



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2017

No. 193

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 28, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROGER W. MARSHALL 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. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

CONNECTICUT'S CRUMBLING FOUNDATIONS

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to talk about a positive, encouraging decision that occurred last week for the State of Connecticut that was issued by the Under Secretary of the Treasury, David Kautter. It concerned a terrible problem that has swept through the State best known as crumbling foundations.

Due to some outstanding journalism that took place over the last couple of years by a TV reporter by the name of George Colli, Jr.; Hartford Courant editorial writer Carolyn Lumsden, who did a series on this problem; and Journal Inquirer's Eric Bedner, who has been consistently reporting on this issue, it came forward and was flushed out to the public that a quarry in north central Connecticut was supplying aggregate concrete for homes over the last 30 years that contained a material known as pyrrhotite.

Pyrrhotite is a metal substance which, when it is exposed to moisture over a period of time, oxidizes or rusts and creates a sickening spider web cracking that ultimately compromises the foundation on homes. Estimates run as high as 19,000 homeowners who unknowingly have this form of concrete that threatens probably their family's biggest asset, namely, their home.

As you can see in this picture, this is an example of a home in Coventry, Connecticut, where the home was lifted with a house jack and the contractor, Don Childree, was actually able to remove the concrete by hand. That is how compromised and unstable the home was because of this terrible problem.

This picture shows an example of a condominium project that was completely jacked up for the repairs, which involved jacking up the house, removing the old foundation, pouring a new foundation, and then lowering and re-connecting the condominium to the new foundation.

For a homeowner of a rather average-size house, we are talking about repairs that total as much as \$150,000 to \$200,000. In some cases, it almost surpasses the family's value in their home.

It has set off a wave of litigation and claims against property casualty insurers, with mixed results. The property

casualty policies, in many cases, require only coverage for a sudden collapse as opposed to something that happens over a period of time.

It is devastating for the homeowners who are affected by this. It affects about 40 communities in north central and eastern Connecticut.

On Wednesday, the Treasury Department issued a ruling extending the property casualty loss Tax Code provisions to allow these homeowners to take a deduction for their loss. This was a 19-month process which took place, from my office, with an outstanding staffer, Beata Fogarasi; from Congressman JOHN LARSON's office in the Hartford area with an outstanding staffer by the name of Sylvia Lee; and with Under Secretary Kautter, who issued the ruling that will provide safe harbor for people who have suffered a loss to be able to claim that on their tax returns.

We had the support of the departing IRS Commissioner, John Koskinen, as well as the National Taxpayer Advocate, who endorsed this request last year under the prior administration—two administrations working with Members of Congress, presenting the facts and the law and getting a decision which, actually, is a positive move forward for homeowners who are in this affected region.

It showed the interplay of the free press, of the organizing that took place, and the Connecticut Coalition Against Crumbling Foundations, led by Tim Heim from Willington, Connecticut. Organized homeowners did rallies, did town halls, brought their case forward, and it resulted in real change. The needle moved to allow people much-needed relief.

We have more work to do. As Winston Churchill said: "This is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. It is the end of the beginning."

The decision the day before Thanksgiving by the Treasury Department

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H9437

gave great hope to these homeowners that, actually, the system can work, and that is probably the most powerful emotion that people took away from the decision that took place on Wednesday.

We are going to continue to move forward to help people, middle class, hardworking people who pay their bills, have invested in their life's biggest asset, their home, to make sure that they are protected and they get help.

REAUTHORIZING FISH RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMS IN UPPER COLORADO AND SAN JUAN RIVER BASINS

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, most of us know how important water is in our States and the impact it plays in growth. It is directly tied to economic development and the health and beauty of the places we live.

Today, in accordance with commitments I have made to build improved quality of life in the rural areas of my district, I am introducing bipartisan legislation that will reauthorize the Bureau of Reclamation to provide cost sharing for the endangered fish recovery implementation programs in the Upper Colorado and San Juan River basins.

This bill is important because the successful recovery of these endangered species paves the way for critical projects in these waterways, projects that will facilitate water for agriculture, economic development, and other important uses not just in the rural areas of Utah's Third Congressional District, but in Colorado, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico as well.

This bill reauthorizes a program that has become a national model for addressing the demands for water development to support growing Western communities. It has been run with accountability and solid results since 2012. Constituents will be pleased that the revenue for this project comes not from tax dollars but, rather, from fees collected by the projects from water users within the area.

The bill also strikes an important balance between conservation, recreation, and ensuring that we have access to public lands and natural resources.

The programs support millions of people who depend on the river's water to grow food, generate electricity, and serve the needs of cities and towns.

To quote Utah's Governor, Gary Herbert: "The success of the . . . program is vital for . . . our State's continued progress and providing for the needs of the citizens of Utah."

I would like to express my appreciation to Congressman ROB BISHOP and the members of the Natural Resources Committee, who have done the heavy lifting on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues in the House and the Senate will support this very important bill.

A SALUTE TO THE BRAVE WOMEN WHO SPEAK OUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURTIS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as a practicing obstetrician and gynecologist for 25 years, I certainly had a very unique perspective of many of the unique challenges faced by women in the workplace.

For many women, I would see them once a year and, in a very casual greeting, ask them how they were and what was new. Once in a while, a woman would have a new job, and I would ask her: "Wow. You had a great job. Why did you leave that?" Too often, the answer was because of sexual harassment.

Now, as a United States Congressman, I think it is important that I do more than just listen to these constituents of mine. I was sent here to be their voice, to be a strong voice for all of my constituents, and especially to draw upon my experiences as an obstetrician and gynecologist to be an advocate for women.

With the strongest and most unequivocal terms I can voice, Mr. Speaker, I rise to condemn sexual harassment and assault and those cowards who perpetrate it.

Mr. Speaker, I am also here to salute those brave women who are speaking out about their past experiences here on Capitol Hill. These women are the victims. They should be treated as very courageous folks who are sharing their story to help protect others. In doing so, they are not only helping to identify another predator, but they are helping the thousands of women who will come after them and work in these hallowed Halls.

By bringing these dark, disgusting secrets to light, they make the workplace across America that much of a safer environment for all women, something we must not stop working toward, and something we must all take responsibility to foster.

In the plainest terms, I want to make sure all men know that it is unacceptable behavior, to not allow your co-workers to perpetrate it, and that those who assault or harass women should receive the harshest punishment. There is no place in America for this behavior, and we must all take responsibility for ensuring it has no place in our offices.

I would offer up this advice that was given to me many years ago, that all men treat every woman as though they were your mother, your sister, or your daughter, and let that be your creed when you are choosing your words and your actions.

Let us all take responsibility and use this incredible social moment to make a lasting impact for my daughter, our

granddaughters behind them, and for future generations. It certainly starts with me in my office, my sons, my grandsons, the people who work with me, and the people I choose to surround myself with. We can all be that shining example, and I pray that my colleagues will join me in making this so.

WE HAVE A SPENDING PROBLEM

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, history is replete with examples of prosperous nations and powerful empires whose demise was not as a result of adversaries on the outside but, rather, the enemy within.

Congress and our President face several challenges to ensure the next generation inherits a safe, strong, and free country. There is the rise of global Islamic terrorism, escalating nuclear threats, increasing geopolitical instability, the need to modernize our military and ensure it is prepared to address those threats, and, finally, the need to revive our economy and give more and better jobs to middle and working class Americans.

While these are serious issues and they necessitate a sense of urgency and bold actions, they are all but irrelevant if we experience a sovereign debt crisis. This is not a hypothetical. This is a real probability, and if we stay on our current trajectory, we will all but assure our children and grandchildren will suffer the consequences.

If the United States experiences a debt crisis, how are we going to fund a safety net for our agriculture producers and our most vulnerable? How are we going to have transportation and other critical infrastructure to support economic growth? And, most importantly, how are we going to give the tools to our men and women in uniform so they will be successful and safe? How will we fund these national priorities if our government is insolvent?

Today, the United States is \$20 trillion in debt—over 70 percent of GDP. That is roughly \$165,000 per taxpayer. If all current policies stay in place, in the next 10 years, we will be \$30 trillion in debt, or nearly 90 percent of GDP, the highest level we have seen since 1947, according to the CBO. We will have \$1 trillion in annual deficit spending; and, get this, we will spend more on the interest on our debt than we will on national defense.

Just to give you a sense of how quickly this debt is amassing, in the next 24 hours, we will have increased our debt \$1.5 billion.

I want to be clear. This is not a revenue problem. Just this past year, according to the monthly Treasury statement, the Federal Government collected record amounts of both individual income tax revenue and payroll tax revenue.

