution mean that we won't even vote on whether we can find out if the President has financial ties to a foreign entity for 2 more days?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Recognition for a parliamentary inquiry is within the discretion of the Chair. The gentleman is no longer recognized.

The Chair is prepared to resume proceedings on votes postponed earlier today.

DHS MULTIYEAR ACQUISITION STRATEGY ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5 minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1249) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require a multiyear acquisition strategy of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

YEAS—409

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul

McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—20

Barr
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Comer
Deutch
Duncan (SC)
Fortenberry
Gutiérrez
Hoyer
Marchant
Payne
Renacci
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sinema
Slaughter
Suozzi
Titus
Tsongas
Valadao

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1906

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DHS ACQUISITION AUTHORITIES ACT OF 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1252) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for certain acquisition authorities for the Under Secretary of Management of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]

YEAS—407

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—1

Jones

NOT VOTING—21

Barr
Cleaver
Comer
Deutch
Duncan (SC)
Fortenberry
Gutiérrez
Hoyer
Marchant
Payne
Perry
Renacci
Rohrabacher
Royce (CA)
Rush
Sinema
Slaughter
Suozzi
Titus
Tsongas
Valadao

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1913

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 173 H.R. 1294, had I been present, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall vote 174 H.R. 1249 (as amended), had I been present, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall vote 175 H.R. 1252 (as amended), had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 372, COMPETITIVE HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2017

Mr. BYRNE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–50) on the resolution (H. Res. 209) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 372) to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1101, REPORT ONSMALL BUSINESS HEALTH FAIRNESS ACT OF 2017

Mr. BYRNE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–51) on the resolution (H. Res. 210) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1101) to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1915

REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 1628, AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2017

Mrs. BLACK, from the Committee on the Budget, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–52) on the bill (H.R. 1628) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RECOGNIZING VIZCAYA, A SOUTH FLORIDA NATIONAL TREASURE

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Vizcaya, an accredited museum and national historic landmark, located in my congressional district and the legacy of visionary James Deering, who created this south Florida gem 100 years ago.

With the help of Deering's nieces, public officials, and private citizens, Vizcaya has been serving as a public resource for more than 60 years now. Today, it is at the origins of modern Miami's interest in art, international culture and innovation, and welcomes over 275,000 guests each year.

Vizcaya will restore several historic village buildings and the surrounding landscape, which will enable them to tell the full story of the estate, including the legacy of its workers, and to accommodate new programs for students and families, including those on urban farming.

Vizcaya's future will be rooted in its history, but directed toward the demands of 21st century Miami.

For 100 years, Mr. Speaker, Vizcaya has been a place for people to gather, to learn, to engage in social activity, and to find inspiration. Its continued evolution will cement its role as Miami's cultural hub.

INVEST IN THE HEALTH OF BOTH OUR PEOPLE AND OUR ECONOMY

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Mr. Speaker, the GOP's American Health Care Act would turn back the clock on health care for the American people while driving States toward bankruptcy and devastating our economy.

Under the Affordable Care Act, 1 million people in Illinois gained health insurance. Under this plan, over 1 million would lose it. Millions more across our country currently receiving coverage through their jobs would lose their health care as well.

State and local budgets would face cuts in Federal aid, forcing a choice between cutting coverage and raising taxes. My home State of Illinois alone would lose $40 billion over the next decade.

And this bill would wreak havoc on the American economy. The American Health Care Act would kill nearly 2 million jobs, while eliminating billions in healthcare funding that would otherwise support hospitals, community health services, and the development of new cures.

We need to invest in the health of both our people and our economy. Unfortunately, this plan does neither.

SPRING CREEK TROUT UNLIMITED CHAPTER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Spring Creek Trout Unlimited Chapter located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District for receiving the National 2016 Gold Trout Award as the Nation's most outstanding Trout Unlimited chapter.

The Spring Creek Chapter's conservation and angler science activities this year are world class, with more than 1.5 miles of riparian habitat planted, 13 in-stream structures built, water quality monitoring, redd count and angler surveys totaling more than 4,500 hours. These volunteer efforts are valued at more than $210,000.

Beyond this outstanding conservation activity, the chapter reaches into the community, hosting events and activities. The Veterans Service Partnership program serves hundreds of veterans, with the power of healing and a sense of community.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to joining the members of the Spring Creek Trout Unlimited Chapter this Saturday for the 44th annual dinner to celebrate the chapter's gold trout award. It is just 1 of 400 Trout Unlimited chapters across the country. This outstanding achievement shows the power, dedication, and teamwork from local Trout Unlimited members.

QUESTIONING MR. COMEY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in a methodical questioning of Mr. Comey today in the Intelligence Committee, let me recount for you and my colleagues the responses of Mr. Comey.

Mr. Trump's tweet, March 4, 2017: Terrible. Just found out that Obama had my wires tapped in Trump Tower just before the victory. Nothing found. This is McCarthyism.

Mr. Comey said: No, it did not happen.

March 4, 2017: Is it legal for a sitting President to be wiretapping a race for President prior to an election? Turned down by court earlier. A new low.

Mr. Comey said: No, it did not happen.

Mr. Comey, the FBI director.

Again on March 4, 2017: I bet a good lawyer could make a great case out of the fact that President Obama was tapping my phones in October, just prior to election.

Again, Mr. Comey said: No.

And then again on March 4, 2017, Mr. Trump said: How low has President Obama gone to tap my phones during the very sacred election process. This is Nixon/Watergate. Bad, or sick, guy.

Mr. Comey, the FBI director, said: No.

Definitively, Mr. Trump did not tell the truth. More investigations deliberatively to determine the status of the actions of the President of the United States accusing a former President of a criminal felony which did not happen. It did not happen.

CALIFORNIA'S FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT TOWNHALL MEETINGS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, in my own First Congressional District of California, we had the first of our series of townhall meetings—this one in Nevada County at the Grass Valley fairgrounds.

It was a good meeting. A bit raucous at times. There was disagreement, and there was some agreement as well. But I think it was a good dialogue to get started with the dialogue we need to have in northern California on the very important issues that we are working on here in Congress.

There was agreement and disagreement on where we should go with the ACA treatment and where we should go with the funding of EPA. But what I am happiest about is that at least we were able to come together, 1,400 people and me and my staff, and have a dialogue that, again, at times was a little loud, a little raucous, but also people looking forward to being able to hear each other and listen to each other on the issues that are important as we go forward in this Congress.

I commend people in Nevada County for reaching out and for helping us get started with our outreach that we are going to have in northern California. Upcoming next will be Butte County, Shasta County, and the farther reaches a little bit later.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good dialogue I need to have.

DEFENDING PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to defend public broadcasting and honor the late Fred Rogers, whose birthday is today, March 20. Known fondly by millions simply as Mr. Rogers, his wonderful, beloved presence has reached millions of homes across our Nation captivating generations of children, and even adults.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting is a vital part of America, including cities, but small towns as well. NPR and PBS stations will be disproportionately impacted by President Trump's proposed budget zeroing out public broadcasting. It is not right.

President Trump's travel bill to Mara-Lago and the growing security that the American people are paying for over at his Trump Tower in New York, which reports show to already be in the tens of millions of dollars, will soon swamp the $200 million America dedicates to public broadcasting annually.

We have been here before. In 1969, President Richard Nixon threatened to slash funding for PBS. Mr. Rogers went before the Senate to defend public broadcasting and its value to our children, especially for learning. I know I am not alone in wishing Mr. Rogers were with us once again to make the case for America's children and public broadcasting.

I hope President Trump and my colleagues will join me in supporting programming that boosts kids' confidence and helps children enjoy learning and the wonder of math, science, and books.

HONORING THE LATE ANTONIO CLAUDIO MARTINEZ

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to pay tribute to a community leader, a pioneer, and a humanitarian.

Mr. Antonio C. Martinez was one of the first Dominican-American members of the New York State Bar. He was born in Santiago, Dominican Republic, in 1926, and immigrated to the United States with his mother through Ellis Island. He passed away on December 16, 1999, leaving behind a great legacy.

Antonio attended Hunter College in Manhattan and graduated from Brooklyn Law School in 1956. And when the call to duty came during World War II, Antonio selflessly enlisted in the U.S. Army and served honorably in the Pacific theater.

Antonio dedicated his 43 years of legal career to immigration, assisting thousands of families through the process of legally entering the United States. His efforts and the cases he argued helped improve the law.

I am privileged to speak from my heart about Antonio's great work in the legal field, because my family and I were fortunate enough to have Antonio represent us when we needed to navigate the immigration system here in the United States. Antonio's dedication to our legal system played an important role. I am proud to say that, as the first Dominican-American Congressman, my family and I are very proud of the work he did.

Today, his professional legacy lives on. His son is here in the gallery. I am happy to recognize Antonio's work of many years.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order hour.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, for the next 60 minutes, it is with great honor that I rise to coanchor this CBC Special Order hour. For the next 60 minutes, we have a chance to speak directly to the American people on the issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus, to Congress, and to constituents who represent all Americans.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, we would like to use this time to talk about the Affordable Care Act. What do you have to lose? What do you have to lose, Mr. Speaker? Such was President Trump's constant refrain to the African-American community when rallying for their support of his administration's various policies.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to say that with critical elements of the American healthcare policy on the chopping block, African-Americans have a lot to lose, possibly even their lives.

□ 1930

There is as much at stake if President Trump and the Republican-controlled Congress healthcare policies take shape in their current form.

By illustration, I want to address the impact on low-income families and individuals in the Virgin Islands who rely on Medicaid, and, presently, Medicaid is capped in the Virgin Islands. You can look at our territory as an example of what will happen when there is a cap on services, which could compromise a State or local government's ability to administer those most in need.

Since its inception, Medicaid has been an open-ended program that was intended to expand and contract with need, especially when States and localities face crippling economic downturns of both manmade and natural origins. Medicaid covers one in five Americans, and of those, the majority of enrollees are children and individuals with disabilities.

Under the Affordable Care Act, widely known as ObamaCare, millions of African Americans finally gained access to healthcare coverage. In 2015, approximately 11.2 million African Americans became eligible for Medicaid through the expansion, health care that they previously did not receive and which would have cost this country much more if that early-warning health care was not taken care of.

President Trump and Republicans in Congress propose converting Medicaid from a shared payment program between States and Federal Government to an arrangement much like a block grant, where the Federal Government puts a cap on its payment assistance, creating a huge cost shift to the States. If you want to know what you have to lose if caps on Medicaid are enacted nationwide, look no further than my home, the Virgin Islands. It is a grim outlook.

Federal caps on Medicaid programs in the Virgin Islands are set on a per-enrollee basis. Unlike States in the mainland where Federal Medicaid spending is open-ended depending on the needs of the people, the Virgin Islands can only access Federal dollars up to an annual ceiling. Beyond that cap, the Virgin Islands' government is responsible for the remaining costs. That means many Virgin Islanders who would qualify in other States and in other circumstances don't get the healthcare coverage that they need now.

Under the proposed fiscal arrangement, spending caps don't take into account the cost of providing services or unpredictable changes in a community—such as the closure of a major employer or a natural disasters—forcing a cost obligation for critical support services onto the already strained budgets of the territory.

As a result, States and local governments, increasingly, would have to make tough choices to either reduce services for recipients of Medicaid or restrict eligibility and enrollment of additional people who may need it. Those are the choices that Virgin Islanders must make. So the most vulnerable of our constituents—in this case, children—who need the safety net that Medicaid, by definition, is supposed to provide have that final option cut out from under them.

When it comes to Medicaid coverage, the Virgin Islands struggles to provide low-income families with Medicaid services for three major reasons:

First, while the Affordable Care Act raised the territory's Federal Medicaid assistance percentage up to 83 percent for newly eligible enrollees, this increase in Federal match funding did not apply to those previously enrolled, which the Federal Government only matched at 55 percent in the Virgin Islands, requiring that the remaining costs be covered by the Virgin Islands government, a government already strained to meet basic needs.

The Virgin Islands and the smaller territories are not included in the Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital, DSH, program, which would shoulder the unanticipated costs our hospitals must take on to provide adequate care for individuals who use hospitals for basic services since they have no insurance.

Three, With no Affordable Care Act exchange and no Federal subsidies to create our own health exchange, many Virgin Islanders were only able to obtain coverage through the Medicaid expansion if they met the already strenuous requirements. That means that 30 percent of Virgin Islanders presently have no health insurance.

This is what the rest of the States are going to have if this American Health Care Act, as it stands, is passed. A cap on Medicaid is a cap on medical services that our constituents just can't do without; and in poor communities, it is going to be even more impactful.

When ObamaCare provided increased funding to expand Medicaid, the island of Saint Croix was able to start a monthly homeless clinic at the Frederiksted Health Care Center about 15 months ago. That clinic has been able to serve many people, providing them with medical care, showers, meals, and transportation.

On St. Thomas, with the East End health clinic, they were able to expand their services and increase dental services to people who were sorely in need of that. If this funding decreases or is lost altogether, it is highly unlikely that this initiative can be continued.

Our current healthcare struggle is set to become a future hardship for mainland American States that provide Medicaid to a significant number of their population should the current proposals to cap Medicaid nationwide become law.

How do we avoid this? Do not place a cap on Medicaid. Too many in the African-American community have everything to lose if healthcare policy goes in this direction.

At this time, I yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, my good colleague and good friend. I thank her sincerely.

Last summer when speaking to the African-American community at a rally in Philadelphia, President Trump asked the question: What do you have to lose? Yes, he asked that question: What do you have to lose?

President Trump, what don't we have to lose? The programs the President wants to cut is the Community Development Block Grant, Meals on Wheels, and funding for Medicaid. There are programs that help combat poverty by providing the resources for better schools and food nutritional programs. These are the programs that help provide for the most vulnerable Americans who are fighting every day to try to get ahead.

What do we have to lose? Look at what the Republicans are trying to do with the Affordable Care Act. They say they want to cut costs and cover more Americans, but their plan doesn't do that. It does the opposite.

Take, for example, how they want to change the core structure of Medicare. They want to shift the Medicare from an open-ended entitlement program to one with a limited lens that does not take into account individual needs on a case-by-case basis.

What do we have to lose? All of the investments we have made to try to stabilize our cities, the budget cuts will have a direct impact. Take, for example, Temple University Hospital in the heart of the Second Congressional District. Temple University Hospital stands to lose $45 million in funding. This translates into less jobs for our city and reduces the capacity of quality patient care. The President's proposal takes our city backwards. It unravels all of our hard work to make our communities more stable.

What do we have to lose? Everything that builds a brighter future for our neighborhoods, block by block. It is time step up, speak up, and speak out to hold our President accountable.

President Trump, we have a lot to lose. We are going to make sure you hear our message and our voice.

Ms. PLASKETT. Thank you so much to my distinguished colleague from Philadelphia (Mr. EVANS) and for the information you have shared with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Chicago, Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY, who is also the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Health Braintrust, so she can expound upon this question: What do we have to lose?

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to my distinguished colleague from the Virgin Islands. It is an honor to be with you this evening, and thank you for your hard work and helping us to keep families healthy. Thank you also to CBC Chairman RICHMOND for organizing this important Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out for more than 975,000 residents of Illinois, including nearly 240,000 children that my Republican colleagues are plotting to strip of their health insurance.

This bill, the so-called American Health Care Act, ends the guarantee of quality, affordable, and accessible health care. This bill puts politics before people. But it isn't the politics that matters.

Mrs. Johnson affording her cancer treatment matters. A 5-year-old dying because her parents can't afford a transplant matters. Keeping our neighbors healthy no matter what street they live on or what their ZIP Code is will keep us all healthy.

So I must ask: What are my Republican colleagues thinking?

This bill was introduced at night, but the cover of darkness cannot hide the fact that this bill will kill tens of thousands of Americans every year. The dark of night cannot hide the reality that, because of this bad bill, more Americans will die of cancer, nor can it conceal the fact that millions of older Americans will be punished by the Republican's new ''age tax.''

Conversely, the Affordable Care Act protects older Americans from insurance companies who want to use their age as a reason to charge thousands and thousands more. While this bill from my Republican colleagues was written to empower insurance executives, the Affordable Care Act protects everyone. It includes unprecedented healthcare access safeguards for America's elderly, people living with disabilities, children, and young adults.

Meanwhile, the GOP's American Health Care Act reduces consumer protections. The American people will be left with more expensive healthcare coverage plans, and 24 million will lose their healthcare insurance completely, 14 million next year.

