

ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S.J. RES. 9

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 9, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8, of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to the disclosure of payments by resource extraction issuers.

S.J. RES. 11

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 11, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Bureau of Land Management relating to "Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation".

S.J. RES. 13

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 13, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to compliance with title X requirements by project recipients in selecting subrecipients.

S.J. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 14, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Social Security Administration relating to Implementation of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007.

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management relating to resource management planning.

S.J. RES. 16

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 16, a joint resolution approving the discontinuation of the process for consideration and automatic implementation of the annual proposal of the Independent Medicare Advisory Board under section 1899A of the Social Security Act.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming

(Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to prepaid accounts under the Electronic Fund Transfer Act and the Truth in Lending Act.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 276. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to divide the ninth judicial circuit of the United States into 2 circuits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, one of the most important elements of the rule of law is the promise of swift access to the courts, but that promise has been broken in my home State of Arizona. That is because Arizona falls under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, a circuit that is both oversized and overworked.

With the jurisdiction encompassing 13 districts spread across nine States and 2 U.S. territories, the Ninth Circuit covers 1 in 5 Americans. It hears roughly 12,000 appeals each year. The next busiest circuit doesn't even hear 9,000, and for the thousands of cases under its consideration, the average turnaround time exceeds 15 months.

Now, if excessive delays weren't bad enough, it turns out the Ninth Circuit is overturned by the Supreme Court 77 percent of the time when the Supreme Court grants cert—77 percent of the time. That is obviously higher than any other court. So not only is the court excruciatingly slow, but in many instances it is simply wrong.

The court, itself, is unusually large. It has 29 authorized judgeships. That is 12 more than the next largest circuit.

The Ninth Circuit is so big that it can't even rehear cases as a whole body, like every other appeals court does. Instead, cases are reheard with limited en banc; these are panels of 11 judges each. That means that only one-third of its judges are deciding law for the entire court—only one-third.

Of the States suffering under the weight of the Ninth Circuit's crushing backlog, Arizona shoulders a uniquely heavy burden. Per capita, Arizona has the busiest Federal docket in the circuit. That puts Arizonans at the back of an already long line just to get their day in court.

As if the deluge of cases continues to fill the Ninth Circuit's docket, the line keeps getting longer and longer if you happen to live in Arizona.

With problems like these, we are left to ask: Is the Ninth Circuit simply too big to succeed? If you are an Arizonan, the answer is unquestionably yes.

Arizonans deserve better, and that is why today I am introducing a bill to break up the Ninth Circuit.

With the support of my colleague from Arizona, JOHN MCCAIN, and the support of Gov. Doug Ducey, I have introduced the Judicial Administration and Improvement Act. This bill would create a new Twelfth Circuit by moving Arizona, as well as Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Washington, out of the Ninth Circuit. Doing so would create two smaller appellate courts where one dysfunctional court stood, all the while establishing stronger local, regional, and cultural ties. This would help alleviate the Ninth Circuit's enormous caseload and ensure a more timely and accurate judicial process for both circuits.

Now, importantly, the bill would also free the new circuit from the Ninth Circuit's precedent. That means States like Arizona would be able to chart their own legal course, consistent with their local needs and traditions.

A fair and functioning judiciary is one of the pillars of our democracy. Geography shouldn't limit a citizen's access to the courts.

The Judicial Administration and Improvement Act will right this wrong by restoring faith in our judicial system and securing the access to Justice that Americans deserve.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 278. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for innovative research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, in recent years we have seen the inability of the Federal Government to quickly adapt to changing technology and emerging threats. In June of 2015 the Office of Personnel Management, OPM, was infiltrated with a major cyber breach, affecting more than 22 million current and former Federal employees, including myself. In January of 2016, another nearly half a million Americans had their social security numbers stolen when the Internal Revenue Service was hacked.

I spent 28 years in the private sector, 12 years with a global cloud computing company. We faced cyber threats daily, and our customers expected security of their data. We delivered, not once was our data compromised. Until I came to the Federal Government and received the letters from OPM, my data had been secured too.

I know firsthand that industry has the talent and incentive to keep their information systems secure. The Federal Government should continue to innovate and utilize industries' expertise and learn from their best practices.

That is why I am introducing the Support for Rapid Innovation Act. This

legislation will extend the authorization for the Secretary of Homeland Security to carry out innovative research and development projects that will enhance our Nation's cyber security. It will focus efforts on developing more secure information systems, technologies for detecting and containing attacks in real-time, and develop cyber forensics to identify perpetrators. This will be done by leveraging private sectors' innovation and ingenuity.

I want to thank Senator WARNER for being an original cosponsor of this bill and Representative RATCLIFFE of Texas for leading introduction of companion legislation in the House of Representatives. I ask my Senate colleagues to join us in support of this important legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 278

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Support for Rapid Innovation Act of 2017".

**SEC. 2. CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.**

(a) CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**"SEC. 321. CYBERSECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall support the research, development, testing, evaluation, and transition of cybersecurity technologies, including fundamental research to improve the sharing of information, information security, analytics, and methodologies related to cybersecurity risks and incidents, consistent with current law.