The underlying issue here is runaway spending. We all know it. The American people know it. The lion's share of that spending is for mandatory spending. Mandatory spending is government spending on autopilot.

Today, mandatory spending makes up 70 percent of the entire Federal budget. In terms of growth in spending, over the next 10 years, 90 percent of the growth will come from mandatory spending.

We will never solve the national debt problem on discretionary spending alone. We must deal with mandatory spending, which means entitlement reform is the most serious and realistic opportunity to address our national debt.

□ 1215

Many of our entitlement programs are nearing insolvency. Without immediate action, some of these important social safety net programs will not be there for the next generation. With 10,000 baby boomers entering retirement every day—the largest generational retirement in the history of the world—these critical safety net programs, like Medicare and Social Security, will be insolvent; Medicare by 2030, Social Security by 2034.

We no longer have the luxury of kicking the can down the road. We are long overdue for action and we are fast approaching yet another debt ceiling.

The debt ceiling has been in existence since 1941, 70 years, and every time very little has been done to rein in spending as a result. It was supposed to serve as a warning so that we pause and consider the risk of borrowing more money that 74 times we have effectively just blown past through it.

We cannot continue to increase our borrowing capacity every time we hit the debt ceiling without some countervailing action to address our deficit and debt.

At what point is enough enough? How far do we want to put our children and grandchildren in the debt hole before we decide that this is a moral obligation and this is truly a looming crisis?

As Congress works to deal with the debt ceiling and our spending package that is here on the immediate horizon, it is important that we also introduce structural spending reforms. We need to have a balanced budget, for heaven's sake. We need to move some of the mandatory over to discretionary.

We need to set targets for reducing our debt. And if we don't meet those targets because we don't have the courage to do it, then it should be forced on us to cut across the board until we get this debt down to a manageable size for our children and for the future of this country.

Balancing our budget and reducing our country's debilitating debt is the challenge of the 21st century. It is my generation's greatest challenge. It is time for Congress to step up to the plate and get to work addressing the biggest problem facing our country.

That means less partisan obstruction and thinking about our political futures and more courageous leadership and thinking about our children's future.

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 16 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: Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

You have blessed us with all good gifts, and this past week, with thankful hearts, we gathered with family and loved ones throughout this great land to celebrate our blessings together.

Bless the Members of the people's House, who have been entrusted with the privilege to serve our Nation and all Americans in their need. Grant them to work together in respect and affection, and to be faithful in the responsibilities they have been given.

Much is left to be done. Bestow upon them the gifts of wisdom and discernment, that in their words and actions they will do justice, love with mercy, and walk humbly with You.

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 Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania 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.

IN TRIBUTE TO IRIS CAMPBELL

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, former first lady of South Carolina, Iris Campbell, wife of the late Governor Carroll Campbell, passed away last week. South Carolinians are grateful for her dedication to our citizens.

Born in Greenville, Iris Campbell was married to the love of her life, Carroll Campbell, for 46 years. Together, they built successful small businesses and then served the people they loved for three decades, being instrumental in the development of the two-party system, with Carroll Campbell being the first Republican elected to Congress from Greenville-Spartanburg in over 100 years.

As South Carolina's first lady from 1987 to 1995, Iris Campbell devoted herself to service organizations, including the American Cancer Society, the March of Dimes, and Carolina Children's Home. She served on the board of trustees for Richland Memorial Children's Hospital.

When Governor Campbell was diagnosed with Alzheimer's, Iris Campbell devoted herself to caring for him and to raising money for Alzheimer's research and the Carroll Campbell Place for Alzheimer's Care of Lexington Medical Center in Lexington.

Roxanne and I join all South Carolinians in thanking the Campbell family, especially sons Carroll, Jr.—Tumpy—and Mike for sharing Iris with us. She has made South Carolina better, and we will miss her.

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

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF POLICE OFFICER BRIAN SHAW

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

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues of the death of Brian Shaw, a brave, young police officer who was recently killed in the line of duty in my district on November 17.

What began as a routine traffic stop turned into a pursuit on foot and an exchange of gunfire that left Officer Shaw mortally wounded.

Brian was just 25 years old when he was murdered doing the job he loved. He was a universally loved and respected member of his community. He was well liked and respected by his fellow officers. His life was brutally cut short, but there is no denying it was a life well lived.

Brian was a graduate of Burrell High School, Slippery Rock University, and the Allegheny County Police Training Academy.

He served as a police officer in Cheswick, Frazer, and Springdale Township before joining the New Kensington Police Department this June.

Friends have said that Brian always wanted to be a police officer. Brian said that he became a police officer because he wanted to make a difference. I want my colleagues and the whole Nation to know that he did.

Throughout his service as a police officer, he upheld the law, and he served the communities with dedication, compassion, and a warm smile. He knew the risks that come with being a law enforcement officer, and he accepted them willingly.

I had the honor of attending the memorial service for Officer Shaw at Mount St. Peter Church last week. The turnout was amazing. The church was packed to the rafters. Thousands more stood outside, including more than 1,000 police officers. I can't think of a more tangible expression of respect and appreciation for Officer Shaw's service and his sacrifice.

In closing, I want to express my deepest sympathy to Officer Shaw's parents, Lisa and Stephan; his brother, Steffan; his fellow police officers; his family; and his friends.

HONORING POLICE OFFICER BRIAN SHAW

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for his remarks regarding Officer Shaw.

The Book of Wisdom teaches that "the souls of the just are in the hands of God, and no torment shall touch them."

The family and friends of New Kensington, Pennsylvania, Police Officer Brian Shaw today must trust in that Scripture as they continue to grieve his loss.

Officer Shaw was only 25 years old when he was taken in an act of senseless violence, but in his short life, he learned a great deal, and what he learned allowed him to give even more.

Brian Shaw knew his vocation, to serve as a police officer and, as he said, to make a difference. His former supervisor, Frazer Township Police Chief Terry Kuhns, recalled that when Brian gave that answer during his job interview, he knew he meant it as he looked in his eyes and his smile.

Perhaps what Chief Kuhns saw in Brian were virtues our world desperately needs more of: authenticity and sincerity. Those virtues contributed to what New Kensington Police Chief Jim Klein described as Brian's incredible passion for his work.

To Brian's parents and family, you raised him right. May Brian Shaw, a just man, evermore rest in the hands of God.

WE NEED TAX REFORM

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share some of the feedback I have heard from my constituents about the tax bill that has already passed this House and is now under consideration in the Senate.

More than 2,000 of my constituents have taken the time to reach out to me and share their overwhelming opposition to this bill.

I have heard from people like the 83-year-old man in Lake Forest who will face financial hardship when he is no longer able to deduct his medical expenses; or the professor at Rosalind Franklin University in north Chicago who emailed that she is worried about what the elimination of the tuition waivers will mean for her medical students; or the man in Libertyville who fears that, with the elimination of the State and local tax deduction for property taxes, he will face both a higher annual tax bill and more than a 10 percent hit on the value of his home.

Mr. Speaker, we need tax reform. I remain committed to working across the aisle to achieve it, but this partisan proposal is not the way. I urge my colleagues to listen to their own constituents, abandon this fatally flawed bill, and work in a bipartisan way to accomplish fair, responsible tax reform.

HIGHLIGHTING THE RISING SEVERITY OF ILLEGAL MARIJUANA GROWS ON FEDERAL LANDS

(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, today I rise to highlight the rising severity of illegal marijuana grows on Federal lands.

In 2016, the DEA Cannabis Eradication Program found a 60 percent increase in the amount of assets seized from marijuana raids compared to just the previous year.

The same year, the Forest Service eradicated nearly \$1.5 million worth of marijuana plants from over 240 sites on National Forest System in the Pacific area alone.

Local sheriffs from my district have expressed to me their great concern for public safety, environmental destruction, a lot of time which farmers end up getting blamed for for water quality and the chemicals and stuff that get left behind, not the farmers' fault, but indeed these illegal grows, and even human trafficking gets caught up in all this.

What is currently being done to address the amount of marijuana grows on our public lands? Not nearly enough. People feel endangered by going out into their public lands, whether it is adjacent private property owners or what have you.

Timber harvest needs to be done, forest thinning needs to be done, taking

care of the environmental needs for our wildlife, all that, and it can't happen due to these illegal grows and the danger they bring. They should be able to enjoy them, and we should be able to stop this illegal practice. We need many more assets poured into our Western forest lands to eradicate this illegal grow.