A disproportionate number of those losing insurance will come from African-American, Latino, Asian-American, and Pacific Islander communities. They will be women and children or older Americans, especially those living on the edge.

As chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Health Braintrust, I am working to close the gap in healthcare disparities that is plaguing these communities. This bill will make these disparities even worse.

And for the record, the ACA more than halved the uninsured rate in the African-American community and halved the national uninsured rate.

But the recent Congressional Budget Office report makes it clear that this will not continue in a positive way. In less than 10 years, 52 million Americans will be uninsured under the GPO's

plan. The majority of these will be our grandmothers, grandfathers, great-aunts, and great-uncles.

Under the Speaker's plan, my State, Illinois, will have to cut Medicare eligibility. More than 53,000 constituents will lose their health care just because of this provision. The GOP also plans to defund Planned Parenthood, a decision that means 60,000 residents of Illinois will go without lifesaving cancer and STI screenings.

The list of the not very good, very bad things from the Republican healthcare bill go on and on and on. It will make us sicker.

It also raises the national debt, and it kills at least 1.2 million American jobs. And it stops us from reaching what should be our ultimate goal: the ability of every American to live a long, healthy life.

Mr. Speaker, can we finally get serious and call this bill, your GOP healthcare bill, what it really is: the Trump don't care bill.

Well, the Congressional Black Caucus cares. The House Democrats—and hopefully some House Republicans—care, and they will care enough to do the right thing and will oppose this bill.

Ms. PLASKETT. Thank you so much, Congresswoman KELLY, for that information that you are sharing and for the work of the Congressional Black Caucus Health Braintrust and for the information that you are giving in the seminars and the groups, the different experiences that you have had throughout the country.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) so that she can tell us about some of the places that the Congressional Black Caucus Braintrust has had workshops or townhalls when sharing information with Americans.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Besides the District of Columbia, we have been to South Carolina. We have been to a couple of places in Los Angeles as well as Oakland to deal with the issue of AIDS. Also, of course, in my town of Chicago, we have had healthcare seminars; and, actually, we have had big health fairs so we can make sure that people get back-to-school checks, mental health checks, and AIDS checks. We gave food to people that might be in food deserts.

So we really tried to be well-rounded and also tried to educate people. And going forward this week, we do plan to be on a call with ministers all across the United States so they know exactly what is going on and how they can help their constituents in this fight against this new healthcare bill.

□ 1945

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I know the work that the gentlewoman from Illinois has done in health disparities that African Americans face. We disproportionately are struck with hypertension, high blood pressure, and diabetes, which are some of the things that we are concerned about. Lapse in coverage under the Affordable Care Act will affect African Americans in a large way because then those will become preexisting conditions, which are not covered under this healthcare plan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, actually, of the top 10 diseases African Americans die from, African Americans die more from 8 out of the top 10.

So this new bill is not going to send us in a better direction, and we don't want to keep those statistics. We want to do better, and we were doing better, especially around the area of cancer. We want to keep going in the positive direction, not the negative direction.

So we don't want to see this bill passed, and we want to educate as many people as possible and encourage them to call their Congressperson and Senator.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for the information and for being with us.

I also thank Chairman RICHMOND for providing this opportunity for the Congressional Black Caucus to speak before all of you and let you know.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), my distinguished co-chair, who has some great information to share with us about what do we have to lose under the new Health Care Act that is being considered by the Republicans at this time.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands. And I always enjoy hearing from the gentlewoman from the Chicago area, and I appreciate everything that she is doing as well.

It is interesting the President posed that question: What do you have to lose?

What he was referencing to was the African-American community. Instead of offering anything of substance, he just put out that very simple question.

I have got to tell you that it is pretty evident what we have to lose now. It is not only a lot of the gains that were made under the Obama Administration, but something that is near and dear to all of us, and that is health care.

I think about the district that I represent, and 40,000 people or more have actually been covered because of the Affordable Care Act. They will probably lose that insurance if TrumpCare were to become law. And if you represent low-income families and workers out there, that is a scary prospect.

It is already bad enough that the State of Texas made probably what is considered one of the biggest policy blunders in Texas State legislative history when they decided not to expand Medicaid, which left so many others statewide, including in the district I represent, again, off of the insurance rolls.

What do you have to lose?

God, there are so many ways and so many areas that I can sort of describe what you would have to lose. The first thing I think about is, in the Dallas/Fort Worth area, if you lose your insurance, of course, that means that the burden is going to fall back on John Peter Smith Hospital, which is one of our county hospitals in the north Texas area, and Parkland Hospital in Dallas.

So instead of people having insurance that they pay into, that they have where they can go and see a doctor, they will end up back in the county hospital rolls and, of course, that will end up costing the taxpayers more money.

During President Trump's first 50 days, the Republicans introduced this legislation that, again, will just decimate the progress that so many people around the country have seen under the Affordable Care Act.

This Thursday, as we actually mark the seventh anniversary of the signing of the Affordable Care Act, the House is set to vote on the Republicans' healthcare replacement. Ironically, on a day that we should be celebrating the tremendous progress our country has made since this landmark law's passage, we will be defending the merits in our continued battle to fight its repeal.

So what does the Black community have to lose?

Again, we pose that question. The Congressional Budget Office—and there is a Republican appointee that runs that office, by the way—says that 24 million people are going to lose their healthcare insurance. Of those 24 million who are set to be kicked off of their healthcare plan and sent out to nowhere, African Americans are going to be hit the hardest.

The ACA boosted the African-American insured rate from 79 percent to 88 percent, just slightly below the 91 percent national figure. Some of those gains stem from Medicaid expansion under the ACA, where nearly 15 million of the nearly 40 million African Americans gained coverage.

That is what I was talking about a little bit earlier, Representative PLASKETT. In Texas, we did not get to benefit from that. That would have been a huge benefit to us. Again, it is really considered one of the biggest policy blunders in the country.

As you see, Republican governors are actually afraid right now that the Medicaid expansion that has benefited their States that they are going to lose out on that because of this repeal that is going to take place. They are pushing back. They are saying this whole TrumpCare and RyanCare plan is a hot mess and that they absolutely want nothing to do with it.

It is also important to remember, under the Republican plan, the decision to cut $880 billion from Medicaid over the next 10 years will translate into millions of African Americans potentially losing health care. While these numbers are alarming, it is the human impact that cannot be lost on GOP colleagues.

I have heard directly from constituents that I serve how the ACA has improved or saved their lives, and I would like to actually share some of those stories with you today.

One of the constituents that I serve worked for the same company for 35 years but was forced to retire because of declining health before he was eligible for Medicare. He faces drug costs of over $500 per day and requires a lifesaving procedure four times a year that costs $14,000 per treatment. You can imagine what $14,000 per treatment would do, and that is four times a year. Overall, his medical costs per month is $15,000.

With the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, he had access to quality care that helped ease his financial burden. Under the Republican plan, this hardworking man, this taxpayer, this person that has worked hard, that worked for one company for 35 years—that used to mean so much in this country when people would give 35 years to one company and expected to be treated right—under the Republican plan, this hardworking man would pay thousands of dollars in out-of-pocket medical expenses for lifesaving care that would not be covered by this disastrous plan that we are actually going to have to take a vote on on Thursday.

It is stories like that that I think are really sad and why we need to tap the brakes and see what we can do to help make the current healthcare plan that we have, the ACA, stronger and better, to help out people like this gentleman who are going to be left out in the cold.

You have to really be wondering what our Republican colleagues are thinking, because it is not just the constituents that I represent. It is many of the constituents that they represent, too. I can tell you that out in the Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex, while I do represent largely urban areas—Dallas, Fort Worth, Irving, Grand Prairie, Arlington—I know that there are a lot of people that live out in these rural areas, that live outside of Dallas and Fort Worth, that live outside of Dallas County and Tarrant County. They consider themselves conservatives, and I can tell you that they cannot afford $14,000 per treatment; but if the Republicans pass their plan, that is what they are going to be left with and they are not going to be able to afford it. They are not going to get the care that they need, and that is what they need to understand tonight and that is what the Republicans need to understand tonight.

The only thing that they can guarantee individuals, like I just talked about, is that they are going to be paying a whole lot more for a lot less coverage. I think that is really a shame.

Another constituent was forced to pay $100 per month for medically necessary birth control pills after her husband lost his job in 2010. Luckily, the Affordable Care Act provided access to health care, and now her birth control that she needs is covered in full. And that is important, too.

We have actually seen teen pregnancy rates in this country drop all over the country, which is good. Because when people can afford to start a family when they are ready, when they are financially ready to start a family, those kids are more likely to do better in school. They are more likely to be in a stable household. They are more likely to get the education that they need to be able to achieve the things they want to achieve when they leave the house. So there are a lot of these initiatives around the country where we have really seen teen pregnancy rates drop 20, 30 percent or more. It has been great.

I can tell you that in Dallas County, while the teen pregnancy rate is dropping all over the country, we have actually seen it rise at an alarming rate.

So what does that tell me?

That tells me that if you see the teen pregnancy rate going up and that you are going to kick all these people off their health care, that is going to be more of a strain on the social service system.

Republicans used to pretend like they were for people to have an opportunity to get off the system. But once you take people's birth control away and not give them the options that they need for family planning, you are increasing the social services. The Republican CBO report actually points that out, and they are still going ahead with this. So I think that that is really what is sad.

I think overall what we want to get at tonight is that the Affordable Care Act has been a lifeline for African Americans and African-American families. The full repeal will snatch the safety net out from under the Black community.

Despite the lies that our colleagues across the aisle and in the White House want to spread about the ACA, my colleagues and I will continue to defend it to the very end because it turns out that the Black community has a lot to lose under the Republican healthcare plan.

I am so glad that so many of our colleagues came out tonight. I am glad that you are here helping lead this hour because we need to get the word out. We can stop something really devastating from happening here. The thing about it is that we really need to try to stop something devastating from happening on a bipartisan basis, such as people losing their health care, getting left out in the cold, being kicked off of their health insurance; trying to figure out, if they have a preexisting condition, how they are going to afford being pushed back into a high-risk pool.

What is this going to do to so many Americans? We are here focusing on the African-American community tonight with the Congressional Black Caucus, but what is this going to do to all Americans?

It is going to hurt them. It is going to hurt their bottom line. It is going to hurt their families. It is going to leave them in financial disrepair. I think it is going to be a sad day for our country.

Instead of trying to destroy something, we need to be trying to work together to try to strengthen the current system and make sure that all Americans have the opportunity to be covered.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I agree very much with everything that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) has said. I thank him for the stories of individuals because it is individuals that the Affordable Care Act was meant to cover, not groups of people, but everyday Americans, children, disabled, our elderly.

Some of the reports say that TrumpCare would be the largest transfer of wealth from working families to the rich in our Nation's history; that the Republicans are handing $600 billion in tax breaks to rich and big corporations through this bill while taking money away from those Americans who have been able to have their healthcare needs taken care of in an affordable manner.

You have families that are going to be paying more for less under TrumpCare. Deductibles and out-of-pocket costs are going to skyrocket, leaving sick people unable to afford the care that they need. Premiums will soar and quality coverage is going to be priced out of reach for many families.

We also heard earlier about the middle-aged American paying an age tax that is going to come from this, that older Americans are going to be forced to pay premiums five times higher than what others pay for healthcare coverage.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), the distinguished freshman Congresswoman from the 10th District of Florida, so she can explain to us how TrumpCare and the new Health Care Act is going to affect her constituents and all Americans and, particularly, African Americans in this country.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), Mr. RICHMOND, and all of the distinguished members of the Congressional Black Caucus for leading this very important and critical conversation and discussion this evening.

President Trump said it couldn't get any worse for the African-American community. He asked the question: What did we have to lose by supporting him?

□ 2000

Well, it is even clearer now that we have everything to lose, starting with health care.

Marian Wright Edelman said: ''The question is not whether we can afford to invest in every child, but it is whether we can afford not to.''

Health care, we all know, is one of the most important investments we

can make in our children. Nearly 12 million African Americans are insured through Medicaid. In Florida, 41 percent of children, in my home State of Florida are covered through Medicaid.

This GOP healthcare plan guts Medicaid, cutting funding by $880 billion over the next 10 years. It also eliminates Medicaid expansion, which covers 1.5 million African Americans.

So what do we have to lose?

Families, children, will lose their health care. For those who do not lose health care, they will be forced to pay higher premiums. That, for some families, could mean the difference between a doctor's visit and food on the table.

Since the ACA was signed into law 7 years ago this Thursday, our community has seen its insured rate increase to the highest number in recent history. For a community that has long faced increased barriers to healthcare access and delayed doctor visits because of the cost, the ACA has meant the difference between life and death.

There is no question, we can make the Affordable Care Act more affordable for all Americans, but this bill doesn't do that.

So what do we have to lose?

President Trump, and to my GOP colleagues, I tell you the stakes could not be higher. Progress will be lost—progress that took many years to make, progress could be lost—by repealing the ACA.

The most vulnerable of people, the people we really should be taking care of in a country that we say is the greatest country in the world—I do believe that to be true—people that we should be taking care of, including our children, will be hurt the hardest.

Florida has the Nation's highest enrollment number in the ACA, at 1.67 million sign-ups for 2017. But not only does repeal hurt children, but, in my home State of Florida, it also hurts millions of seniors.

A recent analysis from AARP shows that Florida will be ''Ground Zero'' for the Republicans' health plan's effects. They found that nearly a half a million Floridians between the ages of 50 and 64 would face higher premiums under the GOP plan, more than any other State; the people affected the most, low-income seniors.

So here is what is at risk in Florida's 10th Congressional District. The district's uninsured rate has gone from 22 percent to 15 percent since the ACA was implemented. 343,000 individuals in the district who now have health insurance that covers preventative services like cancer screenings and flu shots, without any copays, coinsurance or deductibles, stand to lose this access if the Republican Congress eliminates the ACA provisions requiring health insurance to cover important preventative services without cost-sharing.

392,000 individuals in the district with employer-sponsored health insurance are at risk of losing important consumer protections. 64,000 individuals in the district who have purchased high-quality marketplace coverage now stand to lose their coverage if the Republican Congress dismantles the marketplaces.

Over 60,000 individuals in the district who received financial assistance to purchase marketplace coverage in 2016 are now at risk of coverage becoming unaffordable if the Republican Congress eliminates the premium tax credits.

So what do we have to lose?

The evidence could not be clearer.

Ms. PLASKETT. Congresswoman DEMINGS, in fact, you do have a lot to lose. We see how Florida, with its elders, its senior citizens, will really take a major hit if this law is passed. And our colleagues have been giving us examples all the time.

I am always trying to let them know that the Virgin Islands stands as an example of what it will look like if the Affordable Care Act is repealed because the Virgin Islands doesn't have the expansion. We were not put in the mandate for the exchange, and that has led to 30 percent of Virgin Islanders having absolutely no health insurance, which then means that our hospitals are strained because the hospitals have to pick up costs for individuals who are without health care.

Listen, if your child is ill or sick, or you are dying, you are going to go to the hospital whether you can take care of it or not, whether you can pay the bill or not; and that has put a tremendous burden on our hospitals for them to meet the costs of those 30 percent of individuals living in the Virgin Islands who do not have health insurance, are not covered by either the government group insurance for the local government or by the Medicaid money that we utilized because we did not have the expansion.

And even that is scheduled to leave after the fiscal year 2019, and we are going to have to make choices of removing people from Medicaid, of removing care from children, removing care from elderly and from individuals with disabilities. That is not a choice that Americans should have to make in this day and age, that individuals do not receive health care.

I know, Congressman VEASEY, that you are hearing from people in your own district who are giving you these same stories: What is going to happen if I don't have healthcare coverage? What is going to happen to my children if they are not able—they have asthma, they have juvenile diabetes, they have these issues, and I am not going to be able to take care of them because I am not going to have this insurance. Or the Medicaid is going to have to be pulled back in our State because we are going to have it capped; and our State is not a wealthy State and is not going to be able to make up the difference.

I know that the gentleman has examples from other Members who have come and given statements for us to bring to the RECORD about what is going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. VEASEY. Absolutely, Representative PLASKETT. And one of our colleagues, who also happens to be my neighbor, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, you can easily make the argument that she knows something about health care, considering that she worked in the healthcare arena before she came to Congress. And not only did she work in the healthcare arena, she has a lot of people that were uninsured that live in her district that are now insured because of the Affordable Care Act.