"(b) ACTIVITIES.—The research and development supported under subsection (a) shall serve the components of the Department and shall—

"(1) advance the development and accelerate the deployment of more secure information systems;

"(2) improve and create technologies for detecting and preventing attacks or intrusions, including real-time continuous diagnostics, real-time analytic technologies, and full lifecycle information protection;

"(3) improve and create mitigation and recovery methodologies, including techniques and policies for real-time containment of attacks, and development of resilient networks and information systems;

"(4) support, in coordination with non-Federal entities, the review of source code that underpins critical infrastructure information systems;

"(5) assist the development and support infrastructure and tools to support cybersecurity research and development efforts, including modeling, testbeds, and data sets for assessment of new cybersecurity technologies;

"(6) assist the development and support of technologies to reduce vulnerabilities in industrial control systems;

"(7) assist the development and support cyber forensics and attack attribution capabilities;

"(8) assist the development and accelerate the deployment of full information lifecycle security technologies to enhance protection, control, and privacy of information to detect and prevent cybersecurity risks and incidents;

"(9) assist the development and accelerate the deployment of information security measures, in addition to perimeter-based protections;

"(10) assist the development and accelerate the deployment of technologies to detect improper information access by authorized users;

"(11) assist the development and accelerate the deployment of cryptographic technologies to protect information at rest, in transit, and in use;

"(12) assist the development and accelerate the deployment of methods to promote greater software assurance;

"(13) assist the development and accelerate the deployment of tools to securely and automatically update software and firmware in use, with limited or no necessary intervention by users and limited impact on concurrently operating systems and processes; and

"(14) assist in identifying and addressing unidentified or future cybersecurity threats.

"(c) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall coordinate activities with—

"(1) the Under Secretary appointed pursuant to section 103(a)(1)(H);

"(2) the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, as appropriate; and

"(3) industry and academia.

"(d) TRANSITION TO PRACTICE.—The Under Secretary for Science and Technology shall support projects carried out under this title through the full life cycle of such projects, including research, development, testing, evaluation, pilots, and transitions. The Under Secretary shall identify mature technologies that address existing or imminent cybersecurity gaps in public or private information systems and networks of information systems, protect sensitive information within and outside networks of information systems, identify and support necessary improvements identified during pilot programs and testing and evaluation activities, and introduce new cybersecurity technologies throughout the homeland security enterprise through partnerships and commercialization. The Under Secretary shall target Federally funded cybersecurity research that demonstrates a high probability of successful transition to the commercial market within two years and that is expected to have a notable impact on the public or private information systems and networks of information systems.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) CYBERSECURITY RISK.—The term 'cybersecurity risk' has the meaning given such term in section 227.

"(2) HOMELAND SECURITY ENTERPRISE.—The term 'homeland security enterprise' means relevant governmental and nongovernmental entities involved in homeland security, including Federal, State, local, and tribal government officials, private sector representatives, academics, and other policy experts.

"(3) INCIDENT.—The term 'incident' has the meaning given such term in section 227.

"(4) INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The term 'information system' has the meaning given such term in section 3502(8) of title 44, United States Code.

"(5) SOFTWARE ASSURANCE.—The term 'software assurance' means confidence that software—

"(A) is free from vulnerabilities, either intentionally designed into the software or ac-

identally inserted at any time during the lifecycle of the software; and

"(B) functioning in the intended manner.".

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to second section 319 the following new item:

"Sec. 321. Cybersecurity research and development.".

(b) RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—Section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "2016" and inserting "2021";

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking the last sentence; and

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

"(3) PRIOR APPROVAL.—In any case in which the head of a component or office of the Department seeks to utilize the authority under this section, such head shall first receive prior approval from the Secretary by providing to the Secretary a proposal that includes the rationale for the utilization of such authority, the funds to be spent on the use of such authority, and the expected outcome for each project that is the subject of the use of such authority. In such a case, the authority for evaluating the proposal may not be delegated by the Secretary to anyone other than the Under Secretary for Management.";

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "2016" and inserting "2021"; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) REPORT.—The Secretary shall annually submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report detailing the projects for which the authority granted by subsection (a) was utilized, the rationale for such utilizations, the funds spent utilizing such authority, the extent of cost-sharing for such projects among Federal and non-Federal sources, the extent to which utilization of such authority has addressed a homeland security capability gap or threat to the homeland identified by the Department, the total amount of payments, if any, that were received by the Federal Government as a result of the utilization of such authority during the period covered by each such report, the outcome of each project for which such authority was utilized, and the results of any audits of such projects."; and

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

"(e) TRAINING.—The Secretary shall develop a training program for acquisitions staff on the utilization of the authority provided under subsection (a) to ensure accountability and effective management of projects consistent with the Program Management Improvement Accountability Act (Public Law 114-264) and the amendments made by such Act.".

(c) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No additional funds are authorized to carry out the requirements of this Act and the amendments made by this Act. Such requirements shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 288. A bill to require notice and comment for certain interpretative

rules; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 288

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Regulatory Predictability for Business Growth Act of 2017”.