CELEBRATING THE CAREER OF MONSIGNOR FRANKLYN CASALE

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of Monsignor Franklyn Casale, who will retire this coming spring after serving as president of St. Thomas University for the past 24 years.

Monsignor Casale has led an exemplary life of service, including many leadership positions. In south Florida, we are most thankful for the monsignor's distinguished presidency of St. Thomas, which included the expansion of campus facilities, positioning the university as a leader in the fight against human trafficking, and the establishment of the university's first doctoral program.

During his tenure, Monsignor Casale created a legacy of committed service, which transformed St. Thomas into one of the Nation's leading universities, and prepared thousands of his graduates to become leaders in their fields.

Once again, congratulations, Monsignor Casale, on a well-deserved retirement and on a remarkable career advancing St. Thomas' legacy of academic achievement and spiritual development. Your lifelong emphasis on Catholic values, diversity, and student success has helped empower many students to take on the world with compassion and strong conviction.

"Congratulations, my friend,"
"Felicidades, mi amigo."

CONGRATULATING ST. CROIX NATIVE TIM DUNCAN

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate St. Croix native Tim Duncan on his induction to the Collegiate Basketball Hall of Fame.

In 1989, Tim was training to be an Olympic swimmer when Hurricane Hugo struck the Virgin Islands, destroying all of the Olympic-size swimming pools. With no place left on the island to train, he turned his focus to basketball.

At Wake Forest, he helped lead the team to four NCAA tournaments, was named the National Association of Basketball Coaches Player of the Year three times, the ACC Player of the Year twice, and the National Player of the Year in 1997.

Tim was drafted as the number one pick to the Spurs, where he served as a leader on and off the court for 19 years.

Tim Duncan has not forgotten his home, and after two back-to-back Category 5 hurricanes, he helped to contribute 20,000-plus pounds of food and donated millions of dollars through his Tim Duncan Foundation.

Tim exemplifies the idea of making a way out of no way. Hurricane Hugo did not defeat him, just as Hurricanes Maria and Irma will not defeat the U.S. Virgin Islands.

I want to use this time to thank him and, on Giving Tuesday, thank all of the others who have contributed in the hurricane relief: My Brothers Workshop, Family Resource Center, Community Foundation of the Virgin Islands, St. Croix Foundation, Virgin Islands ASAP Relief Group, Bloomberg Philanthropies, Love 4 Love City, Operation Rebuild, Jody Olson, VI-R3, Tony Rosario, USVI Boxing, Operation Rebuild Virgin Islands, and, of course, all the first responders and all the Virgin Islanders who are staying V.I. strong.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PALAZZO) at 4 o'clock and 30 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 votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

FOWLER AND BOSKOFF PEAKS DESIGNATION ACT

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2768) to designate certain mountain peaks in the State of Colorado as "Fowler Peak" and "Boskoff Peak".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2768

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 "Fowler and Boskoff Peaks Designation Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Charlie Fowler was—

(A) one of the most experienced mountain climbers in North America, having successfully climbed many of the highest peaks in the world;

(B) an author, guide, filmmaker, photographer, and wilderness advocate;

(C) the recipient of the 2004 Robert and Miriam Underhill Award from the American Alpine Club, an award that—

(i) honors outstanding mountaineering achievement; and

(ii) is awarded annually to climbers who have "demonstrated the highest level of skill in mountaineering and who, through the application of this skill, courage, and perseverance, have achieved outstanding success in the various fields of mountaineering"; and

(D) a summiter of several 8,000-meter peaks, specifically—

(i) Everest;

(ii) Cho Oyu; and

(iii) Shishapangma;

(2) Christine Boskoff—

(A) was one of the leading female alpinists in the United States, having climbed 6 of the 14 mountain peaks in the world that are higher than 8,000 meters, specifically—

(i) Everest;

(ii) Cho Oyu;

(iii) Gasherbrum II;

(iv) Lhotse;

(v) Shishapangma; and

(vi) Broad Peak;

(B) gave countless hours to nonprofit organizations that supported—

(i) the rights of porters and Sherpas;

(ii) the education of women; and

(iii) global literacy and gender equality; and

(C) was recognized by the education communities in the United States and Nepal as a role model for students;

(3) Charlie Fowler and Christine Boskoff were long-time residents of San Miguel County, Colorado, and champions for Colorado's pristine backcountry;

(4) Charlie Fowler and Christine Boskoff died in an avalanche in November 2006 while attempting to summit Genyen Peak in Tibet;

(5) 2 unnamed 13,000-foot peaks located west of Wilson Peak on the boundary of San Miguel and Dolores Counties, Colorado, offer spectacular recreational climbing and hiking opportunities; and

(6) the local community in the vicinity of the peaks described in paragraph (5) and fellow climbers propose to honor and commemorate Charlie Fowler and Christine Boskoff by naming the peaks after Charlie Fowler and Christine Boskoff.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION OF FOWLER PEAK AND BOSKOFF PEAK, COLORADO.

(a) DESIGNATION OF FOWLER PEAK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The 13,498-foot mountain peak, located at 37.8569° N, by -108.0117° W, in the Uncompahgre National Forest in the State of Colorado, shall be known and designated as "Fowler Peak".

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the peak described in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to "Fowler Peak".

(b) DESIGNATION OF BOSKOFF PEAK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The 13,123-foot mountain peak, located at 37.85549° N, by -108.03112° W, in the Uncompahgre National Forest in the State of Colorado, shall be known and designated as "Boskoff Peak".

(2) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the peak described in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to be a reference to "Boskoff Peak".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, my bill, the Fowler and Boskoff Peaks Designation Act, would designate two unnamed peaks in the Uncompahgre National Forest in Colorado as Fowler Peak and Boskoff Peak.

Charlie Fowler and his partner, Christine "Chris" Boskoff, were longtime residents of San Miguel County, Colorado, and were avid alpinists.

Charlie Fowler was one of North America's most experienced mountain climbers. He was also an author, a guide, a filmmaker, a photographer, and an advocate for the outdoors. Beginning in the mid-1980s, Charlie worked full time as a mountain guide, leading mountaineering expeditions in the United States and abroad.

His photographs and articles were published in a variety of books and magazines, and he was the author of multiple mountaineering guidebooks. In 2004, Charlie was awarded the Robert and Miriam Underhill Award by the American Alpine Society, an honor given annually to an individual who has demonstrated the highest level of skill in the mountaineering arts and who, through the application of this skill, courage, and perseverance, has achieved outstanding success in the various fields of mountaineering endeavor.

Christine Boskoff began her climbing career in 1993 and quickly rose to become a leader in the sport of mountaineering. Christine summited Mount Everest and five of the globe's more than 26,000-foot mountains. One of the world's leading female alpinists, a professional mountaineering guide and an adventure entrepreneur, Christine participated in numerous expeditions in the United States and on five continents.

Charlie and Christine were also known for their philanthropic work. Charlie worked to promote his sport by installing climbing walls in schools across southwest Colorado. Christine was active in nonprofit organizations that supported the rights of porters and Sherpas, women's education, global literacy, and gender equality.

Sadly, Charlie and Christine were killed in an avalanche in 2006 while exploring a series of unclimbed summits in China's Sichuan province.

The naming of these peaks is a fitting tribute to Charlie and Christine,

who were outstanding mountaineers and advocates for our Nation's treasured open spaces.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

H.R. 2768 names two peaks in the Uncompahgre National Forest in Colorado after Charlie Fowler and Christine Boskoff.

Fowler and Boskoff were world-class rock climbers whose accomplishments left enduring legacies on the sport. Sadly, in 2016, the two set out to climb a mountain in a remote part of China near the Tibetan border and never returned.

This bill and the renaming of the peaks is a fitting tribute and I support its adoption.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REED). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2768.

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. TIPTON. 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.

GULF ISLANDS NATIONAL SEASHORE LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2017

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2615) to authorize the exchange of certain land located in Gulf Islands National Seashore, Jackson County, Mississippi, between the National Park Service and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2615

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 "Gulf Islands National Seashore Land Exchange Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE, GULF ISLANDS NATIONAL SEASHORE, JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.

(a) LAND EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service (in this section referred to as the "Secretary") may convey to the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 5699 (in this section referred to as the "Post") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, consisting of approximately 1.542 acres, located within the Gulf Islands National Sea-

shore in Jackson County, Mississippi, and identified as "NPS Exchange Area" on the map entitled "Gulf Islands National Seashore, Proposed Land Exchange with VFW, Davis Bayou Area—Jackson County, MS", numbered 635/133309, and dated June 2016.