So, again, not only does she have that healthcare experience, she has been out in the community and has met with people for many years now on health care, even before she came to the Congress, when she was in the State Senate; so she has sat down and she has talked to people. She understands why it is important for people to have health care. She understands why it can be financially hard on people when they are hit by a catastrophic illness.

She gave a speech on the House floor—or she has a speech that she is going to submit—where she talks about the fact that the district that she represents, the uninsured rate dropped 27.3, all the way down to 20.8 percent; and that was a huge benefit for the constituents that she serves on a daily basis.

I mentioned Parkland Hospital a little bit earlier. Parkland Hospital is a Dallas County public hospital. Parkland Hospital provided $1 billion in uncompensated care in 2015—$1 billion. And if this RyanCare-TrumpCare bill were to become law, you can imagine what a large system like Parkland, that already provides so much in uncompensated care, what they are going to be hit with. It is going to be absolutely devastating.

I already talked about the fact also that Texas—and Representative JOHNSON mentions Medicaid in her letter. I have already talked about the fact that Texas made a big public policy blunder and decided not to take the money that the Federal Government was going to give them to help expand Medicaid coverage. They just prefer to just leave all those people uninsured.

So now one of the things that will happen under this GOP bill that the Congresswoman points out is that the money will be sent to people in a block grant; and you can imagine the shortfalls that that would create, particularly in a large State like Texas, because there are going to be shortcomings. So hospital systems like Parkland, like John Peter Smith, they are really going to be hit with a hammer were this ever to pass and become law just because they are already being pushed so much.

Again, what just doesn't make any sense is that the Republicans so prided themselves for so many years about being the party that was about self-empowerment and helping people out, so

now they want to kick people off of their insurance and leave them out in the cold and have them start going back to Parkland, start going back to John Peter Smith because they are not going to be able to afford their insurance anymore under this. It doesn't make any sense.

Ms. PLASKETT. From our experience in the Virgin Islands, that is what you do not want to happen.

People talk about: Who is on Medicaid? Who are these types of individuals? Why don't they get jobs?

I mean, in the Virgin Islands, when we had our largest employer, Hovensa, an oil refinery, close, of course, then our unemployment rate went up. And these are families in need, families who need the support.

With a cap on Medicaid, we were only able to have 55 percent of individuals who would qualify for Medicaid with that cap, with that ceiling that was in place from the Federal Government. It means that a tremendous amount of children, homeless individuals, people, families that are out of work for a period of time, are not covered. That, then, creates this huge burden on a hospital for those families to be taken care of, for individual care and individual need.

Particularly in the African-American community, when you have things like diabetes, hypertension, all of these diseases which need constant monitoring and primary care physicians to take care of and to ensure that they do not become life-threatening, and come to a place where then they are coming to the hospital, it is in the millions of dollars that you are going to need support and care for the servicing of individuals with these diseases.

So I know that we are pushing that there be an expansion of Medicaid, that the cap not be put on Medicaid services, not because we want to coddle people who are poor, but because we know it is necessary. And the cost of not taking care of them on the front end of health care, with Medicaid, is an astronomical cost on the back end when they have diseases that have just gone out of control because they have not been able to go to primary care physicians and get the health care that they need.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. VEASEY. All of those are absolutely good points, and I was talking about the uncompensated costs there for public hospitals. The one thing that I did not mention—and everybody knows this—is that if you don't have insurance and you do find yourself having to depend on the county hospital system or the public hospital system in your area, and those lines get longer and longer, which is what would happen if this bill were repealed—people have to remember that if someone is having an emergency and they know that the lines at the county hospital are just out of control and long, they are going to go to the private hospital.

□ 2015

They are going to go to the nonprofit hospital like in Dallas County that could be Baylor, that could be Huguley, and those hospitals are going to take on uncompensated costs. That is what is going to end up happening. They can't get a regular appointment there without insurance, but if they go to the hospital emergency room, they can't be turned away. Not only is it going to be a burden on our county hospital system, it is going to be a burden on our nonpublic providers as well.

Again, one thing to remember is that, before the Affordable Care Act, we had over 1 million people in Dallas-Fort Worth that did not have insurance. Just in the congressional district, alone, that I represent, I have the largest uninsured rate out of any congressional district in the entire country. That surprises a lot of people just because of the growth and the opportunities that the Dallas-Fort Worth area have been blessed with. But I actually have the largest uninsured rate out of any congressional Member in the country.

So when you think about the district that I represent and then you expand that across the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex, you are talking about 1 million people in a very prosperous area that still find themselves without insurance. That is scary.

I mentioned a little bit earlier the district I represent, the uninsured rate has gone from 37.9 percent to 31.4 percent since ACA was implemented; 2,003 individuals in the district now have health insurance that covers preventive services like cancer screenings and flu shots.

When you start talking about kidney dialysis, for instance, I visited a kidney dialysis center in Dallas County shortly after I was first sworn in. I was taking a tour of the kidney dialysis center, and I asked the doctor who was in charge of the center, I said: Wow, there are a lot of younger people in here.

About 60 percent of the patients were African American. About 40 percent were Hispanic. There was one White patient that was in there.

The lady said: It doesn't matter where you go. If you go to visit any of our clinics or any of our kidney dialysis centers, this is what a typical day looks like.

I asked her: Is it hereditary? What is going on? I don't understand what the problem is here.

She said: No. A lot of it is because they weren't receiving the care that they needed.

The sad part about that, she went on to explain to me, is sometimes it can be a person who has high blood pressure issues, and if they had just gotten those high blood pressure issues addressed, it could have been the difference between them taking some high blood pressure medicine instead of them basically having to give up their careers and go and sit in a chair to receive dialysis treatment 3, 4 days a week, 2 to 3 hours each time. That is sad.

She also talked about diabetes and how some people have diabetes, and they don't get that diabetes treated in time. Maybe they didn't even know they had diabetes. Again, type 2 diabetes is something very treatable. You can imagine the difference between treating somebody, giving them a prescription to treat their type 2 diabetes or their high blood pressure versus your earning capacity being greatly diminished by you having to go sit in a chair 2, 3, or more times 3 or 4 days a week versus if they had just been able to go see a primary care physician.

That is the type of thing that the Affordable Care Act is doing, giving people the opportunity to go and get those things treated before they become more costly to the system. That is something that is being missed.

The other thing that I think scares everybody—and it doesn't matter if you, again, live in my district or you live in the one of many districts in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex, when you start talking about people who have preexisting conditions and you start talking about the fact that people are going to lose consumer protections that have been put in place under the Affordable Care Act and that they are going to see those consumer protections killed—like the prohibition on annual and lifetime limits, protection against unfair policy rescissions and coverage of preexisting conditions—again, if you see the ACA repealed, it is people like that who, for the first time, didn't have to worry about those limits, and they are going to see that snatched away from them. That is just really one of the tragedies.

Mr. Speaker, 27,000 people in the district that I represent, again, received financial assistance to purchase marketplace coverage in 2016. Now they are going to risk being uninsured again, and the insurance is going to be unaffordable under the Republican plan. There are just so many stories like that.

One of the things that I didn't point out about some of the people that are going to lose some of these consumer protections is that some of those people have worked really hard on their jobs, they are still working on their jobs, and they are going to be hit with those lifetime limits. It is going to be completely unfair to them while they are out there working hard every day. It was something they didn't have to worry about before, or at least when the ACA was put in place. If the ACA is repealed, they are going to be subject to that, too.

I think the narrative that has been put out there by the Republicans is that, no, it is just people that are taking advantage of the system. But understand, there are people that fall into these categories that we are talking about right now that get up and they

go and work hard every day—every single day—and they have health insurance on their jobs, and they are going to be greatly impacted by this.

Speaking of people who go and work hard on their job every day, one of the things that I know that a lot of Democrats would like to see put in place—and even some Republicans have said they would like to see put in place—is they want to see the Cadillac tax repealed. That is not happening under this Republican plan. That is completely out of it.

So, again, there are a lot of problems with this and a lot of unfairness about this, about the people that are going to be harmed and affected. I hope that we can work in a bipartisan manner to really stop this from happening. And again, like we are here talking about tonight, the African-American community, in particular, will really be hit very, very hard.

Ms. PLASKETT. I thank the gentleman for all of the examples that he has given, real-world, real-people examples. I think it is important that all of us, as Members of Congress, really take to heart the words that we are hearing from Americans that are going to be affected by this.

Particularly in the African-American community, this is going to have a devastating affect on them to have this Affordable Care Act be repealed and this replacement. It does not take into account the lives that people are really living.

This is really a tax break bill. That is what this boils down to in many respects, because the individuals who are going to be displaced from this are those individuals who are the poor.

I just want to thank Congressman VEASEY for the time that he has given us this evening and all of our colleagues who are here and spoke about the Affordable Care Act and what the African-American community and what many Americans have to lose from this bill.

At this time, I conclude this CBC Special Order hour.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the American Health Care Act. As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, I would like to answer President Trump's repeated question to the black community; ''what do we have to lose?'' Our healthcare, Mr. President. The Affordable Care Act has been working.

The Affordable Care Act brought my district's uninsured rate from 27.3 percent down to 20.8 percent, and insured 265,600 individuals who didn't have health insurance before. While the main safety net provider in my district, Parkland Hospital, provided $1 billion in uncompensated care in 2015, Parkland and the other safety net providers faces severe financial burdens in the House GOP proposal. One of my main concerns with this bill is that it punishes people who get their coverage through Medicaid by capping and slashing the program. With 70 million Americans and 5.2 million Texans who currently rely on Medicaid, per capita caps on the program would not meet the needs of the population and people would suffer.

Under the Republican proposal, millions of Americans will lose their coverage and families will pay more for fewer protections. To put this into exact numbers, according to a Congressional Budget Office report, 24 million people would lose coverage by 2026, and 7 million people would lose employer-based coverage. This bill includes an $880 billion cut to Medicaid, then cuts and caps the program so that it cannot expand and contract as needed. Medicaid covers 1 in 5 Americans and in 2015, Medicaid covered 11.2 million African Americans. This is a 25 percent cut to the program and it is harmful and unsustainable.

This piece of legislation forces Americans to pay more and get less. The average subsidy under the American Health Care Act will likely be about 60 percent of the average subsidy under current law. Deductibles and out-of-pocket spending in the individual market will have to increase due to the elimination of requirements that insurance plans cover a certain value. Americans will pay more for their premiums, more for their care, more on out-of-pocket expenses and deductibles; all the while giving tax breaks to the wealthy and the tanning industry.

I urge my colleagues to consider the harmful effects of this bill. Your constituents are asking you to work with Democrats to repair the Affordable Care Act. We are ready to work.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank Congressman VEASEY for his tireless work to protect healthcare for all people.

Also to Congresswoman PLASKETT, I thank the gentlewoman for continuing to speak out, to organize us, and for her stellar representation of her district.

Let me also thank Congressman RICHMOND, Chair of the CBC, for his steadfast leadership on so many issues.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago Republicans unveiled their dangerous plan to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

A plan the CBO confirmed would rip healthcare away from 24 million Americans.

This week—on the 7th anniversary of the Affordable Care Act—their terrible plan will make it to the House Floor.

Mr. Speaker, one thing is clear: the proposal Republicans wrote in secret backrooms would be a disaster for struggling families, seniors, and people with disabilities.

Their proposal would mean 24 million fewer people with health insurance and 2 million jobs lost.

Their plan defunds Planned Parenthood and rations healthcare for low-income Americans.

It would make working people sicker, in order to provide a $600 billion tax giveaway for billionaires.

We know who this plan will devastate the most: communities of color, especially African Americans.

By ending Medicaid as we know it, at least 1.5 million low-income African Americans could lose their coverage.

And millions more would lose access to high-quality healthcare with the elimination of the ACA's marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous.

We know that African Americans already suffer from shocking health disparities, including diabetes, heart disease, and cancer.

And sadly, these disparities are all too often fatal.

Mr. Speaker, when we wrote the ACA, we worked hard to ensure that our healthcare bill would help end these disparities.

I was Chair of the CBC at the time and addressing harmful health disparities—especially for African Americans—was at the top of our priorities in drafting the ACA.

The final legislation was a huge step forward for underserved families—particularly communities of color.

Through the exchanges and Medicaid expansion, millions of African Americans gained the insurance that they needed and they deserved, including those living with pre-existing conditions.

Take the issue of HIV/AIDS for example. Although they represent only 12% of the population, African Americans disproportionately account for 44% of new HIV cases and 40% of those living with HIV in the U.S.

Before the ACA, many African Americans living with HIV didn't have any insurance at all.

Through the exchanges and Medicaid expansion, millions of African Americans gained the insurance that they needed and they deserved.

Let me be clear: For people living with HIV in this country—repealing the ACA could mean a death sentence.

Without the Affordable Care Act, people living with HIV are at risk of losing access to the medicine and doctors that keep them healthy.

Clearly, health insurance is critical to keeping people healthy and reducing health disparities.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the ACA works.

It has provided healthcare for over 20 million Americans—7 8 million of whom are African American—since it was signed into law.

And because of this bill, young people, working class people, and people of color now have high-quality, affordable healthcare.

But Republicans don't seem to care.

They are on a rampage to make America sick again—and we must stand in their way.

Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are making their voices heard in protests, in town halls and in the streets.

And their message is simple: ''Keep your hands off of our healthcare.''

I'm standing with the millions of Americans who are in opposition to this disastrous healthcare bill.

The fight to protect affordable healthcare is on.

We will not rest until Republicans and Trump end their cruel campaign to kick American families off their healthcare.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of the Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the Speaker for the recognition.

Mr. Speaker, October of last year, October of 2016, Bill Clinton, speaking in front of a group of people in Michigan, said:

> So you have got this crazy system. There are all these people out there who are busting it sometimes 60 hours a week, and they wind up with their premiums doubled and their coverage cut in half. It is the craziest thing in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I don't often agree with former President Bill Clinton, but that quote pretty much sums up why we are here doing what we are doing this week with trying to fix the problems inherent in the Affordable Care Act.

Now, sometimes people turning in and watching these hours must wonder how can it be we are talking about the same thing where one side says it is good and one side says it is not. Mr. Speaker, it may help to set some of the historical context. I would like to do that tonight. I would like to talk about the beginnings of what we now know as the Affordable Care Act. Some people refer to it as ObamaCare.

This is a bill that was signed into law 7 years ago this month, but it didn't just spring forth. There was a lot of work involved in bringing it forward and getting it heard and getting it voted on on the floor of this House. I was part of the Energy and Commerce Committee that summer, as I still am today. The Energy and Commerce Committee did hear what was then H.R. 3100, several hours of markup in the committee, several days of markup. Other committees marked it up, and H.R. 3100 was a 1,000-page bill that left our committee. I didn't vote for the bill. I didn't think it was a good idea, but it did have Republican amendments at the end of that process.

That bill then went to the Speaker's Office—not to the Budget Committee, but to the Speaker's Office. Speaker PELOSI put it together, and when it emerged, it was a 2,000-page bill that really didn't have much to do with the bill that was marked up in the committee. But, nevertheless, the bill came to the floor of this House; and in November of 2009, after a significant amount of debate, a significant amount of anxiety expressed on the Republican side and even some on the Democratic side, the bill was passed by a very slim majority. The bill went over to the Senate, and that was the end of that bill.

What happened next was there were—it was not exactly a bill—several drafts of several ideas that people had over on the Senate side; and the Senate took up a bill that the House had previously passed, H.R. 3590 was the number of that bill, and the Senate debated and passed that bill on Christmas Eve of 2009. You may remember there was a snowstorm that was descending upon Washington, kind of a familiar story, a snowstorm that was coming to town. The Senators wanted to get home before the snowstorm hit, and they passed H.R. 3590.

Remember, back in those days, the Democrats had a 60-vote majority in the Senate. They were able to cut off debate and pass the bill on a party-line vote with 60 Democratic Senators voting in favor of that bill.

Then something strange happened. The Democrats actually lost a Senate seat in a special election in the State of Massachusetts that they weren't expecting to lose. As a consequence of losing that Senate seat, now, instead of a 60-vote majority, they had a 59-vote majority, so they actually could not cut off debate. It was not a filibuster-proof majority.

Harry Reid told NANCY PELOSI, who was then the Speaker of the House: Well, I have done everything I can do. You are just going to have to pass our bill as it is. I can't make any changes to it.