**SEC. 2. REQUIRING NOTICE AND COMMENT FOR CERTAIN INTERPRETATIVE RULES.**

Subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 551—

(A) in paragraph (13), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (14), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) ‘longstanding interpretative rule’ means an interpretative rule that has been in effect for not less than 1 year; and

“(16) ‘revise’ means, with respect to an interpretative rule, altering or otherwise changing any provision of a longstanding interpretative rule that conflicts, or is in any way inconsistent with, any provision in a subsequently promulgated interpretative rule.”; and

(2) in section 553—

(A) in subsection (b)(A), by striking “interpretative rules” and inserting “an interpretative rule of an agency, unless the interpretative rule revises a longstanding interpretative rule of the agency”; and

(B) in subsection (d)(2), by striking “interpretative rules” and inserting “an interpretative rule of an agency, unless the interpretative rule revises a longstanding interpretative rule of the agency.”.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 292. A bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senators CAPITO, VAN HOLLEN, and ISAKSON in the introduction of the Childhood Cancer Survivorship, Treatment, Access, and Research, STAR, Act of 2017. This legislation is an extension of ongoing bipartisan efforts in the Senate over the past decade to get us closer to the goal of hopefully one day curing cancers in children, adolescents, and young adults. Representatives MCCAUL, SPEIER, KELLY, and BUTTERFIELD are introducing the companion legislation in the other body.

I first started working on this issue after meeting the Haight family from Warwick, Rhode Island in June of 2004. Nancy and Vincent lost their son, Ben, when he was just nine years old to neuroblastoma, a very aggressive tumor in the brain.

With the strong support of families like the Hights for increased research

into the causes of childhood cancers and improved treatment options, I introduced bipartisan legislation that eventually was signed into law in 2008 as the Caroline Pryce Walker Conquer Childhood Cancer Act.

This was an important step. Yet, more work remains. The STAR Act seeks to advance pediatric cancer research and child-focused cancer treatments, while also improving childhood cancer surveillance and providing resources for survivors and those impacted by childhood cancer.

If a treatment is working, doctors elsewhere should know immediately. The same should happen if a treatment isn’t working, or if other major medical events occur during the course of a particular treatment. It is critical that doctors, nurses, and other providers are able to effectively communicate information about the disease, the treatment process, and what other health and development impacts children can expect to experience with a particular course of treatment.

As such, the STAR Act would reauthorize the Caroline Pryce Walker Conquer Childhood Cancer Act, creating a comprehensive children’s cancer biorepository for researchers to use in searching for biospecimens to study and would improve surveillance of childhood cancer cases.

This legislation also includes provisions dealing with issues that arise for survivors of childhood cancer. Unfortunately, even after beating cancer, as many as two-thirds of childhood cancer survivors are likely to experience at least one late effect of treatment; as many as one-fourth experience a late effect that is serious or life-threatening, including second cancers and organ damage.

We must do more to ensure that children survive cancer and any late effects so they can live a long, healthy, and productive life. This legislation would enhance research on the late effects of childhood cancers, improve collaboration among providers so that doctors are better able to care for this population as they age, and establish a new pilot program to begin to explore improved models of care for childhood cancer survivors.

Lastly, this bill would ensure more pediatric expertise at the National Institutes of Health to better leverage the research investment to improve pediatric cancer research by requiring the inclusion of at least one pediatric oncologist on the National Cancer Advisory Board and improving childhood health reporting requirements to include pediatric cancer.

Last year, Senator CAPITO and I were able to get a provision of this bill included in the 21st Century CURES Act, which was signed into law at the end of the year. That provision will provide some clarity for patients and their physicians attempting to access new drugs and therapies from pharmaceutical companies. When a patient has run out of other options, the last thing

they and their families need is to spend months being given the run-around trying to access a potential treatment.

I am hopeful that we can build on this momentum. Indeed, it was heartening to see the House of Representatives pass the Childhood Cancer STAR Act as one of its last acts of the 114th Congress by a unanimous vote. While, the Senate was unable to follow suit as time ran out at the end of the year, HELP Committee Chairman ALEXANDER and Ranking Member MURRAY have committed to working with Senator CAPITO and me to move the legislation this year.

The Childhood Cancer STAR Act has the support of the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, St. Baldrick’s Foundation, and Children’s Oncology Group, among others. I look forward to our continued work with these stakeholders to build support for the bill and with the HELP Committee to see this bill advance through the legislative process.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 42—AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BARRASSO submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Environment and Public Works; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 42

*Resolved,*

**SECTION 1. GENERAL AUTHORITY.**

In carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Environment and Public Works (in this resolution referred to as the “committee”) is authorized from March 1, 2017 through February 28, 2019, in its discretion, to—

(1) make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate;

(2) employ personnel; and

(3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, use on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

**SEC. 2. EXPENSES.**

(a) EXPENSES FOR PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2017.—The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017 under this resolution shall not exceed \$3,060,871, of which amount—

(1) not to exceed \$4,666 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 4301(i))); and

(2) not to exceed \$1,166 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of the committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of that Act).