(b) LAND TO BE ACQUIRED.—In exchange for the property described in subsection (a), the Post shall convey to the Secretary all right, title, and interest of the Post in and to a parcel of real property, consisting of approximately 2.161 acres, located in Jackson County, Mississippi, and identified as "VFW Exchange Area" on the map described in subsection (a).

(c) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The values of the parcels of real property to be exchanged under this section shall be determined by an appraisal conducted—

(A) by a qualified and independent appraiser; and

(B) in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards.

(2) EQUALIZATION.—If the values of the parcels of real property to be exchanged under this section, as determined pursuant to paragraph (1), are not equal, the values shall be equalized through—

(A) a cash payment; or

(B) adjustments to the acreage of the parcels of real property to be exchanged.

(d) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall require the Post to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for such costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the land exchange under this section, including survey costs, costs related to environmental documentation, and any other administrative costs related to the land exchange. If amounts are collected from the Secretary in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the land exchange, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the Post.

(2) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover those costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the land exchange. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(e) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of property to be exchanged under this section shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary and the Post.

(f) CONVEYANCE AGREEMENT.—The exchange of real property under this section shall be accomplished using a quit claim deed or other legal instrument and upon terms and conditions mutually satisfactory to the Secretary and the Post, including such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(g) VALID EXISTING RIGHTS.—The exchange authorized under this section shall be subject to valid existing rights.

(h) TITLE APPROVAL.—Title to the real property described in subsection (a) and the real property described in subsection (b) to be exchanged under this section shall be in a form acceptable to the Secretary.

(i) TREATMENT OF ACQUIRED LAND.—Land and interests in land acquired by the United States under subsection (b) shall be administered by the Secretary as part of the Gulf Islands National Seashore.

(j) MODIFICATION OF BOUNDARY.—Upon completion of the land exchange under this sec-

tion, the Secretary shall modify the boundary of the Gulf Islands National Seashore to reflect such land exchange.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and the gentleman from California (Mrs. TORRES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 2615, introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO), authorizes the National Park Service to convey to the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 5699 1.54 acres located within the Gulf Islands National Seashore in Jackson County, Mississippi, in exchange for a 2.16-acre parcel of land owned by the VFW post.

This bill benefits both the VFW post and the Park Service. It provides the VFW post with permanent access to their building via a long driveway currently owned by the Park Service while also adding land to the Gulf Islands National Seashore.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2615 is a simple bipartisan bill that authorizes the exchange of two small parcels of land to provide needed access for our veterans in Mississippi.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 5699 is located adjacent to a portion of Gulf Islands National Seashore, and while having a national park in your backyard is a desirable condition, the post has found themselves landlocked and in need of direct access to their facility.

To solve this issue, the Gulf Islands National Seashore Land Exchange Act will exchange approximately 2 acres of land owned by the VFW with 1.5 acres owned by the Federal Government.

The acreage required by the VFW will be used to establish a short driveway directly to the post while the land given in exchange to the Federal Government will be managed as part of Gulf Islands National Seashore.

This exchange is supported by both the VFW post and the National Park Service and is a simple and logical solution to a local issue. I am pleased to see the National Park Service and the VFW working together to form a solution to this issue. This bill passed the House in the 114th Congress, and I urge all Members to support this commonsense, bipartisan bill.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Colorado for the time and for his positive comments, as well as Mrs. TORRES, in support of H.R. 2615.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2615, the Gulf Islands National Seashore Land Exchange Act.

The Gulf Islands National Seashore is a national park that draws millions of visitors to the islands in the northern Gulf of Mexico. The Gulf Islands National Seashore includes the Mississippi barrier islands of Petit Bois, Horn, East and West Ship, and Cat, as well as the Davis Bayou Area.

I am proud to have this important park and its natural beaches, historic sites, and wildlife sanctuaries within my district.

The Gulf Islands National Seashore has been a part of the Mississippi Gulf Coast community since Congress established the park in 1971. Since that establishment, the Gulf Islands National Seashore has worked closely with the Mark Seymour Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 5699. In fact, the post has shared a road with the seashore for the better part of the last 30 years.

The Gulf Islands National Seashore Land Exchange Act would make permanent a 30-year easement that has provided an access road and driveway for the VFW. In exchange, the VFW will give the Gulf Islands National Seashore some of its acreage, which also includes valuable wetlands.

The Gulf Islands National Seashore and the Mark Seymour VFW Post strongly support this land exchange, but the Department of the Interior needs congressional approval before it can make the land exchange official. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I encourage the House to pass this bill as a suspension vote.

I would also like to thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, as well as Chairman BISHOP and the Committee on Natural Resources for their support and help in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, this is also a non-controversial bill, and I urge the Senate to pass it without delay.

Mr. TIPTON. 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 Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2615.

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.

SANTA YNEZ BAND OF CHUMASH INDIANS LAND AFFIRMATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1491) to reaffirm the action of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for the benefit of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1491

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 “Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians Land Affirmation Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On October 13, 2017, the General Council of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians voted to approve the Memorandum of Agreement between the County of Santa Barbara and the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians regarding the approximately 1,427.28 acres of land, commonly known as Camp 4, and authorized the Tribal Chairman to sign the Memorandum of Agreement.

(2) On October 31, 2017, the Board of Supervisors for the County of Santa Barbara approved the Memorandum of Agreement on Camp 4 and authorized the Chair to sign the Memorandum of Agreement.

(3) The Secretary of the Interior approved the Memorandum of Agreement pursuant to section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 81).

SEC. 3. REAFFIRMATION OF STATUS AND ACTIONS.

(a) RATIFICATION OF TRUST STATUS.—The action taken by the Secretary on January 20, 2017, to place approximately 1,427.28 acres of land located in Santa Barbara County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians is hereby ratified and confirmed as if that action had been taken under a Federal law specifically authorizing or directing that action.

(b) RATIFICATION OF ACTIONS OF THE SECRETARY.—The actions taken by the Secretary to assume jurisdiction over the appeals relating to the fee-to-trust acquisition of approximately 1,427.28 acres in Santa Barbara County, California, on January 30, 2015, is hereby ratified and confirmed as if that action had been taken under a Federal law specifically authorizing or directing that action.

(c) RATIFICATION OF ACTIONS OF THE SECRETARY.—The actions taken by the Secretary to dismiss the appeals relating to the fee-to-trust acquisition of approximately 1,427.28 acres in Santa Barbara County, California, on January 19, 2017, is hereby ratified and confirmed as if that action had been taken under a Federal law specifically authorizing or directing that action.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) ADMINISTRATION.—The land placed into trust for the benefit of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians by the Secretary of the Interior on January 20, 2017, shall be a part of the Santa Ynez Indian Reservation and administered in accordance with the laws and regulations generally applicable to the land held in trust by the United States for an Indian tribe.

(2) EFFECT.—For purposes of certain California State laws (including the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, Government Code Section 51200, et seq.), placing the land

described in subsection (b) into trust shall remove any restrictions on the property pursuant to California Government Code Section 51295 or any other provision of such Act.

(e) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LANDS TRANSFERRED.—The lands to be transferred pursuant to this Act are described as follows:

Legal Land Description/Site Location: Real property in the unincorporated area of the County of Santa Barbara, State of California, described as follows: PARCEL 1: (APN: 141-121-51 AND PORTION OF APN 141-140-10) LOTS 9 THROUGH 18, INCLUSIVE, OF TRACT 18, IN THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP SHOWING THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE CANADA DE LOS PINOS OR COLLEGE RANCHO, FILED IN RACK 3, AS MAP 4 IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY. THIS LEGAL IS MADE PURSUANT TO THAT CERTAIN CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 2001 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 01-105580 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. PARCEL 2: (PORTION OF APN: 141-140-10) LOTS 1 THROUGH 12, INCLUSIVE, OF TRACT 24, IN THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP SHOWING THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE CANADA DE LOS PINOS OR COLLEGE RANCHO, FILED IN RACK 3, AS MAP 4 IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY. THIS LEGAL IS MADE PURSUANT TO THAT CERTAIN CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 2001 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 01-105581 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. PARCEL 3: (PORTIONS OF APNS: 141-230-23 AND 141-140-10) LOTS 19 AND 20 OF TRACT 18 AND THAT PORTION OF LOTS 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, AND 15 THROUGH 20, INCLUSIVE, OF TRACT 16, IN THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP SHOWING THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE CANADA DE LOS PINOS OR COLLEGE RANCHO, FILED IN RACK 3, AS MAP 4 IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, THAT LIES NORTHEASTERLY OF THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF THE LAND GRANTED TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA BY AN EXECUTOR'S DEED RECORDED APRIL 2, 1968 IN BOOK 2227, PAGE 136 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY. THIS LEGAL IS MADE PURSUANT TO THAT CERTAIN CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 2001 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 01-105582 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. PARCEL 4: (APN: 141-240-02 AND PORTION OF APN: 141-140-10) LOTS 1 THROUGH 12, INCLUSIVE, OF TRACT 25, IN THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP SHOWING THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE CANADA DE LOS PINOS OR COLLEGE RANCHO, FILED IN RACK 3, AS MAP 4 IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY. THIS LEGAL IS MADE PURSUANT TO THAT CERTAIN CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 2001 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 01-105583 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS. PARCEL 5: (PORTION OF APN: 141-230-23) THAT PORTION OF LOTS 3 AND 6 OF TRACT 16, IN THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AS SHOWN ON THE MAP SHOWING THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE CANADA DE LOS PINOS OR COLLEGE RANCHO, FILED IN RACK 3, AS MAP 4 IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY, THAT LIES NORTHEASTERLY OF THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF THE LAND GRANTED TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA BY AN EXECUTOR'S DEED RECORDED APRIL 2, 1968 IN BOOK 2227, PAGE 136 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID

COUNTY. THIS LEGAL IS MADE PURSUANT TO THAT CERTAIN CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE RECORDED DECEMBER 5, 2001 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 01-105584 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS.

(f) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall—

(1) enlarge, impair, or otherwise affect any right or claim of the Tribe to any land or interest in land that is in existence before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) affect any water right of the Tribe in existence before the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(3) terminate or limit any access in any way to any right-of-way or right-of-use issued, granted, or permitted before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) RESTRICTED USE OF TRANSFERRED LANDS.—The Tribe may not conduct, on the land described in subsection (b) taken into trust for the Tribe pursuant to this Act, gaming activities—

(1) as a matter of claimed inherent authority; or

(2) under any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) and regulations promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission under that Act.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1491, which would reaffirm the Bureau of Indian Affairs' action placing approximately 1,400 acres of land known as Camp 4 into a trust for the benefit of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians in Santa Barbara County, California.

The Chumash Tribe has about 140 enrolled members with a 138-acre reservation in Santa Ynez, California. The Tribe constructed a casino and hotel resort on its reservation pursuant to the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, which has lifted the Tribe from historic poverty to economic success.

With other private investments in the region, the Tribe has become one of the largest employers in Santa Barbara County.

In 2010, the Tribe purchased a 1,400-acre tract of land known as Camp 4, located about 2 miles from the reservation in an unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County, from the Fess

Parker estate. The Tribe has testified that it intends to use Camp 4 for suitable Tribal housing for its current and future members. At present, the landscape of Camp 4 is mainly agricultural.

In 2014, the Bureau of Indian Affairs approved an application filed by the Tribe to place Camp 4 in trust under the agency's regulatory procedures. However, the title had not been transferred to the United States pending the resolution of an administrative appeal filed by Santa Barbara County and private citizens.

On January 17, 2017, the Department of the Interior dismissed pending appeals of the application and affirmed the 2014 decision.

Despite the dismissal of the appeals, the Tribe and the County of Santa Barbara continued work to address concerns with the trust acquisition. On November 1, 2017, the Tribe and county entered into a long-term memorandum of agreement to protect the mutual interests of both the Tribe and the county. The bill, as amended, includes a reference to this agreement and support of the County of Santa Barbara.

I would like to thank the sponsor of this bill, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs, Mr. LAMALFA, for his hard work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, passage of H.R. 1491, which I am proud to cosponsor, will clear the way for the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians to finally provide additional Tribal housing for their members. Only 17 percent of Tribal members and lineal descendants live in Tribal housing.

In 2010, the Tribe purchased approximately 1,400 acres of ancestral land in an effort to provide suitable housing for the Tribe's members and their descendants.

□ 1645

Even though this land was taken into trust administratively in January of this year, a number of parties continue to file lawsuits appealing the decision.

The Chumash leadership has been forthcoming in their desire to acquire this land only for additional Tribal housing, and they have attempted to be good neighbors by engaging local elected officials and groups to mitigate any and all concerns.

It is a shame that it has almost taken a decade for this issue to be resolved, but we are now at a point where we can finally put an end to this process. Passage of H.R. 1491 will reinforce the Secretarial decision that put the land in trust and will also incorporate a memorandum of agreement between the Chumash Tribe and the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors in relation to the land.

I congratulate the Chumash leadership for their work and persistence on

this issue, and I thank the Santa Barbara County Board Supervisors for coming to this agreement. I also thank my friend and colleague from California, Chairman LAMALFA, for carrying this legislation, not giving up on it, and moving it forward.

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

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am very pleased to speak on this bill here tonight. I am so proud of the effort to work in a bipartisan nature with my colleague and friend, the ranking member, Mrs. TORRES, as well as all the members of the committee. We have had such overwhelming support to move this bill along.

Mr. Speaker, indeed, this is a culmination of a lot of strong, bipartisan effort here in the committee as well as the community itself, which sought consensus during the several years that I have been involved with this legislation and now as chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs. We have seen the local consensus that has been built with the local government, the Tribe, and my colleagues on the committee.

With the inclusion of language referencing the local agreement, the bill is supported by the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians; the County of Santa Barbara; and the region's representative, my colleague, Representative SALUD CARBAJAL, and was reported out of the House Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent on September 17, 2017.

Located in Santa Barbara County for thousands of years, as was pointed out by my colleagues, the recorded history of the Chumash reaches back to the earliest arrival of Europeans in California, when Spanish explorer Cabrillo recorded his encounters with the Chumash in 1542. They had a long and unbroken connection to the Camp 4 parcel, which is located very close to their current reservation.

In the early 1800s, the Chumash became wards of the Spanish mission in Santa Ynez, which included Camp 4, and later, the Mexican Governor granted lands to Chumash members, which also included Camp 4. The commission created by the Mission Relief Act of 1891 recognized that the Tribe continued to reside in the Santa Ynez and Camp 4 area, though only 99 acres were ultimately taken into trust for the Chumash at the time, which is a fairly common problem for many Tribes.

With the various things that have happened to them, such as derecognition and decertification over the years, tribes end up on very small, narrow parcels of land that make it very difficult for them to grow and prosper. So today, partly because of that, the Chumash face a significant housing crisis, as was pointed out, and fewer than 17 percent of their members and descendants are able to reside on

the Tribe's existing reservation, which consists largely of hillsides, wetlands, and streambeds unsuitable for housing.

To address the housing shortage, the Chumash used their own resources to purchase the Camp 4 parcel, with the intent of constructing homes for their members. They applied to take Camp 4 into trust administratively, and after conducting a thorough public process, the Bureau of Indian Affairs issued a decision in December of 2014.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. The Department of the Interior then completed the fee-to-trust process in January of 2017. Indeed, this is ongoing.

On October 31, the county ratified an agreement with the Chumash, ensuring that any impacts of Camp 4 housing on local infrastructure and other resources would be addressed, and the Department of the Interior approved this agreement on the same day.

In order to enable the Chumash to address their housing crisis and ensure any impacts to local governments are addressed, H.R. 1491 takes the following actions:

It affirms and ratifies the action of the Department of the Interior to take the Camp 4 parcel into trust on January 19, 2017.

It codifies references to the Chumash-county agreement ratified by Santa Barbara County on October 31, 2017, addressing impacts to local infrastructure and services.

By request of the Chumash, it prohibits the operation of gaming facilities on the Camp 4 parcel.

It protects and respects rights-of-way also held by local stakeholders.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents, again, the culmination of years of effort on the part of the Chumash, the county, the committee, and Congress to ensure that the concerns of all stakeholders were addressed fairly through a local process and reaching a consensus with the Tribe and the county that we sought from the beginning. Indeed, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs, I believe this agreement is the outcome of good faith negotiations by all parties and should be considered a model for maintaining positive working relationships between tribal and local governments.

I urge all Members to support this bipartisan, noncontroversial measure.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, as the Member of Congress representing the "Camp 4" property addressed in H.R. 1491, which would reaffirm the action of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sup-

port for the amended version of the bill under consideration today which incorporates the recently completed local agreement between Santa Barbara County and the Chumash Tribe.