Speaker PELOSI wisely said—I am paraphrasing here because I don't remember the exact quote—but I think she said: I haven't got 100 votes for that thing over here in the House.

I think she was right. But they worked on it, and President Obama worked on it, and 3 months later, in March of 2010, indeed, they did bring that vote up in the House, passed exactly what had passed in the Senate. As a consequence, since the Senate bill was actually an amendment to a House bill that didn't have anything to do with health care in the first place, but since it was only an amendment to a House bill that had passed the House, so many as are in favor agree with the amendment to the Senate bill, the number being 218, that bill went down to the President for a signing ceremony that very same week. Thus was born the Affordable Care Act.

Now, what has led us to the point where former President Bill Clinton would say that it is a crazy system? Well, there is a lot of discussion back and forth.

Certainly, Republicans took the majority shortly after that bill was signed into law. I would submit that because that bill was signed into law, Republicans regained the majority in the House of Representatives in 2011 and since that time have had a number of votes either trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act or improve the Affordable Care Act. A number of those votes have, indeed, been bipartisan votes, that is, Democrats have voted with Republicans.

□ 2030

I think the total count is there have been 47 Democratic votes to either repeal, replace, reform, or repair the Affordable Care Act. It really has been a bipartisan effort these past 7 years.

We are where we are today because of the problems that exist in the bill. Despite the talk that we heard in the last hour, people are suffering under this.

There is a gentleman back home in my district. I think he is a plumber by profession. He has previously been diagnosed with bladder cancer. He says, under his Affordable Care Act policy, he gets to go see his primary care doctor once a year. His primary care doctor says, Well, you need to go to a urologist to have your cystoscopy, but his deductible is so high, he doesn't do it. He has got access to insurance, but he doesn't really have access to the kind of care that he needs that could be lifesaving and could prevent him from having a much greater problem down the road.

We can all bring our individual stories out, but the fact of the matter is, access to coverage is not the same thing as access to care.

During the course of the campaign this last fall—and I remember this very specifically because November 1 was the day that the new rates came out—the open enrollment period for the Affordable Care Act opened up on November 1, and people got a glimpse of what their marketplace rates were.

As a consequence of those marketplace rates, people started to pay attention. There was still another week to go before election day, and people started to pay a significant amount of attention to what the rates were.

It isn't just the rates. It is the access. One-third of U.S. counties have only one insurer willing to sell in marketplace in those counties. I think the number is either five or seven States that have entire States with only one insurance company. That is not really choice. That is not really access. That, in fact, is a monopoly.

2017 was a year marked by a sharp rise in premium increases across the country. Seven States saw premium increases of more than 50 percent. Texas was about 25 percent. Some States went up over 100 percent.

The individual mandate, which was part and parcel of the Affordable Care Act, the most coercive Federal legislation passed since the income tax passed 100 years ago—the individual mandate is the reason that the Affordable Care Act has never achieved widespread popularity. But even with the individual mandate—that is, we are going to send the Internal Revenue Service out and make them make you buy health insurance—over 19 million taxpayers elected to pay the mandate penalty or claim a hardship exemption.

There were 6.5 million individuals who paid the penalty and over 12.5 million people claimed a hardship exemption, according to the Internal Revenue Service's own files.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services reported that 10.5 million individuals enrolled in an exchange plan through the first half of 2016. More than twice that number chose to either exempt themselves through a hardship waiver or just simply pay the fine and walk away from the obligation to purchase insurance.

I am firmly of the belief that the individual mandate has no place in a free society. The one central thesis of the

Affordable Care Act that I long to see repealed is the repeal of the individual mandate. While we are at it, we might as well take care of the employer mandate.

By the way, President Obama delayed the employer mandate for 2 full years, not by a House passed bill, but by administrative fiat. He simply decided, prior to the Fourth of July in 2013: You know what? The employer mandate is going to cause trouble in the next congressional election, so I will just suspend it.

In a blog post put up by Valerie Jarrett on the evening of July 2, 2013, the employer mandate was simply suspended for a couple of years because it was felt to be too onerous and because of the effect that they feared it would have on the midterm elections in 2014.

Time after time, the Obama administration took it upon themselves to delay or turn back a portion of their own law, and there were multiple times where there were votes taken on this floor.

I think of the 1099, the paperwork that was going to be required in the business-to-business transactions; the 1099 forms that were required under ObamaCare that were repealed by this House in a bipartisan fashion because it did pass in the Senate, and the Senate was controlled by Democrats at the time.

Also, the CLASS Act, a particularly onerous part of the community living access ostensibly to provide some help with long-term care, except it really didn't. It was in an actuarial death spiral even before it was enacted. It was one of those things in the Affordable Care Act where you paid for 10 years of taxes and got 6 years of benefits. When they got finished collecting the taxes, it was decided they better do away with the benefit because, in fact, there was no benefit there at all.

Time after time, in a bipartisan fashion, this House has taken action to restrict or remodel or repair or repeal portions of the Affordable Care Act. We are now coming up on a time where significant change is going to occur in the issuance of health care in this country. The change is going to be tough. We always knew it would be, but it is the right change.

The Energy and Commerce Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and the Budget Committee have put together legislation that we will be hearing up in the Rules Committee later this week; the American Health Care Act, which will come to the floor before the end of this week. Let me just make a prediction: it will pass the floor of this House.

I see that I am joined by a colleague this evening. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) to talk on this issue or any issue that may come to his mind.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding, my good friend, Representative BURGESS from Texas.

We are very blessed to have Representative BURGESS' leadership on the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee, as he chairs the Health Subcommittee and brings his years of experience. I want to thank him for his leadership and for holding this tonight.

Mr. Speaker, every day, I hear stories from folks all across my district in the First Congressional District of Georgia, in southeast Georgia, who have been forced to choose. They have been forced to choose between paying their monthly insurance premium or buying other essentials for their families.

I want to give you an example of someone who I am talking about—a real life example, someone who has experienced this.

Consider the case of Bob Joiner. Bob Joiner is an independent adviser in south Georgia. His wife, Kim, is an audiologist who works in a small practice that does not provide healthcare benefits.

Bob and Kim exercise regularly. They watch their nutrition. They are fortunate to have no health problems. They also have a 28-year-old son, Wesley. In 2016, Bob's monthly healthcare premium increased 134 percent, and his son's healthcare insurance climbed to an astonishing 190 percent. In total, their 2016 annual premiums were $4,285 for their son Wesley, and for them it was $19,026.

The Joiners should have been hopeful that in 2017 they could change their plan for something more affordable. But thanks to ObamaCare, that wasn't the case. You see, what ObamaCare has done is to limit choices.

In 2017, there was only one ObamaCare-compliant plan that was accessible to the Joiners on the healthcare.gov website. An additional policy featuring a higher deductible with lower premiums was available; however, the plan was not ObamaCare compliant, leaving the Joiners subjected to the penalty. Before ObamaCare, the Joiner family's annual premium was $7,400. At the time, they had access to multiple providers and dozens of plan designs.

Unfortunately, ObamaCare has brought chaos into the healthcare system. The Joiners are not alone. This is just one example of many throughout my district and throughout America of what ObamaCare has done.

ObamaCare has done, essentially, three things. First of all, it has taken away choice. It has limited choices.

Representative BURGESS mentioned the fact that a third of the counties in America right now only have one provider. Only one provider. That is not a choice. Five States only have one provider. That is not a choice. Sixteen counties in Tennessee have no provider. No one. That is not sustainable.

We have a situation that faced us here in the majority party, the Republican Party. We had to decide: What are we going to do? Should we even touch health care or should we just leave it alone?

We did the right thing. We said: We need to rescue the healthcare system here in America. We have got to act, and we have got to act now. ObamaCare is imploding. We know that. Premiums have gone up, on average this year, 25 percent. In seven States, they have gone up over 50 percent. It is simply not sustainable.

It has decreased choices and increased cost. It has also caused much red tape and many obstacles between patients and their healthcare providers, between patients and physicians, between patients and pharmacists. That is not the way health care is supposed to be in America.

I am a strong believer in health care. I am the only pharmacist currently serving in Congress. My professional career, like Representative BURGESS, has been dedicated to health care. I am just not going to sit around and watch the greatest healthcare system in the world be ruined. That is why we have passed out of three committees thus far the American Health Care Act.

Representative BURGESS mentioned the fact that it has been through the Energy and Commerce Committee, it has been through the Ways and Means Committee, it has been through the Budget Committee. Now it will be on the floor this week.

Thursday will be a historical day for our country. It will be a historical day for health care in America. What are we going to be offering? We are going to be offering a plan that increases choices, that increases accessibility, that cuts red tape, that removes barriers between patients and healthcare professionals, that empowers people. It empowers citizens to be able to make their own healthcare choices.

Instead of having Washington, D.C., in their infinite wisdom, infinite knowledge, tell you what you need to have, you now will decide what you need to have, what is best for you, what is best for your family. That is what it is all about. That is one of the many reasons it is so good.

This plan offers so many good things in it. Health savings accounts. To be able to put more into a health savings account, to be able to roll it over from year to year, to be able to increase the amount in there, and even pass it on to survivors.

We utilize tax credits to make sure that, no, unlike ObamaCare, you are not penalized for not having insurance, but instead, you are rewarded for having insurance. That is what we are going to do.

Of all the bad things that I think ObamaCare has done to the healthcare system in America, first of all, it has taken the free market out of health care. No more competition, as we noted earlier. But the second thing has been this Medicaid expansion. That really is something that I take offense to.

Medicaid is a great program. It is a program that is necessary. It is a safety net program. It is intended to take care of the aged, the blind, the disabled, children and mothers. It was

never intended to be for able-bodied adults. This is not what a safety net program is about.

Under ObamaCare, I hear the other party say: Well, we have added 20 million people onto the insurance roles. Well, let's look at that. 14.5 million of those people were added on to Medicaid expansion. We shouldn't be calling this ObamaCare. We should be calling it ObamaCaid. Able-bodied adults added on to a safety net program. We are revising Medicaid. We are reforming Medicaid.

□ 2045

Medicaid is going to be even better for those people who need it. Instead of diluting that program, we are going to make sure that those people who truly need it—the aged, the blind, the disabled, children, mothers—have more access to it, as they should.

We promised three things among many things, but we promised, hey, we are going to keep a couple of things in here. We are going to make sure that parents can continue to have their children up to age 26 on their insurance. We promised that we were going to make sure that preexisting conditions were going to be included and that you would not be kicked off of your health insurance. We promised that we were going to have a stable transition. We are doing just that.

We are delivering on those promises. We are making sure—I often get asked: What about that 100 to 138 percent of the Federal poverty level? What are you doing for them?

Well, we came up with a refundable tax credit that is actually going to pay their insurance. That will go directly to pay their insurance.

The American Health Care Act delivers on what we promised. What we promised is that we would have more choices. What we promised is that we would have more accessibility. What we promised is that we would empower patients. We are doing that. We are empowering people. We are rescuing health care in America. I intend to vote for this plan Thursday night, and I am going to be very proud to vote for it.

We are going to rescue the healthcare system that I practiced in for over 30 years. I have seen how competition works in the healthcare system. I practiced in it. I have competed in it. I have seen how it lowers costs, and it will lower costs. People now will be empowered to have the ability to choose their own insurance instead of being mandated from Washington, D.C., what kind of insurance they should have.

I thank leadership for what they have done to pull this together. I thank the President. The President is behind this. President Trump made it one of his campaign promises: We are going to repeal and we are going to replace ObamaCare.

You know, it amazes me the media seems to—I get asked quite often: Can you believe he is doing this? Can you believe he is doing that?

I just think: Didn't he tell you he was going to do this? Didn't he tell you he was going to do that?

I think they are just amazed that we actually have somebody in the White House who is delivering on promises that he made, and he is doing just that.

This is a historical week in Congress. Thursday will be a historical day. We are rescuing health care. I am going to be proud to vote for this bill. Again, I thank leadership. I thank the White House. I thank Representative BURGESS, who has been a great leader through all this and has had a big part in this. I thank him for his part in this as well.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, as the gentleman knows, he and I spent—what was it—27½ hours in a committee markup 2 weeks ago getting us to this point. So the gentleman from Texas thanks the gentleman from Georgia for his part and his participation. That was a very long markup, but he stayed attentive and asked good questions and offered good insights all the way to the end. We were very fortunate to have him on the committee. I have been on the committee a few more years, but it was certainly one of the nights on that committee that I will long remember.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Again, I thank the gentleman from Texas for leading this Special Order here tonight, and I thank everyone who has been involved in this.

Mr. BURGESS. Will the gentleman maintain his position for just a moment so perhaps we can engage in a brief colloquy?

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Absolutely.

Mr. BURGESS. Of course, the gentleman was not here in 2009–2010 when this thing came down the pike, but you may remember the townhall meetings from that summer, that August of 2009, and they were pretty intense. We hear a lot about townhall meetings today, but I promise you they were every bit, if not more so, intense during August of 2009.

When I look back on that, Mr. CARTER, what I remember is really two things that people were asking. Yes, it wasn't nearly as long as what the Affordable Care Act ended up being, but still a thousand-page bill, people have to dig through it, have to understand it. And the two things that I took away from those townhall meetings back in the district were people were telling us, number one: Don't mess up what we have got. We have something, and it may be imperfect, but by golly, it is working for us and our families right now, so don't hurt that.

The other thing they would ask is: If you are going to do anything at all, could you please help us with cost, because we are concerned about the cost of these products and we are concerned what the trajectory may be for the costs going up over time?

I will just ask the gentleman from Georgia—since he was a citizen at that time, how does the gentleman from Georgia think we did with those two requests that were coming to us from our constituents?

I use the term ''we'' advisedly. Obviously, I voted against that bill.

But as things turned out with the Affordable Care Act, how did that turn out for the American healthcare consumer?

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Well, as we say in south Georgia, the proof is in the pudding, and the proof is right here. Premiums have gone up this year. Look, one thing that amazes me is we have almost created two new classes of uninsured. First of all, through ObamaCare, it has mandated that people have insurance. So you have got a class who have insurance, but their deductibles are so high they can't afford to use it. So there you have a new class of literally uninsured. Then you have another class of people who were able to afford insurance before, but now it has gotten so expensive, they just pay the penalty. They cannot even afford it. I think it has done just the opposite of what it was intended to do.

I have heard this same argument, that we had to do something, that costs were rising. I will agree that we have to address healthcare costs. We do. We are. In fact, we are doing it this week. Remember, this is the first phase. As you pointed out, what we vote on this week is only the first phase. We have got two more phases to go. In those two phases, we intend to do a lot that is going to help control healthcare costs.

I like to give the example, if you will indulge me for just a minute, when I was still practicing pharmacy—and I tell you this to explain just how competition works. When I was still practicing pharmacy, I still had my pharmacy, and I still owned it at the time. This drugstore opened down the street, a tiny company. I am trying to remember the name. Oh, yeah, it was Walmart.

They decided they wanted to be a player in the healthcare system, in the pharmacy system, in the pharmacy market. So they came out with this idea that they were going to sell a 30-day supply of generics for $4. I thought to myself, they must be crazy, I can't even buy it for that much. I bowed my back and I said: I am not going to do that. I am not going to do that.

Well, guess what. A week later, I was doing it.

I had people leaving my store. And I called my supplier up and I said: You have got to do something here, you have got to help me.

That is the way competition in health care works. When you have got choices, when you have got competition, prices go down, quality goes up. Sometimes we get caught up too much in the numbers game, thinking, oh, we

have got all these lives covered. Coverage does not necessarily equate quality health care, as you well understand. We have to be very careful with that.

Now, we want people to have coverage, and we want them more so to have quality health care. This plan addresses that. It addresses it by increasing choices, by increasing competition, by increasing accessibility, and by empowering people. I am very proud. I am going to be very proud to vote for this bill on Thursday.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for participating this evening. It means a lot to me individually that he was willing to come up and stay up late with us tonight yet one more night dealing with the Affordable Care Act.

But the gentleman is quite direct. The journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step. It is a three-part program. This was the first part, the first phase that will happen on Thursday night. This deals with some of the more egregious aspects of the Affordable Care Act, those things that can be tackled through Senate rules of reconciliation that only require 51 Senators to get passed. So that is one part of this.