I have a unique perspective on this issue, having previously served as a Santa Barbara County Supervisor for twelve years. During my tenure, the issue of Camp 4 was deliberated before the Board of Supervisors on several occasions. During those discussions, I was one of the first elected officials to consistently call for direct government-to-government discussions between the Chumash Tribe and the County. I am pleased to see that those ensuing negotiations have now resulted in an agreement that addresses the Tribe's well documented need for tribal housing while providing for important mitigations to address potential impacts on public views, traffic, local tax revenues, and the natural environment.

I believe that the locally negotiated agreement concerning Camp 4 between the Tribe and the County, which is incorporated in today's amended version of H.R. 1491, is in the best interest of my constituents and is an important step toward establishing a long-term collaborative relationship between all parties involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1491, 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.

SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2017

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3115) to provide for a land exchange involving Federal land in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Weeks Law, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3115

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 "Superior National Forest Land Exchange Act of 2017".

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

Sec. 1. *Short title; table of contents.*

Sec. 2. *Purpose and need for NorthMet Land Exchange.*

Sec. 3. *Definitions.*

Sec. 4. *NorthMet Land Exchange.*

Sec. 5. *Valuation of NorthMet Land Exchange.*

Sec. 6. *Maps and legal descriptions.*

Sec. 7. *Post-exchange land management.*

Sec. 8. *Miscellaneous provisions.*

SEC. 2. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR NORTHMET LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) *PURPOSE.*—It is the purpose of this Act to further the public interest by consummating the NorthMet Land Exchange as specifically set forth in this Act.

(b) *NEED.*—According to the Final Record of Decision, the NorthMet Land Exchange is advisable and needed because the NorthMet Land Exchange will—

(1) result in a 40-acre net gain in National Forest System lands;

(2) improve the spatial arrangement of National Forest System lands by reducing the amount of ownership boundaries to be managed by 33 miles;

(3) improve management effectiveness by exchanging isolated Federal lands with no public overland access for non-Federal lands that will have public overland access and be accessible and open to public use and enjoyment;

(4) result in Federal cost savings by eliminating certain easements and their associated administration costs;

(5) meet several of the priorities identified in the land and resource management plan for Superior National Forest to protect and manage administratively or congressionally designated, unique, proposed, or recommended areas, including acquisition of 307 acres of land to the administratively proposed candidate Research Natural Areas, which are managed by preserving and maintaining areas for ecological research, observation, genetic conservation, monitoring, and educational activities;

(6) promote more effective land management that would meet specific National Forest needs for management, including acquisition of over 6,500 acres of land for new public access, watershed protection, ecologically rare habitats, wetlands, water frontage, and improved ownership patterns;

(7) convey Federal land generally not needed for other Forest resource management objectives, because such land is adjacent to intensively developed private land including ferrous mining areas, where abundant mining infrastructure and transportation are already in place, including—

(A) a large, intensively developed open pit mine lying directly to the north of the Federal land;

(B) a private mine railroad, powerlines, and roads lying directly to the south of the Federal land; and

(C) already existing ore processing, milling, and tailings facilities located approximately 5 miles to the west of the Federal land; and

(8) provide a practical resolution to complex issues pertaining to the development of private mineral rights underlying the Federal land surface, and thereby avoid potential litigation which could adversely impact the status and management of the Federal land and other National Forest System land acquired under the authority of section 6 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Law; 16 U.S.C. 515).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) *COLLECTION AGREEMENTS.*—The term "Collection Agreements" means the following agreements between the Secretary and Poly Met pertaining to the NorthMet Land Exchange:

(A) The agreement dated August 25, 2015.

(B) The agreement dated January 15, 2016.

(2) *FEDERAL LAND PARCEL.*—The term "Federal land parcel" means all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 6,650 acres of National Forest System land, as identified in the Final Record of Decision, within the Superior National Forest in St. Louis County, Minnesota, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Federal Land Parcel—NorthMet Land Exchange", and dated June 2017.

(3) *NON-FEDERAL LAND.*—The term "non-Federal land" means all right, title, and interest of Poly Met in and to approximately 6,690 acres of land in four separate tracts (comprising 10 separate land parcels in total) within the Superior National Forest to be conveyed to the United States by Poly Met in the land exchange as generally depicted on an overview map entitled

“Non-Federal Land Parcels—NorthMet Land Exchange” and dated June 2017, and further depicted on separate tract maps as follows:

(A) TRACT 1.—Approximately 4,650 acres of land in St. Louis County, Minnesota, generally depicted on the map entitled “Non-Federal Land Parcels—NorthMet Land Exchange—Hay Lake Tract”, and dated June 2017.

(B) TRACT 2.—Approximately 320 acres of land in 4 separate parcels in Lake County, Minnesota, generally depicted on the map entitled “Non-Federal Land Parcels—NorthMet Land Exchange—Lake County Lands”, and dated June 2017.

(C) TRACT 3.—Approximately 1,560 acres of land in 4 separate parcels in Lake County, Minnesota, generally depicted on the map entitled “Non-Federal Land Parcels—NorthMet Land Exchange—Wolf Lands”, and dated June 2017.

(D) TRACT 4.—Approximately 160 acres of land in St. Louis County, Minnesota, generally depicted on the map entitled “Non-Federal Land Parcel—NorthMet Land Exchange—Hunting Club Lands”, dated June 2017.

(4) NORTHMET LAND EXCHANGE.—The term “NorthMet Land Exchange” means the land exchange specifically authorized and directed by section 4 of this Act.

(5) POLY MET.—The term “Poly Met” means Poly Met Mining Corporation, Inc., a Minnesota Corporation with executive offices in St. Paul, Minnesota, and headquarters in Hoyt Lakes, Minnesota.

(6) RECORD OF DECISION.—The term “Record of Decision” means the Final Record of Decision of the Forest Service issued on January 9, 2017, approving the NorthMet Land Exchange between the United States and PolyMet Mining, Inc., a Minnesota Corporation, involving National Forest System land in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota.

(7) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(8) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Minnesota.

SEC. 4. NORTHMET LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) EXCHANGE AUTHORIZED AND DIRECTED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to section 5(c)(1) and other conditions imposed by this Act, if Poly Met offers to convey to the United States all right, title, and interest of Poly Met in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall accept the offer and convey to Poly Met all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land parcel.

(2) LAND EXCHANGE EXPEDITED.—Subject to the conditions imposed by this Act, the NorthMet Land Exchange directed by this Act shall be consummated not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) FORM OF CONVEYANCE.—

(1) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—Title to the non-Federal land conveyed by Poly Met to the United States shall be by general warranty deed subject to existing rights of record, and otherwise conform to the title approval regulations of the Attorney General of the United States.

(2) FEDERAL LAND PARCEL.—The Federal land parcel shall be quitclaimed by the Secretary to Poly Met by an exchange deed.

(c) EXCHANGE COSTS.—

(1) REIMBURSEMENT REQUIRED.—Poly Met shall pay or reimburse the Secretary, either directly or through the Collection Agreements, for all land survey, appraisal, land title, deed preparation, and other costs incurred by the Secretary in processing and consummating the NorthMet Land Exchange. The Collection Agreements, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, may be modified through the mutual consent of the parties.

(2) DEPOSIT OF FUNDS.—All funds paid or reimbursed to the Secretary under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall be deposited and credited to the accounts in accordance with the Collection Agreements;

(B) shall be used for the purposes specified for the accounts; and

(C) shall remain available to the Secretary until expended without further appropriation.

(d) CONDITIONS ON LAND EXCHANGE.—

(1) RESERVATION OF CERTAIN MINERAL RIGHTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the United States shall reserve the mineral rights on approximately 181 acres of the Federal land parcel as generally identified on the map entitled “Federal Land Parcel—NorthMet Land Exchange”, and dated June 2017.

(2) THIRD-PARTY AUTHORIZATIONS.—As set forth in the Final Record of Decision, Poly Met shall honor existing road and transmission line authorizations on the Federal land parcel. Upon relinquishment of the authorizations by the holders or upon revocation of the authorizations by the Forest Service, Poly Met shall offer replacement authorizations to the holders on at least equivalent terms.

SEC. 5. VALUATION OF NORTHMET LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) APPRAISALS.—The Congress makes the following new findings:

(1) Appraisals of the Federal and non-Federal lands to be exchanged in the NorthMet Land Exchange were formally prepared in accordance with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions, and were approved by the Secretary in conjunction with preparation of the November 2015 Draft Record of Decision on the NorthMet Land Exchange.

(2) The appraisals referred to in paragraph (1) determined that the value of the non-Federal lands exceeded the value of the Federal land parcel by approximately \$425,000.