Another part is the administrative part. And our former colleague from Georgia, Tom Price, a physician, who is now Secretary Tom Price for the Department of Health and Human Services, he has an administrative part that is actually already underway. We don't have to wait for that to happen. It is already occurring.

Then there is the third part, the so-called regular order part, the part that will require 60 votes on the Senate side, the part that is, by its very nature, going to be bipartisan. We have reported two rules out of the Committee on Rules tonight, one on the McCarran-Ferguson changes that I think the gentleman is well aware of. There are already additional bills that will be coming to the floor of the House that are separate and apart from this reconciliation bill, which is just the first step in repealing the Affordable Care Act.

I do want to point out that Secretary Price sent a letter to the Governors last week or a week and a half ago now talking about some of the waivers that he is bringing forward right now, the 1332 waivers, which are waivers for parts of the Affordable Care Act.

Quoting from his letter here: ''Under Section 1332 of the ACA, states can apply for State Innovation Waivers and pursue innovative strategies to adapt many of the law's requirements to suit the state's specific needs.''

So many details to receive approval, what a State has to do, but he really stresses in this letter and in one of the last paragraphs: ''We encourage states interested in applying for Section 1332 waivers to reach out to the Departments promptly for assistance in formulating an approach that meets the requirements of Section 1332.''

I know the gentleman hasn't served here that long, but I will just tell you, that is a sea change of difference from the Federal agency which time after time told our Governors: No. Stop. Go back to go. Do not collect $200. You can't do that.

Now we have a Secretary at the agency who is reaching out to the Governors: Governor, we want to help you make this work for you. We are going to provide the flexibility that you need.

One of the things that I think is perhaps most promising is the hybrid, high-risk pool, State-operated reinsurance programs that have been proven in several States already. States that were in a so-called death spiral because of guaranteed issue community rating, the premiums were going up, people were dropping their coverage. And now these States have expanding coverage even without the things that we are providing in the American Health Care Act that we are going to be doing later this week. But already by providing that flexibility at the agency level, States are able to provide some relief for their citizens.

Then, finally, the part three of this. There are going to be some must-pass healthcare bills that will be coming up through our committee. We will have an opportunity to work on those things. We are going to work on the Food and Drug Administration user fee agreement reauthorization. So we will have that, which can happen as a bipartisan exercise in our committee.

I will just stress, the Committee on Energy and Commerce has a history of doing things in a bipartisan fashion. One of the reasons why I enjoy serving on that committee is it is a thoughtful committee and it does do things in a bipartisan fashion. Generally, that is one of the strengths of the committee as it brings legislation to the floor.

This is an important first step. It is a necessary first step. This is the key that gets us through the door of actually making a meaningful impact on cost and coverage in these United States. It has been 7 long years, but I am anxious and eager to get started on the next part of the process.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia for joining me here this evening.

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

REPLACING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, yes, this is an important week. There are a lot of things we are bringing up, but nothing is more important than the bill that is supposed to address the Affordable Care Act, as it was called. But it is kind of tough to call it that since it has been completely unaffordable for so many. So many lost their health insurance and lost their doctor. Some lost medication that they were taking before. It is now no longer approved under their new policy. So it has been a very difficult period of time as ObamaCare has been foisted on the country. It came so close to not passing.

□ 2100

And every Republican that I am aware of has promised: You give us the majority in both Houses and the President and we will repeal it. I believe Majority Leader MCCONNELL said we will repeal it and rip it out root and branch. Republican leaders, I believe, mentioned lock, stock, and barrel. And I have great respect for my friends who were just speaking here, but I have got a real problem with the bill.

We are told there will be three phases, three buckets, three stages, whatever you want to call it. The first will be to pass this bill. It leaves in place the parts of ObamaCare that caused insurance to skyrocket. It is leaving in place the part of ObamaCare that caused deductibles to rise from very little to thousands and thousands of dollars, beyond so many Americans' ability to ever reach. So the insurance, they are paying them money every month, but they realize: I don't have $5,000, $6,000, $7,000, $8,000 to pay the deductible; therefore, I am really paying for nothing. Especially young people have found this.

We are told that it is because the Senate has what they refer to as the Byrd rule that would not allow us to take the part that is not currently in the bill regarding all of the regulations. We are told that the Byrd rule—and we have looked into it, apparently—if a bill is moving under reconciliation, as this is, then in the Senate, in essence, it must do more than affect the budget incidentally; it must materially affect the budget. And yet we know that if we repeal all of the part that is being put off for stage 2 or 3, but particularly stage 2, the regulations that were put in place by the Obama administration, the regulatory authority that was given to them, by putting that off, it means the prices that dramatically skyrocketed, they are not going to skyrocket down.

We are told, well, they may go up some, but we think there is a good chance they will come down 10 percent. But for my constituents, so many of whom either lost their insurance or are now paying for skyrocketing prices two, three, four times or more than what they used to pay, a 10 percent drop will not be a help at all. Their deductibles will not be coming down anytime soon.

We are told, though, with the regulatory reform that my good friend Secretary Tom Price will do, that will be the phase, the stage, the bucket, that will drop the prices. But when I read through—and I know some people said 2,700 pages, my two part. And I have

gotten two copies, and they are both around 2,500 pages. So unless there are 200 pages I never found, I did read the bill more than once. And someone said 1,400 times. I don't know. I know it is a lot. The Secretary of Health and Human Services is given wide discretion in putting in place rules and regulations to implement the act.

We have heard that there will, no doubt, be, immediately, litigation filed, lawsuits filed, to try to overturn the regulations that are put in place by Secretary Price. Well, since I have had experience in litigation, including Federal litigation, Federal appeals, what would be the issue?

Well, the issue would be whether or not the Secretary of Health and Human Services has authority to create regulations that will, in effect, completely destroy the bill so that eventually the prices will come back down, the deductibles eventually will come back down. That is what we are told. And I trust Secretary Price will do everything within his power to make this happen.

So Secretary Price will come forward with regulations that will emasculate the bill, emasculate ObamaCare. Litigation is filed. Ultimately, at some point, it will come back to a judge, an appellate judge.

As a State district judge, I handled cases and matters that I knew were going to be appealed. As a chief justice of an appellate court, I made those decisions and sat in on discussions with other justices, and so it seems I am in a good position to potentially analyze what would happen on appeal.

We know the Secretary has wide discretion promulgating the regulations, the rules, to bring about the implementation and the intent of the ACA, ObamaCare. But the question will be, on appeal: Does the Secretary of Health and Human Services have the authority, under the bill, to render it meaningless?

Now, I am not aware of justices at the appellate level who are a great deal more conservative than I was, but I believed in following the law even though I, at times, didn't like the law. I would not legislate from the bench. And in a case such as this, you would look, well, yes, the Secretary should have wide discretion to implement the intention of the bill and see that it is carried out.

But it would certainly seem the more powerful argument—perhaps, most likely, the winning argument—will be, yes, but he doesn't have discretion to kill the bill. He has discretion, wide discretion, to implement the bill and carry out the intent of the bill.

I just can't help but think, again, back to words from my late friend, Justice Scalia. We weren't talking about a specific case, because he never betrayed the trust that he had as Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. We were talking about things in general. He said at times it bothered him that Congress had the power to end some bill, to change some law, and yet we seem to put a rubber stamp and encourage people to go file a lawsuit to get the law struck down instead of just winning the vote in the House and Senate and repealing the law.

The words that really come back are: If you guys in Congress don't have the guts to do what needs to be done, that you have the power to do and you are supposed to do, don't come running to us over at the Supreme Court expecting us to do your job for you.

He was right. This body, along with the Senate, has the power to do exactly what we have promised for 7 years we would do if we got the House, the Senate, and the Presidency. We would repeal ObamaCare.

Now, I don't know how many there are of us that cannot vote for a bill that will leave in place the regulations and the parts that made our insurance skyrocket, that caused me to lose my insurance. And I wouldn't take the subsidy for 3 years until we got insurance through other means. The law is very clear that, as Members of Congress, we weren't supposed to get that, so I went without insurance for a few years. But we promised our constituents we would repeal ObamaCare.

So what about, we are told, this part that can't make it through the Byrd rule in the Senate? Well, for one thing, 51 votes could change the Byrd rule. For another, there is nothing that is going to more materially affect the budget, in this reconciliation or any other, than bringing the price of health insurance and health care down dramatically. That is more appropriate under the Byrd rule than the whole other part that we are told will make it through the Byrd rule in the Senate.

The most important part is the part being left out. That will bring the prices down. That will give control back to the patients and the doctors. That will allow the States to come up with new ideas and new ways to provide health care and to get it to those who need it. But more important than anything, it restores freedom in America that has been lacking since that bill passed.

When the government is in charge of every Americans' health care, the government has every right to tell people how to live. Those claims from years past—we don't want the government in our bedroom—became rather hollow when ObamaCare passed and the government came into your bedroom, your dining room, everywhere in the house. It has got to be repealed. As MITCH MCCONNELL has said previously, rip it out root and branch.

Who is going to make the decision on what seems so clear should allow all of ObamaCare to be repealed? Who is going to make that decision in the Senate?

Well, we know the Vice President can come right on down to the Capitol, come down Pennsylvania Avenue and come into the Senate Chamber. He is the President of the Senate, and I couldn't be more thrilled that he is.

If he is unable to come, then the majority leader could sit in the chair, or he could appoint someone to sit in the chair pro tem. But it will be a Republican who decides whether or not all of ObamaCare can be repealed, but especially the part that is left out right now.

Mr. Speaker, I know the President is coming, and I am so glad that we have this chance because he is President. But I believe that the President of the United States who has been sold this bill that won't bring down prices—maybe 10 percent, we are told, some day—he deserves better. He does not deserve to be slapped in the face with a midterm election when prices have not come down, as people pushing this bill know they won't—maybe 10 percent. That is not going to change votes of those who know we promised a full repeal. We have the power to do a full repeal, and we should do a full repeal.

□ 2115

Let's get freedom back to a doctor-patient relationship. And from what I am told—they certainly haven't called me—I am told that the health insurance lobbyists have been very active, and people in our leadership are listening. But if that is true, these are the same people with Big Pharma that signed off on ObamaCare. It meant they would make billions more than they ever had in the short term, but in the long term, they signed their own death warrant.

We owe it to the American people to make sure that insurance is viable for the future, and the only way to do that is to repeal ObamaCare, rip it out, root and branch. I like MITCH MCCONNELL's expression. That is what needs to happen. And for those of my colleagues who are getting nervous about having pressure from the White House, pressure from the House leaders, pressure from the Senate leaders, it is nothing like the pressure you will get from your constituents when they find out you didn't really do anything to make their lives better because the prices are not coming down; the regulations that require all of those parts and policies that people don't want that they should have the freedom to choose, they are still there; and in the meantime, the new regulations by the great Secretary of Health and Human Services, in whom I have great faith, they will be tied up in litigation. Maybe they get to the Supreme Court in 2 years. Maybe they don't. Maybe it is longer.

And the American people continue to suffer because we didn't have the guts to do what we should do, what we promised we would do, and that is: Repeal ObamaCare.

I would like to keep the Senate majority in 2018, and I am convinced that the only way we do that is if enough of us endure the name calling in the short term, and stand up and say no on this bill that doesn't keep our promises. It has got some good stuff in it, no question, but it doesn't keep our promises.

And if enough of us will do that, then maybe we can get the Senate and the House leadership to agree to do what we promised.

Then the President will be hailed in 2018, as prices of insurance actually come down, people are given their freedom back to choose their doctor, their health insurance, and the short stint of the name calling now ends up paying dividends in a glorious future.

So, Mr. Speaker, thank you for recognizing me. We will see how the week plays out.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORTENBERRY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. JEFFRIES (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for March 17.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 21, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

831. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — 340B Drug Pricing Program Ceiling Price and Manufacturer Civil Monetary Penalties Regulation (RIN: 0906-AA89) received March 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

832. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Adjustments to Civil Penalty Amounts received March 17, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

833. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Previously Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0674; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-019-AD; Amendment 39-18792; AD 2017-03-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

834. 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-2012-0004; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-01-AD; Amendment 39-18794; AD 2017-03-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

835. 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-2016-9510; Directorate Identifier 2016-NE-28-AD; Amendment 39-18780; AD 2017-02-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

836. 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-2015-3984; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-033-AD; Amendment 39-18803; AD 2017-04-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

837. 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-2016-6896; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-016-AD; Amendment 39-18805; AD 2017-04-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

838. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9388; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-145-AD; Amendment 39-18810; AD 2017-04-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

839. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference Amendments [Docket No.: 2016-8926; Amendment No.: 71-48] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 17, 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.

840. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Farmington, MO; and Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Missouri Towns; Ava, MO; Cameron, MO; Chillicothe, MO; Farmington, MO; and Festus, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6986; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ACE-6] received March 17, 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.

841. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Wessington Springs, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9193; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-26] received March 17, 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.

842. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Iron Mountain, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6271; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-15] received March 17, 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.

843. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0154; Directorate Identifier 2016-SW-069-AD; Amendment 39-18814; AD 2017-05-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) March 17, 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.

844. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (Airbus Helicopters) (Previously Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH) [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0155; Directorate identifier 2016-SW-051-AD; Amendment 39-18813; AD 2017-05-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

845. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Weed, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9320; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-2] received March 17, 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.

846. 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-2016-7423; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-034-AD; Amendment 39-18816; AD 2017-05-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

847. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Grand Chenier, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6661; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-10] received March 17, 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.

848. 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-2016-4225; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-139-AD; Amendment 39-18817; AD 2017-05-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

849. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0169; Directorate Identifier 2017-SW-003-AD; Amendment 39-18818; AD 2017-02-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

850. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Barter Island, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9173; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AAL-2] received March 17, 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.

851. 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-2016-9298; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-161-AD; Amendment 39-18811; AD 2017-05-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

852. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mapleton, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8834; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ACE-9] received March 17, 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.

853. 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-2016-6893; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-181-AD; Amendment 39-18812; AD 2017-05-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64] received March 17, 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.

854. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace for the following Texas Towns; Houston Sugar Land, TX; Alice, TX; Bay City,TX; Brenham, TX; Burnet, TX; Falfurrias, TX; Graford, TX; and Hamilton, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8503; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-11] received March 17, 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.

855. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9357; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-030-AD; Amendment 39-18798; AD 2017-04-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

856. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; United Instruments, Inc. Series Altimeters [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9345; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-028-AD; Amendment 39-18801; AD 2017-04-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 17, 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.

857. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Eastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0986; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AEA-7] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 17, 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.

858. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the Paragould, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8835; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-14] received March 17, 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.

859. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Southwest Oklahoma [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3835; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ASW-13] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 17, 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.

860. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace, Willows, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9138; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AWP-13] received March 17, 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.

861. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Santa Rosa, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-6967; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AWP-7] received March 17, 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.

862. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace, St. Petersburg, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0015; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASO-1] received March 17, 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.

863. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-235 and V-293 in the Vicinity of Cedar City, Utah [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9265; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ANM-11] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received March 17, 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.

864. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Milwaukee, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9491; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-25] received March 17, 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.

865. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Ohio Towns; Findlay, OH; Ashland, OH; Celina, OH; Circleville, OH; Columbus, OH; Defiance, OH; Hamilton, OH; Lima, OH; and London, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2016-8839; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AGL-19] received March 17, 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. McCAUL. Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1353. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require certain additional information to be submitted to Congress regarding the strategic 5-year technology investment plan of the Transportation Security Administration (Rept. 115–44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL. Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1294. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for congressional notification regarding major acquisition program breaches, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL. Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1249. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require a multiyear acquisition strategy of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. 115–46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL. Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1252. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for certain acquisition authorities for the Under Secretary of Management of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL. Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1365. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require certain acquisition innovation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1029. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve pesticide registration and other activities under the Act, to extend and modify fee authorities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115–49, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 209. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 372) to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers (Rept. 115–50). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 210. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1101) to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees (Rept. 115–51). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. BLACK: Committee on the Budget. H.R. 1628. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017 (Rept. 115–52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1304. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the definition of health insurance coverage certain medical stop-loss insurance obtained by certain plan sponsors of group

health plans; with an amendment (Rept. 115–53, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1029 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. MESSER (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1624. A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as level 2A liquid assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROYCE of California (for himself and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida):

H.R. 1625. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to include severe forms of trafficking in persons within the definition of transnational organized crime for purposes of the rewards program of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 1626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain amounts realized on the disposition of property raised or produced by a student farmer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 1627. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reinstate the returning worker exemption for H-2B visas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 1629. A bill to restrict the use of steel-jaw leghold traps and Conibear traps on animals in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 1630. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 1631. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the portion of wages and self-employment income subject to payroll taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS (for himself, Mr. BARR, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 1632. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal money for print, radio, television or any other media advertisement, campaign, or form of publicity against the use of a food or beverage that is lawfully marketed under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 1633. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend the period of time for which a conditional permit to land temporarily may be granted to an alien crewman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 1634. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue to Federal agencies guidelines for developing procedures and requirements relating to certain primary care Federal health professionals completing continuing medical education on nutrition and to require Federal agencies to submit annual reports relating to such guidelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 1635. A bill to amend the loan counseling requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 1636. A bill to reauthorize the matching grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 1637. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to authorize private parties to compel the Bureau to seek sanctions by filing civil actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 1638. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 1639. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 1640. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to ensure uniformity in procurement terminology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 1641. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to clarify the responsibilities of Business Opportunity Specialists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1642. A bill to responsibly pay our Nation's bills on time by temporarily extending the public debt limit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 1643. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide agency heads with additional authority to discipline Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RASKIN):

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. ELLISON):

H. Res. 211. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H. Res. 212. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that any legislation to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act should include a replacement for such Act that includes certain health care consumer protections; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. MESSER:

H.R. 1624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ROYCE of California:

H.R. 1625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 1626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 1627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 1629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: 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 therof.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mr. CRIST:
H.R. 1631.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. DESJARLAIS:
H.R. 1632.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes;
By Mr. FARENTHOLD:
H.R. 1633.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. GRIJALVA:
H.R. 1634.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.
By Mr. GUTHRIE:
H.R. 1635.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:
H.R. 1636.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.''
By Mr. MESSER:
H.R. 1637.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Aticle I, Section 8, Clause 3; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; and Article III, Section 1
By Mr. POLIQUIN:
H.R. 1638.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 grants Congress the power to ''regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states.''
By Mr. SHIMKUS:
H.R. 1639.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:
H.R. 1640.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:
H.R. 1641.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
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.
By Mr. WELCH:
H.R. 1642.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, 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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof..
By Mr. YOHO:
H.R. 1643.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 113: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 173: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 305: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
H.R. 355: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 371: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 392: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 426: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 427: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 442: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 448: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 474: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 479: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 489: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 520: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 523: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 553: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 559: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 564: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 592: Mr. ALLEN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 632: Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. TORRES, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 664: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 695: Mr. BARR, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 696: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 709: Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 715: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.
H.R. 721: Mr. BACON, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 741: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 747: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 754: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 772: Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 800: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 804: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 820: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 849: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 852: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 866: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 883: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 909: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 919: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 959: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 960: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HUDSON, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 997: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1017: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1031: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 1038: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1090: Mr. YODER and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1130: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 1136: Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 1143: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1148: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1155: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1156: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 1158: Mr. FASO, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. HURD, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1160: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1164: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 1171: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1179: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1206: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 1219: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1227: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 1232: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 1253: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1299: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1313: Mr. GARRETT.
H.R. 1317: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1318: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1319: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 1326: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1346: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1363: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1393: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 1405: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1409: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1438: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1452: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1472: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1485: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1486: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1494: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1542: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 1544: Mr. DENT and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1551: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1555: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. COLE, and Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 1577: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1588: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1608: Mr. EVANS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1614: Mr. KATKO.
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. CRIST.
H.J. Res. 59: Mrs. NOEM.
H.J. Res. 89: Mr. COLE.
H. Con. Res. 10: Mrs. WAGNER.
H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. OLSON.
H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 60: Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 69: Mr. KENNEDY.
H. Res. 129: Mr. LONG.
H. Res. 135: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mrs. ROBY.
H. Res. 181: Mr. YOHO, Mr. BARR, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H. Res. 184: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. MOORE, Mr. CORREA, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 186: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Res. 187: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Res. 197: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 20, 2017 *No. 48*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 and 6 seconds a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, March 21, 2017.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10 and 14 seconds a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 21, 2017, at 10:30 a.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING ALEC HAGAN OF EUREKA HIGH SCHOOL ON WINNING THE MISSOURI CLASS 4 WRESTLING STATE CHAMPIONSHIP IN THE 152 POUND WEIGHT CLASS

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Alec Hagan of the Eureka High School Wildcats on winning the Class 4 Wrestling State Championship in the 152 pound weight class.

Alec and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Alec Hagan for a job well done.

CONGRATULATING CAMERON RUDY OF FORT ZUMWALT SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL ON WINNING THE MISSOURI CLASS 3 WRESTLING STATE CHAMPIONSHIP IN THE 126 POUND WEIGHT CLASS

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Cameron Rudy of the Fort Zumwalt South High School Bulldogs on winning the Class 3 Wrestling State Championship in the 126 pound weight class.

Cameron and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Cameron Rudy for a job well done.

TRIBUTE TO CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL OFFICER MATTHEW PAUL GISLER

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor California Highway Patrol officer Matthew Paul Gisler, who announced his retirement after 28 years of service.

On February 16, 1989, Officer Gisler graduated from the CHP Academy and was assigned to the CHP Hayward Area Office. He completed over a year with this department and was then reassigned to the Modesto Area Office in 1990. From 1996 through 2003, Officer Gisler fulfilled his assignment in the CHP Central Division Stanislaus County Auto Theft Task Force. In 2003, Officer Gisler returned to the Modesto Area Office, where he remained for the duration of his career.

Officer Gisler has completed extensive training in law enforcement over the years that allowed him to perform as a professional both on and off duty. He is recognized as an officer with great dedication and has provided tremendous support to keep our community safe.

Officer Gisler has been commended on numerous occasions for his many accomplishments, including the Vehicle Theft Award, Master Vehicle Theft Award, the Commander's Commendation on Weapons Proficiency, and the StanCATT Commendation on Auto Theft Instruction and Investigation. These are only a few of the multiple awards Officer Gisler has received during his service.

In addition to his extensive law enforcement career, he is also a member of various professional societies, including the California Association of Highway Patrolmen, the Stanislaus County Peace Officer Association, and from 1996–2003, the Western States Auto Theft Investigators.

Matthew has two children, Christopher and Joshua, with his wife Karen, as well as two stepdaughters, Brandie and Tahnee.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the outstanding contributions made to public safety in the state of California by Officer Matthew Gisler as we wish him continued success in his retirement.

RUTH TSEHAYE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ruth Tsehaye for receiving the 2017 Entrepreneurial Spirit Award.

The Entrepreneurial Spirit Award recognizes a company or entrepreneur that demonstrates a pioneer spirit to develop a business start-up, new product development, or a company/product with growth in new markets. Ruth Tsehaye was born in Ethiopia and raised in Eritrea. She immigrated to the United States in 1984 to study pharmacology. As a student at Metropolitan State University, she began working for 7-Eleven as a part-time employee and later became the store's manager, improving the store's profits in the process.

In 2006, Ruth decided to buy into the franchise and began to win corporate awards for her profitability and leadership. Today, Ruth owns four 7-Eleven stores in Commerce City and employs more than 40 workers. She is set to acquire the newest 7-Eleven location, which is currently being built in Commerce City. 7-Eleven's supply chain reaches into Commerce City with local community suppliers such as Bake Fresh. Her spirit and tenacity exemplify the entrepreneurial spirit.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ruth Tsehaye for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

JALISCO INTERNATIONAL, INC.

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jalisco International, Inc. for receiving the 2017 Commerce City Business on the Move Award.

The Business on the Move Award recognizes businesses bringing new employment, growth in sales, or new capital investment to the city in the last year. Founded in 1985, Jalisco International is a family and minority-owned prime contractor that specializes in the construction of cement roads, bridges, and walls. The company contributed to the E. 104th Avenue and Highway 85 improvements in 2012 through 2013.

In addition, the company is extremely active in charitable giving throughout the metro area. Jalisco International employees volunteer on various community boards and with local organizations and Jalisco International supports Colorado CASA and domestic violence charities women's shelters. Along with these charitable acts, Jalisco International donated playground equipment to local elementary schools in 2016.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Jalisco International for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

SASHCO, INC.

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sashco, Inc. for receiving the 2017 Commerce City Business on the Move Award.

The Business on the Move Award recognizes businesses bringing new employment, growth in sales, or new capital investment to the city in the last year. Founded in 1936, Sashco is a third generation family-owned company that has been an innovator in the sealants and caulking manufacturing industry for decades. Founded by Don Burch, the company has continued to grow while adapting to various improvements and innovations such as the first flexible caulking material and caulking gun as well as AcryColor and Lexel, the first clear sealant in a clear cartridge.

Sashco has been in Commerce City for thirty years and today employs 106 people, 15 of

whom were added in 2016. Sashco is very involved in the community. Most recently, they hosted students from local high schools to show them their facilities and product development lab during the Small Business Associations Manufacturing Week in May 2016.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the Sashco, Inc. for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. A. DONALD McEACHIN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. McEACHIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during roll call no. 170, the amendment to H.R. 1367, numbered eleven, offered by Ms. Hanabusa. I was also unavoidably detained during roll call no. 171, the final passage of H.R. 1367. I was also unavoidably detained during roll call no. 172, on approving the Journal.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

Yea on Roll Call No. 170

Yea on Roll Call No. 171

Yea on Roll Call No. 172

CONGRATULATING JACOB WARREN OF WINDSOR HIGH SCHOOL ON WINNING THE MISSOURI CLASS 3 WRESTLING STATE CHAMPIONSHIP IN THE 145 POUND WEIGHT CLASS

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Jacob Warren of the Windsor High School Owls on winning the Class 3 Wrestling State Championship in the 145 pound weight class.

Jacob and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Jacob Warren for a job well done.

CONGRATULATING KYLE DICKHAUS OF EUREKA HIGH SCHOOL ON WINNING THE MISSOURI CLASS 4 WRESTLING STATE CHAMPIONSHIP IN THE 182 POUND WEIGHT CLASS

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kyle Dickhaus of the Eureka High School Wildcats on winning the Class 4 Wrestling State Championship in the 182 pound weight class.

Kyle and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Kyle Dickhaus for a job well done.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. DOROTHY ENOMOTO

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise to honor the life of my good friend, Dorothy Stevens Enomoto, who passed away on February 14th of this year. I ask my colleagues to join me in tribute to Dorothy's truly remarkable life which she dedicated to civil rights advocacy and public service.

Dorothy Stevens Enomoto was the widow of the late Jerry Enomoto, the first Asian-Pacific American United States Marshal. Dorothy met Jerry during her time in the Department of Corrections, where she became the first African-American woman to manage a department and to hold the position of Deputy Director of the Department of Women's Civil Addict Unit at the California Rehabilitation Center.

Born in Atlanta, Georgia, Dorothy was the granddaughter of a former slave. Dorothy was a classmate and close friend to Martin Luther King, Jr., sharing valedictorian honors with him at Booker T. Washington Senior High School in Atlanta, Georgia. Eighteen years ago, Dorothy cofounded the annual Martin Luther King, Jr. Annual Celebration with her late husband, Jerry, and my late husband, Bob.

After her retirement, Dorothy continued to pursue the fight for equality by serving on the Sacramento Affirmative Action Committee, the Executive Committee of the Sacramento chapter of the NAACP, and numerous other organizations which benefitted from her knowledge and experience. She and Jerry also served on the U.S. Attorney General's Greater Sacramento Area Hate Crimes Task Force.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Dorothy Stevens Enomoto. Her daughters, Yvonne Roby and Marcia Roby Jackson, are living testaments to the positive impact she and Jerry made on our community and world.

UNITED POWER, INC.

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud United Power, Inc. for receiving the 2017 Economic Development Award for Leadership.

The Economic Development Award for Leadership honors a business or individual that has been a catalyst for economic vitality in Commerce City through creative leadership, innovation, facilitation, collaboration or through contribution of resources. United Power is a community-based, progressive utility cooperative serving 900 square miles along the north central range of the Colorado Rockies. The company has an electric franchise agreement with Commerce City to provide service to the city's growth areas in the northeast. United Power's capital investment in Commerce City includes a Reunion Substation with 37.5MVA (mega volt amp) transformer that is designed to support future expansion.

In addition, United Power provides monetary and volunteer support for community events, non-profit organizations, service groups and chambers. United Power also has a charitable foundation that offers direct grants for 501(c)3 organizations that provide services to United Power members. Employees at United Power also sit on numerous boards.

I extend my deepest congratulations to United Power, Inc. for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

WOMEN'S DAY

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 2017 International Women's Day as this is an important time to celebrate women and the great strides made with gender equality. Today is an opportunity to highlight the tremendous accomplishments of women all over the world for their achievements without regard to divisions, whether national, ethnic, linguistic, cultural, economic or political who pave the way for our future generation.

Women's rights are an important issue for our country. As a father of daughters, I value the contributions women make to our country and our communities. That is why I voted for both the Paycheck Fairness Act and the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 to help close the gender gap that currently exists between men and women. We must work to ensure equal pay for equal work and support women and their families in the workplace and at home. On a global scale, the United Nation's Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) is working to ensure the rights of women in every country I support these efforts and all efforts to ensure women are treated equally across our country and the world.

I extend my deepest gratitude to all attendees today for recognizing the contributions of women around the world.

JACK ETHREDGE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Jack Ethredge and his 32-year tenure as City Manager with the City of Thornton in Colorado.

Jack Ethredge began serving as City Manager in January 1985 and served in that capacity until his retirement in March 2017. During his tenure, Jack oversaw the construction of many large-scale projects and helped improve the collaboration between City Council and staff to implement Thornton's vision and overall growth of the city.

Specifically, Jack spearheaded several intergovernmental agreements with surrounding cities and school districts, including an agreement with the City of Westminster, which was the first of its kind in Colorado. These agreements helped better coordinate planning in terms of costs, revenue and future growth areas among Thornton's neighboring communities.

In addition, these agreements helped make Thornton's city services more efficient and cost-effective including snow and ice control removal on shared streets, special transit services for seniors and low-moderate income residents, and coordination of transportation planning. The Denver Regional Council of Governments and the Colorado Municipal League have recognized several of these programs virtually every year since 1986.

Jack's vision, leadership, and commitment to public service and his local community has been recognized by a wide variety of organizations and awards including: Metro North Chamber of Commerce's Economic Developer of the Year; Denver Federal Executive Board's Distinguished Local Government Award; and 1986 Man of the Year by the Northglenn-Thornton Sentinel.

I extend my deepest appreciation to Jack Ethredge for his service and commitment to the City of Thornton and I wish him all the best in retirement.

HONORING HARRISBURG FIRE LIEUTENANT DENNIS DEVOE

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I honor Harrisburg Fire Lieutenant Dennis DeVoe, and express my deepest condolences to his family, colleagues, and friends.

On March 11, 2017, Lt. DeVoe was on his way to pick up his gear to respond to a house fire when his vehicle was T-boned. Lt. DeVoe sustained fatal injuries in the crash, passing later that night surrounded by his family. This honorable man lost his life while in the process of saving the lives of others, and the people of Harrisburg, along with myself, are forever grateful for the service he provided his community.

Lt. DeVoe graduated from Kennard-Dale High School in 1989 and later attended Thaddeus Stevens School of Technology, earning an Associate's Degree of Applied Science in Automotive Technology. Lt. DeVoe was a 1996 graduate of the 14th Fire Academy at Harrisburg Area Community College and faithfully served the Harrisburg Fire Department Squad 8 in the 21 years since. Additionally, Lt. DeVoe was a member of the Pennsylvania Search and Rescue and a state Fire Instructor at Harrisburg Area Community College as well as the York County Fire School. Lt. DeVoe was actively involved in the community. Lt. DeVoe volunteered with numerous area fire departments and coached local soccer teams. Lt. DeVoe's colleagues described him as a kind and energetic leader who prioritized community, service to others, and his family above all else.

Lt. DeVoe is survived by his wife, Amy DeVoe, and their four children, Carson, Aliza, Emma, and Jake, his mother, Joyce Webb, and her husband, Robert, and his brother, Brian DeVoe, and his wife, Sheila.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the life and service of Lt. Dennis DeVoe, for his selfless heroism and dedication to his community and his family.