(3) Based on the appraisals referred to in paragraph (1), the United States would ordinarily be required to make a \$425,000 cash equalization payment to Poly Met to equalize exchange values under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), unless such an equalization payment is waived by Poly Met.

(b) VALUES FOR CONSUMMATION OF LAND EXCHANGE.—The appraised values of the Federal and non-Federal land determined and approved by the Secretary in November 2015, and referenced in subsection (a)—

(1) shall be the values utilized to consummate the NorthMet Land Exchange; and

(2) shall not be subject to reappraisal.

(c) WAIVER OF EQUALIZATION PAYMENT.—

(1) CONDITION ON LAND EXCHANGE.—Notwithstanding section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)), and as part of its offer to exchange the non-Federal lands as provided in section 4(a)(1) of this Act, Poly Met shall waive any payment to it of any monies owed by the United States to equalize land values.

(2) TREATMENT OF WAIVER.—A waiver of the equalization payment under paragraph (1) shall be considered as a voluntary donation to the United States by Poly Met for all purposes of law.

SEC. 6. MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.

(a) MINOR ADJUSTMENTS.—By mutual agreement, the Secretary and Poly Met may correct minor or typographical errors in any map, acreage estimate, or description of the Federal land parcel or non-Federal land to be exchanged in the NorthMet Land Exchange.

(b) CONFLICT.—If there is a conflict between a map, an acreage estimate, or a description of land under this Act, the map shall control unless the Secretary and Poly Met mutually agree otherwise.

(c) EXCHANGE MAPS.—The maps referred to in section 3 depicting the Federal and non-Federal lands to be exchanged in the NorthMet Land Exchange, and dated June 2017, depict the identical lands identified in the Final Record of Decision, which are on file in the Office of the Supervisor, Superior National Forest.

SEC. 7. POST-EXCHANGE LAND MANAGEMENT.

(a) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—Upon conveyance of the non-Federal land to the United States in the

NorthMet Land Exchange, the non-Federal land shall become part of the Superior National Forest and be managed in accordance with—

(1) the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Law; 16 U.S.C. 500 et seq.); and

(2) the laws and regulations applicable to the Superior National Forest and the National Forest System.

(b) PLANNING.—Upon acquisition by the United States in the NorthMet Land Exchange, the non-Federal lands shall be managed in a manner consistent with the land and resource management plan applicable to adjacent federally owned lands in the Superior National Forest. An amendment or supplement to the land and resource management plan shall not be required solely because of the acquisition of the non-Federal lands.

(c) FEDERAL LAND.—Upon conveyance of the Federal land parcel to Poly Met in the NorthMet Land Exchange, the Federal land parcel shall become private land and available for any lawful use in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to mining and other uses of land in private ownership.

SEC. 8. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) WITHDRAWAL OF ACQUIRED NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The non-Federal lands acquired by the United States in the NorthMet Land Exchange shall be withdrawn, without further action by the Secretary, from appropriation and disposal under public land laws and under laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing.

(b) WITHDRAWAL REVOCATION.—Any public land order that withdraws the Federal land parcel from appropriation or disposal under a public land law shall be revoked without further action by the Secretary to the extent necessary to permit conveyance of the Federal land parcel to Poly Met.

(c) WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LAND PENDING CONVEYANCE.—The Federal land parcel to be conveyed to Poly Met in the NorthMet Land Exchange, if not already withdrawn or segregated from appropriation or disposal under the mineral leasing and geothermal or other public land laws upon enactment of this Act, is hereby so withdrawn, subject to valid existing rights, until the date of conveyance of the Federal land parcel to Poly Met.

(d) ACT CONTROLS.—In the event any provision of the Record of Decision conflicts with a provision of this Act, the provision of this Act shall control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3115, authored by Congressman RICHARD NOLAN, is a bipartisan bill that implements a land exchange to facilitate the exercise of certain mineral rights in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota to create economic growth for the area.

Congressman NOLAN will certainly provide the history of this exchange,

but I do want to take note that this bill has greater impacts than just a single forest in Minnesota.

Across the United States, people hold mineral estates underlying lands that were acquired by the National Forest under the Weeks Act. Without an agreement such as the one authorized by this bill, their ability to exercise those valid preexisting rights is in jeopardy.

I note that the land exchange authorized in this bill has undergone extensive environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and was supported by the Obama administration.

This is an equal-value land exchange, but the holder of the mineral estate forgoes any equalization under the bill if the private land being swapped for the Federal land is worth more.

Finally, the bill provides a net increase in the size of the Superior National Forest of 40 acres. It is no wonder that this bill was supported by the ranking members of the Subcommittee on Federal Lands and the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources when it was considered by the Natural Resources Committee in July.

I commend Congressman NOLAN, Congressman COLLIN PETERSON, Congressman TOM EMMER, and Congressman JASON LEWIS for working together to craft this commonsense solution bill to help Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3115 authorizes a land exchange between the Forest Service and PolyMet Mining. PolyMet will acquire land within Minnesota's Superior National Forest to pursue the development of an open pit mine.

While the Forest Service already approved the exchange, I understand several groups of concerned Minnesotans have expressed concerns about the proposed development, including the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, a federally recognized Tribe whose reservation is downstream from the proposed mine. The area to be exchanged is part of the Tribe's ancestral homeland, and they have concerns that the conveyance could impact rights to hunt, fish, and gather. Federal ownership protects these rights.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs, I think it is important that we listen to the concerns of tribal communities. That said, I understand this bill is a priority for Representative NOLAN, and I look forward to hearing his perspectives.

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

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3115, the land exchange between PolyMet Mining Corporation and the Superior National Forest of the U.S. Forest Service.

Let me begin by saying that what the exchange involves is PolyMet giving up approximately 6,550 acres of forestland that is surrounded by old mining sites, with no public access. In return, they are giving us 6,690 acres, or an additional 40 acres, which is a wonderfully good deal for the taxpayers and the concerns of the environment, if people just look at the exchange.

At the end of the day, the taxpayers get more land and more value—\$425,000, to be exact. There is no cost to the taxpayers. The public gets more access to the land. They get more lakeshore property, more timberland, more wild rice land, and more wetlands.

If approved and if the PolyMet Mining project should ultimately go forward—by the way, it has received the highest marks that any mining project has ever received from the EPA, after almost 12 years of review—the simple truth is that this is a good bill for the public.

Let me say it is important to note that there are some things that this bill does not do. I need to say that because there is some terrible misinformation floating around out there.

Number one, it does not authorize a mining project. Let's make that very clear.

Number two, it does not interfere with the State and Federal environmental review processes, procedures, and permitting process.

Most importantly, the preponderance of the information coming into my office is concern for the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, and rightfully so. I was an original sponsor of that legislation back in the day before I took my little 32-year hiatus. There is no more precious, pristine area in this country—perhaps, the world—that needs to be protected.

Let me show you something. For those of you who weren't paying attention in science class, there is the Continental Divide. The water north of that flows north and water to the south of that flows south.

This project is south of the Continental Divide, so there is physically no way possible, short of a nuclear bomb or getting hit by a planet or something, that that water can flow into and in any way harm or damage the Boundary Waters.

To be specific, right here, there already is a 60-year-old mining project, Northshore Mining. They have been mining there 60 years.

And by the way, there is sulfur in that soil, as well. It has never caused any damage to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness.

This is a good bill for the environment, good for jobs, and it is good for the community. In no way can it harm or damage the Boundary Waters or I wouldn't be standing here today advocating for its purchase.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this important piece of legislation. I remind them that it has good bipartisan support from our Minnesota Senators and the Governor, bipartisan support from our congressional delegation, chambers of commerce, and the trade unions.

It is a good bill, and I urge its adoption.

□ 1700

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3115, the Superior National Forest Land Exchange Act of 2017. This bill mandates an exchange of more than 6,600 acres in the Superior National Forest for the construction of a massive open pit sulfide-ore copper and nickel mine.

This project is controversial with the majority of Minnesotans who oppose the toxic sulfide-ore mining because it is a threat to our water quality, public lands, and outdoor recreation in our State.

This legislation also raises serious due process concerns. There are four pending lawsuits challenging the land exchange based on existing environmental laws and concerns about the appropriate appraisal values.

Federal courts are still considering these suits, but this legislation undermines the proper judicial review to expedite the construction of the PolyMet mine.

Finally, this bill ignores the treaty rights of the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, a federally recognized Tribal nation. The Fond du Lac Reservation is downstream from the proposed mine site, and the Tribal chairman has told Congress this mine will, and I quote the Tribal chairman, "pose a direct threat to the water and the fish, the game, and the wild rice on which the Tribe depends."