CONGRATULATING RYAN HERMAN OF ST. CLAIR HIGH SCHOOL ON WINNING THE MISSOURI CLASS 2 WRESTLING STATE CHAMPIONSHIP IN THE 145 POUND WEIGHT CLASS

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ryan Herman of the St. Clair High School Bulldogs on winning the Class 2 Wrestling State Championship in the 145 pound weight class.

Ryan and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Ryan Herman for a job well done.

RECOGNIZING FIRST ASSEMBLY OF GOD CHURCH IN SULLIVAN, MISSOURI ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a church in my district, First Assembly of God in Sullivan, Missouri, on its 100th anniversary. It will be observing this milestone on October 8, 2017.

First Assembly of God was founded on June 4, 1917 by Reverend R.O. Miller with 42 charter members. The church is known for its longstanding history of providing Christian services in the community. Its first building was dedicated on March 18, 1923 which served the congregation until its relocation on September 14, 1969 to its current home on Elmont Road.

The mission statement of First Assembly of God is to ''Exalt the Lord through worship, Equip the saints through discipleship, Evangelize the lost through outreach and missions, Embrace each other through fellowship, and Encourage the hurting through ministry.'' Throughout the past 100 years this mission statement has been the foundation on which the church stands and shares the love of God with those in the community.

There are various programs offered at First Assembly of God for children, men, and women of all ages. Christian enrichment classes that are offered include Sunday School, Nursery, Kingdom Kids, Girls Club, Royal Rangers, Jr. High, Anchor 5.8, Anchor Youth, Late Night, and Women's/Men's Ministry.

Reverend Kyle Phillips currently serves as the Senior Pastor at First Assembly of God. He has served in this capacity for 10 years. Pastor Phillips serves the church alongside Youth Pastors Reverends Michael and Anna Maschmeyer, Children's Director Cascha Phillips, Executive Assistant and Treasurer Kay and Larry Cunieo, and Maintenance Director Robert Davis.

I ask you to join me in recognizing First Assembly of God Church on its 100th anniversary. The commitment this church has shown to the Lord, its parishioners, and the entire community is acknowledged by this milestone anniversary.

HONORING THE NAPA JUNIOR GIRLS SOFTBALL LEAGUE

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Napa Junior Girls Softball League (NJGSL) upon the 50th anniversary of its founding. The NJGSL has been a trailblazing community partner and has supported the success of generations of Napa girls.

The NJGSL is a recreational league that offers girls ages 5–12 the opportunity to learn and play softball in a supportive environment. NJGSL participants learn the importance of staying active and healthy and have fun at the same time.

NJGSL participants also learn valuable life lessons that serve them well both on and off the field. Coaches, organizers, and parents focus on building teamwork and sportsmanship skills which will help girls communicate and maintain positive self-esteem throughout their lives. Furthermore, League alumni have even gone on to excel in collegiate softball careers.

Mr. Speaker, the Napa Junior Girls Softball League has been teaching girls in our community both softball and life skills for an impressive five decades. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor the NJGSL here today.

ARDENT MILLS

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ardent Mills for receiving the 2017 Commerce City Business of the Year Award.

The Business of the Year Award is given to a Commerce City company with a pioneer spirit that has shown a history of leadership within its industry and the community. Ardent Mills is the independent joint venture of Cargill, ConAgra and Horizon Milling. The company offers a broad range of flours, mixes, blends, and specialty products along with technical support, customer service and the supply assurance of a coast-to-coast network. Ardent Mills operates a network of more than forty community flour mills and bakery mix facilities in the U.S., Canada and Puerto Rico, including one in Commerce City.

Ardent Mills aims to nurture customers and communities with its innovative grain-based

solutions in order to create a positive impact with employees, customers, communities and partners. In honor of their 80th anniversary in Commerce City, Ardent Mills hosted its first Community Day in May 2016 and hosted mill tours and demonstrations to show their appreciation to local farmers and customers. Ardent Mills' employees donate their time at the Food Bank of the Rockies and Kids First of Commerce City as well as contributing flour donations to organizations in and around Commerce City.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the Ardent Mills for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

BIRKO CORPORATION

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Birko Corporation for receiving the 2017 Commerce City Business on the Move Award.

The Business on the Move Award recognizes businesses bringing new employment, growth in sales, or new capital investment to the city in the last year. Birko Corporation is a female-owned business that manufactures more than 400 concentrated food safety solutions and provides safe chemical formulations, state-of-the-art harvest and dispensing equipment, servicing capabilities, and integrated IT solutions for beef, poultry, pork, produce and brewery applications.

Birko Corporation has been in Commerce City for 25 years, growing their workforce by 10 percent in 2016. Birko is also heavily involved in community service both locally and nationally. Their fundraising efforts include donations to the American Red Cross, Girls on the Run of the Rockies, and several scholarship funds for college students.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the Birko Corporation for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

ASAHI FOOD, INC.

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Asahi Food, Inc. for receiving the 2017 Business on the Move Award.

The Business on the Move Award recognizes businesses bringing new employment, growth in sales, or new capital investment to the city in the last year. Asahi Food was founded six years ago in Commerce City by Owner and President, Paul Guan. The business began with one client, Hapa Sushi in Denver, and today is a leading seafood supplier, delivering fresh-cut fish for more than 200 restaurants in Colorado and surrounding states. Their General Manager is Charlene Thai, founder of the Asian Restaurant Association.

Asahi Food is also extremely involved in the community and is an active member of the Takayama Sister Cities organization, Japan American Society of Colorado, and other Japanese community groups. They are also active with the local Chinese and Taiwanese communities.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the Asahi Food, Inc. for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

TESTIMONY OF SHELTA WILSON ON THE POSITIVE IMPACT OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I enter the powerful words of my constituent, Shelta Wilson, who supports the Affordable Care Act and the protections it provides our most vulnerable citizens.

''Let me introduce myself. My name is Shelta Wilson. I am 37 years old, and I operate a home daycare business in New Haven, Connecticut. It would be my pleasure to tell you why affordable healthcare is important to me. A couple of years ago, I was diagnosed with type 2 diabetes. At that time, I have no health insurance, and my health was seriously declining. It was impossible for me to run my business with these health issues.

Through networking, I was informed on where to go for affordable healthcare. It is called Access Health Exchange, and I was approved by them immediately. I was able to get the supplies and medication I needed to run by business. As of right now, I and 100% free of diabetes and the medication that went with it. I feel good and truly know that without Access Health Exchange and the Affordable Care Act, I would not be able to stand here and talk to you guys today about how important it is to have affordable health care. Having health insurance truly saved my life.''

RECOGNIZING DIRK NOWITZKI'S 30,000 POINT MILESTONE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride for my hometown Dallas Mavericks and my good friend Dirk Nowitzki that I celebrate his 30,000th career point. On March 7th, 2017, with a baseline jump shot we have seen so many times, Dirk Nowitzki joined the ranks of NBA legends Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, Karl Malone, Kobe Bryant, Michael Jordan and Wilt Chamberlain in the 30K points club. I could not be happier for my friend.

In 1998, Dirk Nowitzki, who was born in Germany, was drafted into the NBA and immediately traded to the Dallas Mavericks. Since then, he has played 19 seasons with the same team, and in that time won an MVP award, a national championship, and touched the minds and hearts of so many Dallasites, basketball fans and not. His professional dedication to our city is unmatched these days in professional sports, and so is his charm and sense of humor.

But even more important than any basketball achievement, Dirk Nowitzki is a kind and good-natured person. He has made Dallas his home, and does not rest until all of its citizens enjoy better opportunities in their lives. He impresses me on the basketball court, but off the court, with people, is where his true splendidness is showcased. Mr. Speaker, may the record celebrate this historic accomplishment for a man who will be destined for history no matter what he does.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DR. WILBUR WILLIAMS FOR HIS 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the retirement of Dr. Wilbur Williams from Indiana Wesleyan University in Marion, Indiana. Dr. Williams is a beloved member of the Indiana Wesleyan community, as well as the greater Marion community. Through his 50 years of teaching, he has taught over 17,000 students, led over a hundred trips to the Bible lands, and is an accomplished author. The people of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District are forever grateful for Dr. Wilbur Williams' commitment to educating the next generation of Indiana students to be knowledgeable, passionate, and active members of their community and the world.

Born in Gas City, Indiana to William and Idelta Williams, Dr. Williams is a life-long Hoosier. He graduated from Fairmount High School and later attended Marion College, now Indiana Wesleyan, for his undergraduate studies. He married Ardelia Lee Williams, another beloved faculty member of Indiana Wesleyan, in 1953. After his undergraduate studies, Dr. Williams was a pastor at Sheridan Wesleyan Church in Sheridan, Indiana from 1953 to 1958. In 1957, during his time as pastor, Dr. Williams earned a Master of Science from Butler University. He then went on to become the Assistant General Manager of the Higley Press and Publishing Company from 1959 to 1960 then Plant Manager at the Economy Printing Concern from 1960 to 1961. Dr. Williams was then the Circulation Manager of the Christian Freedom Foundation from 1961 to 1966 as well as was the Editor of the Evangelical Sunday School commentary from 1960 through 1973. He earned his Master of Arts from New York University in 1965 and shortly thereafter, he came back home to Indiana and began his long career as an associate professor, teaching Old Testament and Archaeology, for Indiana Wesleyan University. Dr. Williams earned his Doctorate of Divinity from Oklahoma Wesleyan University in 1992.

Dr. Williams is perhaps one of the most well-known professors in Indiana Wesleyan history. Many students have taken his course, Old Testament Survey, where he has been known to incorporate his 40 plus years' experience in Israel Archeological excavations into the material he teaches. Not only is he a long serving professor, he is beloved by his students. He has been elected ''Professor of the Year'' eight times, most recently in 2009 and 2010. Dr. Williams for many years taught for only a $1 annual salary, so that the money

could be dedicated to maintain the Williams Prayer Chapel. The small Gothic-style chapel in the center of campus opened in August 2001, and is designed to provide a place of solitude for students to experience a moment of peace with the Lord amidst their busy schedules. Dr. Williams' wife, Ardelia Williams, who taught for many years within the Indiana Wesleyan Art Department, crafted all of the stained glass windows in the small sanctuary.

In addition to Dr. Williams' time as a faculty member at Indiana Wesleyan, he has been active on Indian archaeological digs throughout the United States. He has been even more active on excavations in Israel and North Africa. He dug for over 40 years in such cities as Arad, Aphek, Jerusalem, Carthage, Lacbish, Megiddo, Jezreel and Hazor. In September of 2005, at the Indiana-Israel Dinner of State, Israel Bonds bestowed upon Dr. Williams the honor of "Friend of Israel". Governor Mitch Daniels, who was honorary co-chair of the dinner, also presented Williams a "Distinguished Hoosier" award. Altogether Dr. Williams has been to the Bible lands 156 times, nearly all of which have been to Israel. The Israeli Ministry of Tourism honored Dr. Williams for his many trips to the Holy Land, by presenting him with a sterling silver copy of a 1585 world map depicting Jerusalem as the center of the world.

Dr. Williams is an accomplished author who has published many articles and three books: one of poetry titled, "From Sand to Glass"; one on the Ten Commandments titled "How To Find Your Maximum Happiness," and the other a Commentary on the book of Genesis. He is currently writing "God's Grand Design and Satan's Counter Plan".

On behalf of all Hoosiers, I wish to extend a heartfelt thank you to Dr. Williams for his many years in education, for his contributions to our Hoosier community, our nation, and the resilient nation of Israel. I want to congratulate Dr. Williams on his remarkable career and I wish the very best to Dr. Williams, to his wife Ardelia, and to their children and their families, in his well-deserved retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHRIS COLLINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes March 15 and March 16, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 159, YEA on Roll Call No. 160, YEA on Roll Call No. 161, YEA on Roll Call No. 162, YEA on Roll Call No. 163, YEA on Roll Call No. 164, NAY on Roll Call No. 165, NAY on Roll Call No. 166, NAY on Roll Call No. 167, YEA on Roll Call No. 168, YEA on Roll Call No. 169.

TESTIMONY OF MARGARET ADAIR QUINN ON THE POSITIVE IMPACT OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I enter the powerful words of my constituent, Maggie Quinn, who supports the Affordable Care Act and the protections it provides our most vulnerable citizens.

"On December 7, 1991 I fell and broke my back in two places. Fortunately I have regained most of my mobility but at the time it ended my career in the professional theatre. I pulled myself together and with my husband started small business which has kept us afloat. I was doubly fortunate during those years to be able to retain vested beyond COBRA medical insurance for both of us through my union, Actor's Equity Association.

Then, in 2000, my husband was diagnosed with rheumatoid arthritis—so we both then had "pre-existing conditions."

The ACA insurance covered his treatment and drugs, we kept our business going, and were proud that we were at no time a burden on our state or society as a whole, but by 2013, the last year of my AEA coverage, our combined premiums and co-pays neared 40% of our net income.

After the Affordable Care Act was passed and Connecticut opened its insurance exchange, my union terminated my insurance eligibility and, because I had an ACA option available in Connecticut, and because my premiums were less than the union's costs to cover us. At the time, our premiums alone were over 18,000 a year, a severe financial hardship for two self-employed 58 year olds, and I knew even then that we would not be able to sustain them for much longer.

Because of the ACA and the Connecticut exchange, we were able to enroll in a terrific plan, with a reasonable deductible and, with the tax credit figured in, with premiums less than half of what we had been paying. Every year since 2014, our premiums have decreased (they are about 6,000$ a year now) and our deductibles have not risen commensurately. We have been well cared for, my husband's drug costs, which at retail would be approximately 5,000 a month, have not crippled us, and we have continued to work at our small business, to pay our federal, state, local and corporate taxes, and contribute to the prosperity of our town, our state, and the economy of or nation. We have been able to put money away for our eventual retirement.

Now, with the impending repeal of the ACA, that is all in jeopardy.

My husband's Great Grandmother also had Rheumatoid arthritis, and her obituary in the Waterbury Republican/American says she spent the last ten years of her life in bed.

Ms. DeLauro, I am, quite frankly, terrified that this is the prospect that awaits my husband without the safeties of the ACA. It will mean the end of our business, and the end of our livelihood, the end of our ability to pay taxes and support our customers, our community, and our state.

At nearly 62, with the medical problems we both have, we are not realistically employable by any company large enough to provide medical insurance. If the ACA tax credits and the mandate that preexisting conditions cannot factor in insurance coverage are done away with, we are likely to end up in a high risk pool at best, and what would those self-pay premiums be now, given inflation? $25,000 a year? $30,000? We simply cannot afford it. And without the ACA mandated removal of lifetime caps, my husband will surely cap out given his high drug costs. I cannot really express the depths of my fear that we risk becoming burdens on our state and its already stretched social safety net. The ACA has given us the promise of whole, useful working lives without the fear of penury. Please, Ms. DeLauro, help us keep the ACA."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRENDAN F. BOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 2017, I missed roll call vote No. 139 on the floor of the House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, 2017 I was absent for recorded vote No. 170 and No. 171, as I was delayed while leading a critical discussion with Secretary of Homeland Security John Kelly in my capacity as Chair of the Democratic Caucus.

I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were here: On Roll Call No. 170 I would have voted yes. On Roll Call No. 171 I would have voted yes.

RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENT OF CHIEF JUSTICE CAROLYN WRIGHT

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I wish to recognize the significant career of Chief Justice Carolyn Wright, as well as celebrate her recent reception of the 2017 Texas Women Lawyers Pathfinder Award—an honor given to an individual who has championed the advancement of women in the law, and has shown creativity and leadership within that field. Chief Justice Wright has been a trailblazer for women of color working in the legal field; and therefore, I could not think of anyone more deserving of such an honor.

Along with other positions that were historical firsts for women and minorities in Texas, Chief Justice Wright is the first African-American to be appointed to an intermediate court, as well as the first woman to win a multi-county election for any state elected office. Prior to these esteemed positions, Wright has been a judge with more than 30 years experience in civil, family, criminal, and mediation law. Additionally, she has served as a practicing attorney, Dallas County associate judge, state district judge, as well as a Justice on the Court of Appeals, after being appointed by then-Governor George W. Bush in 1995.

Although her resume is quite significant, none of it is as impressive as she is as a community member. For the entire time that I have known her, Carolyn Wright has been an upstanding citizen and proud Dallasite. Those who know her both in and out of the courtroom can attest to her dedication to her work, but at the same time to her thoughtfulness as a leader and a friend. Mr. Speaker, may the

record show that this woman deserves recognition for the incredible career she has made for herself, and the way her life has touched others.

TESTIMONY OF ALEXIS DECECCHI ON THE POSITIVE IMPACT OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I enter the powerful words of my constituent, Alexis Dececchi, who supports the Affordable Care Act and the protections it provides our most vulnerable citizens.

''Hi, my name is Alexis Dececchi. I want to thank Congresswoman DeLauro for taking the time out of her busy schedule to gather us here so we can tell our stories about the ACA. I would not be standing here today if it weren't for the ACA. I think everyone who has developed a major health problem remembers ''that day''— the day everything changed. For me, that day was December 28th, 2012. I refer to this as my second birthday.

During the night of the 28th, my body mounted an inflammatory autoimmune attack against my nervous system, causing me to suffer brain damage. When I awoke, portions of my memory, processing, and visual system had been compromised. Months of fearful confusion followed until the cause was discovered: I had a cellular immunodeficiency affecting my natural killer cells. This caused me to be more susceptible to viral and fungal infections. This susceptibility also caused autoimmune inflammation in my nervous system and brain.

Without the protection of the ACA, I would be defined as having a pre-existing condition, and be subject to expensive, high-risk insurance pools, or potentially be uninsured. Without insurance, I would be unable to afford the experimental antivirals and the biweekly infusions of immunoglobulin that I need, which currently cost over $8000 every month. A reinstatement of lifetime policy caps would also endanger my access to this treatment.

Since receiving my infusions, I have seen improvements in my condition. I have fewer seizures and cognitive issues, and I've regained some of my physical strength. This year, I was finally able to return to the workforce and hold down a part-time job. None of this would be possible for me without the ACA. Though I have improved, there is no cure for my condition, and I will require these treatments indefinitely. Without them, I would start to backslide physically and develop dementia-like symptoms.

The chronic illness and disability community is one of the country's biggest minority groups, but one of the most overlooked. Because of the nature of our disabilities, it has been hard for us to organize, especially if each day is a fight for survival. We should have the equal rights and protections of other minority groups in this country. Right now, our current administration is fighting over policies and ideals, but what we are fighting for is survival. That is a very different type of struggle and one that we cannot afford to lose. The ACA was a step in the right direction for millions of Americans. We can't take a step back. I want to continue to move forward in my life, and I want to do the same for other chronically ill individuals. We need to stand together, and stand with, our representatives who understand that healthcare is a right, not a privilege.''

THE COLUMBIA RIVER IN-LIEU AND TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am reintroducing the Columbia River In-Lieu and Treaty Fishing Access Sites Improvement Act. For decades now, the federal government has forgone its obligations to the four Columbia River Treaty Tribes, after flooding tribal communities, houses, and traditional hunting and fishing sites with the construction of the Bonneville, The Dalles, and John Day dams.

This bill is just part of the work we are pursuing to improve the living conditions at these sites along the Columbia River. This issue deserves significant attention and investment from the federal government. The history of the 31 Columbia River In-Lieu and Treaty Fishing Access Sites dates back decades. Development that began in the 1930s displaced many members of the four Columbia River treaty tribes: the Warm Springs, Umatilla, Nez Perce, and Yakama Nation. Those tribes have a treaty-protected right to fish along the river at their usual and accustomed places that needs to be respected.

The tribes were also promised housing to replace what was inundated after the dams became operational and that promise has largely not been kept. I'm working with my colleagues and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, and the effected tribes to address these unmet needs through the appropriations process and other legislation.

To address fishing access that was wiped out by the dams, the Corps constructed 31 small sites along the Columbia, designed primarily for daily, in-season fishing access and temporary camping. However, largely due to the lack of promised permanent housing and out of a desire to be closer to the Columbia River, their cultural heritage, and traditional fishing areas, many tribal members live in makeshift housing or shelters at these sites. Because they were not designed for longer-term or permanent use, the conditions at these sites are deeply distressing and unsafe, without proper electricity, sewers, or water. I have seen these conditions firsthand on multiple visits, and they have garnered attention from local and national media. The sites are in dire need of urgent upgrades to electrical, sewer, and other infrastructure, beyond their daily operations and maintenance needs.

This legislation calls for BIA to conduct a much-needed assessment of current conditions at the In-Lieu and Treaty Fishing Access sites under BIA ownership on both sides of the Columbia, in coordination with the tribes. It authorizes the BIA to improve existing federal structures and infrastructure, improve sanitation and safety conditions, and improve access to electricity, sewer, and water infrastructure. BIA may contract with tribes and tribal organizations to conduct this important work that will lay a critical foundation for the construction of permanent tribal housing.

This is a significant and meaningful step in improving the living conditions at these sites and should be passed by the House and Senate. Our efforts will not stop here. I will continue working with federal partners and tribal nations to see that the need for more permanent housing is fulfilled and tribal member's treaty rights are respected.

TRIBUTE TO THE BROOKLYN CHINESE-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Brooklyn Chinese-American Association (BCA) as they celebrate the twelfth anniversary of their Sixth Avenue Senior Center.

The Sixth Avenue Center is one of nine locations throughout Brooklyn dedicated to the wellbeing and livelihood of seniors and the people who care about them.

After securing funding from The Aging in New York Fund (DFTA) in 2012, the Center now serves over 200 seniors every day. Whether providing hearty meals, medical screenings, or recreational events like birthday parties and field trips, the Center is an invaluable part of the greater community of Sixth Avenue in Brooklyn.

In the face of uncertain times and proposed budget cuts, creating and maintaining a warm and welcoming space for seniors is a testament to the hard work of the BCA staff. Their presence in the community helps some of our most vulnerable neighbors and makes Brooklyn and all of New York a better place to live.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the staff and all those involved with the Sixth Avenue Senior Center for their dedication to the seniors of Brooklyn. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating them on 12 years of service.

TESTIMONY OF DOMENIQUE THORNTON ON THE POSITIVE IMPACT OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 20, 2017

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I enter the powerful words of my constituent, Dominique Thornton, who supports the Affordable Care Act and the protections it provides our most vulnerable citizens.

''Thank you Congresswoman DeLauro for giving us this opportunity to tell you how essential the Affordable Care Act is in our lives and what a difference it has made for us not to be denied insurance coverage because of preexisting conditions. First of all I want to remind everyone that the full name of the law is the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. One of the most important protections it affords us is the protection not to be denied health insurance coverage due to preexisting conditions. Why would Members of Congress who represent the people of their districts ever seek to repeal patient protections?

I speak today as a mother of an adult daughter who wanted to be here personally to tell her story but could not be and gave me her permission to share her story. I have been an advocate for mental health for the last 10 years because I found out that my daughter suffers from PTSD, chronic anxiety and depression as well as other psychological conditions as a result of sexual assault and physical abuse. One in five women experience sexual assault in this country. One in four has experienced domestic violence. Incredibly being the victim of sexual assault or domestic violence and the resulting psychological disorders are considered preexisting conditions by insurance companies for which they will deny coverage and consequently needed treatment. If a woman is brave enough to report the trauma, she will be denied coverage and treatment for it the next time she changes insurance if the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is repealed. If a woman is struggling in the aftermath of trauma and seeks treatment she will be penalized by being denied coverage for the conditions she suffers as a result of trauma the next time she changes policies if the ACA is repealed. Her diagnosis will be a part of her permanent health record which insurance companies will use to determine what they will cover and what preexisting conditions will be denied.

Another patient protection that specifically protects women and which will also be eliminated if the ACA is repealed is equal cost for men and women. If the ACA is repealed insurance companies will again be able to charge woman more money for the same coverage as polices sold to men. It is discriminatory that women earn only 80% of what men earn at most but it is worse that they will also be charged higher premiums than men for the same coverage through no fault of their own except the immutable characteristic that they were born female.

Women are thus pushed farther and farther into poverty and their only choice is to access the public health system in Medicaid. With State dollars stretched thin and the federal government considering further cuts to Medicaid women's health will be further adversely disproportionately impacted. The wealthy insurance companies who would be required to cover women regardless of preexisting conditions at the same cost will be off the hook and the taxpayers will have to cover the cost of care through our tax dollars. If we the taxpayers are already paying to care for the sick, why don't we have a public option and use the leverage of large numbers. There are 24 million people now covered by the ACA today which can negotiate the cost of health care and prescription drugs down to a more affordable cost. The answers are there to bring the costs of health care down. Will Congress have the courage to stand up for what is right and seek solutions that are fair and equitable for the American people? Do not repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Make changes for the better such as using the buying power of large numbers to reduce costs."

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 21, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 22

9 a.m.
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of R. Alexander Acosta, of Florida, to be Secretary of Labor.
SD–430

10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the promises and perils of emerging technologies for cybersecurity.
SD–106

Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the state of global humanitarian affairs.
SD–419

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine perspectives from the DHS frontline, focusing on evaluating staffing resources and requirements.
SD–342

Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of multiple veterans service organizations.
SD–G50

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Department of Defense
To hold hearings to examine defense readiness and budget update.
SD–192

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard
To hold hearings to examine the state of the Coast Guard, focusing on ensuring military, national security, and enforcement capability and readiness.
SR–253

Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy
To hold hearings to examine a progress report on conflict minerals.
SD–419

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Airland
To hold hearings to examine Army modernization.
SR–222

MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine United States European Command.
SD–G50

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Jay Clayton, of New York, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.
SD–538

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel
To hold hearings to examine Department of Defense civilian personnel reform.
SR–232A

MARCH 29

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management
To hold hearings to examine the effect of borrowing on Federal spending.
SD–342

3 p.m.
Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine how small businesses confront and shape regulations.
SR–428A

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate met at 10:00:06 a.m. in pro forma session, and adjourned at 10:00:14 a.m., until 10:30 a.m., on Tuesday, March 21, 2017.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee held a hearing to examine the nomination of Neil M. Gorsuch, of Colorado, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Gardner and Bennet, and Neal Katyal, Former Acting Solicitor General, testified in his own behalf. Hearings recessed subject to the call and will meet again on Tuesday, March 21, 2017.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 20 public bills, H.R. 1624–1643; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 35–36; and H. Res. 211–212 were introduced. **Page H2240**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H2241**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 1353, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require certain additional information to be submitted to Congress regarding the strategic 5-year technology investment plan of the Transportation Security Administration (H. Rept. 115–44);

H.R. 1294, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for congressional notification regarding major acquisition program breaches, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–45);

H.R. 1249, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require a multiyear acquisition strategy of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–46);

H.R. 1252, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for certain acquisition authorities for the Under Secretary of Management of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–47);

H.R. 1365, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require certain acquisition innovation, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–48);

H.R. 1029, to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve pesticide registration and other activities under the Act, to extend and modify fee authorities, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–49, Part 1);

H. Res. 209, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 372) to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers (H. Rept. 115–50);

H. Res. 210, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1101) to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees (H. Rept. 115–51);

H.R. 1628, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017 (H. Rept. 115–52); and

H.R. 1304, to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Public Health

Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the definition of health insurance coverage certain medical stop-loss insurance obtained by certain plan sponsors of group health plans, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–53, Part 1).

Pages H2239–40

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Newhouse to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2187**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:14 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Pages H2188–89**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:10 p.m. and reconvened at 3:32 p.m. **Page H2190**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Pesticide Registration Enhancement Act of 2017: H.R. 1029, amended, to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to improve pesticide registration and other activities under the Act, to extend and modify fee authorities;

Pages H2190–H2208

100 Years of Women in Congress Act: H.R. 382, to amend the Department of Agriculture program for research and extension grants to increase participation by women and underrepresented minorities in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics to redesignate the program as the ''Jeannette Rankin Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program''; **Pages H2208–10**

TSA Administrator Modernization Act of 2017: H.R. 1309, to streamline the office and term of the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration; **Pages H2210–12**

Reducing DHS Acquisition Cost Growth Act: H.R. 1294, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for congressional notification regarding major acquisition program breaches, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 408 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 173; **Pages H2213–15, H2222**

DHS Multiyear Acquisition Strategy Act of 2017: H.R. 1249, amended, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require a multiyear acquisition strategy of the Department of Homeland Security, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 409 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 174; and

Pages H2216–19, H2223–24

DHS Acquisition Authorities Act of 2017: H.R. 1252, amended, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for certain acquisition authorities for the Under Secretary of Management of the Department of Homeland Security, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 407 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 175. **Pages H2219–21, H2224**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:37 p.m. and reconvened at 6:30 p.m. **Page H2221**

Privileged Resolution—Intent to Offer: Representative Polis announced his intent to offer a privileged resolution. **Pages H2222–23**

Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed: The House debated the following measures under suspension of the rules. Further proceedings were postponed.

Transparency in Technological Acquisitions Act of 2017: H.R. 1353, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require certain additional information to be submitted to Congress regarding the strategic 5-year technology investment plan of the Transportation Security Administration; and

Pages H2212–13

Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Technical Corrections Act of 2017: H.R. 1297, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make technical corrections to the requirement that the Secretary of Homeland Security submit quadrennial homeland security reviews. **Pages H2215–16**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2222, H2223–24, and H2224. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Committee Meetings

COMPETITIVE HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2017; SMALL BUSINESS HEALTH FAIRNESS ACT OF 2017

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 372, the ''Competitive Health Insurance Reform Act of 2017''; and H.R. 1101, the ''Small Business Health Fairness Act of 2017''. The committee granted, by record vote of 7–3, a structured rule for H.R. 1101. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–9 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule makes in order only the further amendment printed in the Rules Committee report, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and

an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The Committee granted, by voice vote, a closed rule for H.R. 372. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–8 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Goodlatte and Representatives Walberg, Scott of Virginia, and Cicilline.

ONGOING INVESTIGATION INTO RUSSIAN ACTIVE MEASURES

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing on ongoing investigation into Russian Active Measures. Testimony was heard from James Comey, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation; and Mike Rogers, Director, National Security Agency.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine U.S. policy and strategy in Europe, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security, to hold hearings to examine fighting back against scams used to defraud Americans, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine opportunities to improve and expand infrastructure important to Federal lands, recreation, water, and resources, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine FDA user fee agreements, focusing on improving medical product innovation for patients, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: to continue hearings to examine the nomination of Neil M. Gorsuch, of Colorado, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Special Committee on Aging: to hold hearings to examine raising grandchildren in the opioid crisis and beyond, 2:30 p.m., SD–562.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Nutrition, hearing entitled ''The Next Farm Bill: Nutrition Distribution Programs'', 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Livestock and Foreign Agriculture, hearing entitled ''The Next Farm Bill: Livestock Producer Perspectives'', 2 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''America's Role in the World'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing entitled ''Social Media Policies of the Military Services'', 3:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Development, hearing entitled ''Improving Federal Student Aid to Better Meet the Needs of Students'', 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled ''Broadband: Deploying America's 21st Century Infrastructure'', 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Fentanyl: The Next Wave of the Opioid Crisis'', 10:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection's Unconstitutional Design'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing entitled ''Ending the De Novo Drought: Examining the Application Process for De Novo Financial Institutions'', 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing entitled ''Pressuring North Korea: Evaluating Options'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security, business meeting on adoption of the Subcommittee's Rules of Procedure and Statement of Policy for Private Immigration Bills; Statement of Policy on Federal Charters; and to Request DHS Departmental Reports on the Beneficiaries of H.R. 349, H.R. 780, and H.R. 461, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Examining Systemic Management and Fiscal Challenges within the Department of Justice'', 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled ''The Importance of Domestically Sourced Raw Materials for Infrastructure Projects'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''$125 Billion in Savings Ignored: Review of DoD's Efficiency Study'', 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on the Interior, Energy and Environment, hearing entitled ''Examining GAO Findings on

Deficiencies at the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement'', 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology, hearing entitled ''National Science Foundation Part II: Future Opportunities and Challenges for Science'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, hearing on H.R. 1461, the ''Veterans, Employees, and Taxpayers Protection Act of 2017'', 2 p.m., 334 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

10:30 a.m., Tuesday, March 21

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of Charles R. Breyer, of California, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission, and Danny C. Reeves, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the United States Sentencing Commission, with votes on confirmation of the nominations, at 12 noon.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10 a.m., Tuesday, March 21

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of H.R. 372—Competitive Health Insurance Reform Act of 2017 (Subject to a Rule). Consideration of H.R. 1101—Small Business Health Fairness Act of 2017 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.
POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.