The National Congress of American Indians also strongly opposes this legislation. H.R. 3115 undermines legal due process, environmental safeguards, and the treaty rights of our Native American brothers and sisters, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 3115.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3115, 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.

Mrs. TORRES. 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.

21ST CENTURY RESPECT ACT

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 995) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to amend regulations for racial appropriateness, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 995

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 "21st Century Respect Act".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO REGULATIONS REQUIRED.

(a) SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall amend section 1901.202 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, for purposes of—

(1) replacing the reference to the term "Negro or Black" with "Black or African American";

(2) replacing the reference to the term "Spanish Surname" with "Hispanic"; and

(3) replacing the reference to the term "Oriental" with "Asian American or Pacific Islander".

(b) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The Secretary of the Interior shall amend section 906.2 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, for purposes of—

(1) replacing the references to the term "Negro" with "Black or African American";

(2) replacing the definition of "Negro" with the definition of "Black or African American" as "a person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa";

(3) replacing the references to the term "Oriental" with "Asian American or Pacific Islander"; and

(4) replacing the references to the terms "Eskimo" and "Aleut" with "Alaska Native".

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments required by this Act, shall be construed to affect Federal law, except with respect to the use of terms by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, respectively, to the regulations affected by this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and the gentleman from California (Mrs. TORRES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the United States is 241 years old. In that time, the country has seen an immense amount of change and growth. Over the course of history,

laws and policies have been updated to be able to reflect this growth. However, some decades-old statutes and regulations still contain antiquated terms.

Enacted in 2016, Public Law 114-157 modernized antiquated ethnic terms related to minorities found in the Office of Minority Economic Impact of the Department of Energy and section 106 of the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976 for racial appropriateness.

H.R. 995 would make similar changes to terms found in certain regulations of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the sponsor of this bill, Mr. JEFFRIES, and I urge adoption of the measure.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, November 20, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We thank you for agreeing to discharge the Committee on Agriculture from further consideration of H.R. 995, the 21st Century Respect Act, that the Committee on Natural Resources ordered favorably reported, as amended, on November 8, 2017.

This concession in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Agriculture represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and your response in the bill report and in the Congressional Record.

Thank you for your consideration of my request and for the extraordinary cooperation shown by you and your staff over matters of shared jurisdiction. I look forward to further opportunities to work with you this Congress.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman,
Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, November 20, 2017.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to review H.R. 995, 21st Century Respect Act. As you are aware, the bill was primarily referred to the Committee on Natural Resources, while the Agriculture Committee received an additional referral.

I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and, accordingly, I agree to discharge H.R. 995 from further consideration by the Committee on Agriculture. I do so with the understanding that by discharging the bill, the Committee on Agriculture does not waive any future jurisdictional claim on this or similar matters. Further, the Committee on Agriculture reserves the right to seek the appointment of conferees, if it should become necessary.

I ask that you insert a copy of our exchange of letters into the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Thank you for your courtesy in this matter and I look forward to continued cooperation between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill could not be more straightforward. H.R. 995 would require the USDA and the Department of the Interior to change the terminology used to describe the racial background or place of origin of people.

These very outdated and offensive racial terms have no place in our Federal regulations. Modernizing these terms should be a continuous effort across all agencies. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for his leadership on this issue by pushing this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I want to include in the RECORD the phrases that this bill would change: replacing the references to the term "Negro" with "Black or African American;" replacing the definition of "Negro" with the definition of "African American" as "a person having origins;" replacing the references of the term "Oriental" with "Asian American;" and replacing the references to the terms "Eskimo" and "Aleut" with "Alaska Native."

I think it is only fair that we move to pass this bill and finally address people as we should. I also want to bring attention to the title of the bill, which is the 21st Century Respect Act.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to add that the bill was reported out of committee by unanimous vote.

I want to read into the RECORD Representative JEFFRIES' remarks on H.R. 995, the 21st Century Respect Act, a bipartisan bill that will remove outdated and offensive racial labels from the Code of Federal Regulations:

I thank Ranking Member Grijalva and Mrs. Torres and Chairman Bishop and Mr. LaMalfa for working with me to move this important bill expeditiously through committee. I also want to thank Congressman CHABOT for his support and partnership.

Words matter. They can cause great harm by making people feel lesser or other, and when words are rooted in bigotry in our Nation's laws, it signals that we, as a country, are legitimizing and normalizing bigotry.

Unfortunately, there are still laws on the books that use old offensive racial terms to refer to our fellow Americans. These terms come from areas where intolerance was acceptable, and they have no place in modern society.

For example, title 36 of this CFR still uses the term "Eskimo" to refer to certain indigenous Americans from Alaska. People in many parts of the arctic consider "Eskimo" a derogatory term because it was widely used to connote barbarism and violence. The 21st Century Respect Act replaces "Eskimo" with "Alaska Native," a modern term embraced by the people that it describes.

Title 7 also includes the terms "Oriental" and "Negro," which are terms that are disparaging today. H.R. 995 replaces those old labels with "Asian American" or "Pacific Islander" and "Black" or "African American," respectively. These new terms reflect America's growth and progress.

Now, more than ever, we need to be conscious of the signals and messages that our

words and actions are sending to our fellow citizens. As elected officials, it is our responsibility to lead by example and make sure that our laws and institutions reflect our best aspirations of unity and respect for Americans of all backgrounds.

Passing the 21st Century Respect Act is a demonstration of our commitment to ensuring that every person who pledges allegiance to our flag feels valued and included by the Nation it represents. I encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 995.

Mr. Speaker, these are words from Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES, who is on his way.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I think the legislation that we are seeing on this floor today demonstrates addressing a variety of issues, be it on our public lands, needing that to be able to be updated, private property rights to be able to update it, but probably nothing is more personal than the legislation that we are addressing at this particular moment, to be able to be respectful of individuals and have that there to actually be able to be addressed.

□ 1715

This legislation is a long time coming—much like Mr. JEFFRIES, coming to the floor—to be able to address this important piece of legislation, for the House to be able to consider, as we move forward with our business.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 995, the 21st Century Respect Act, which we all know is a bipartisan bill that will remove outdated and offensive racial labels from the Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that words matter. They matter. We all stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance every day. Every day I take those words very, very seriously. Words do matter.

It is time that we remove outdated and offensive language from any code, policy, law, regulation: words like Eskimo, words like Oriental—my God—words like Negro. They matter. As elected officials, we have a responsibility.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 11 minutes remaining.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California for yielding and for her leadership as well as her support, in addition to Ranking Member GRIJALVA, Chairman BISHOP, Chairman LAMALFA, and the entire committee for moving

this bill expeditiously to the House floor and for their leadership and partnership in this regard. I also want to thank my good friend and fellow Judiciary Committee member, Congressman CHABOT, for his support, leadership, and cosponsorship of this legislation.

Words definitely matter. They can cause great harm and division, particularly when they are embedded in Federal statute.

So this step that we are taking today, as it relates to the 21st Century Respect Act, is important, as a symbol from this Congress, the people's House, to the Nation that we can come together, that we are all fellow Americans, and that outdated, antiquated, and racially stereotypical terms like Negro and Eskimo and Oriental are not appropriate at this time in America. They reflect a more divisive bygone era.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful to all of my colleagues for coming together in this regard, a small but meaningful step in an era otherwise characterized by great division, and perhaps an indication that we can come together as Democrats, as Republicans, and as people of diverse racial backgrounds to heal whatever divisions may remain in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues for their leadership and support.

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

Mr. TIPTON. 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 Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 995, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to modernize terms in certain regulations."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAW ENFORCEMENT MENTAL HEALTH AND WELLNESS ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2228) to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H. R. 2228

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 "Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017".

SEC. 2. SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.

(a) INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION.—The Attorney General shall consult with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report, which shall be made publicly available, on Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs mental health practices and services that could be adopted by Federal, State, local, or tribal law enforcement agencies.

(b) CASE STUDIES.—The Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services shall submit to Congress a report—

(1) that is similar to the report entitled "Health, Safety, and Wellness Program Case Studies in Law Enforcement" published by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services in 2015; and

(2) that focuses on case studies of programs designed primarily to address officer psychological health and well-being.

(c) PEER MENTORING PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 1701(b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (21), by striking ";" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (22), by striking the period at the end and inserting ";" and "

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(23) to establish peer mentoring mental health and wellness pilot programs within State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies."

SEC. 3. SUPPORT FOR MENTAL HEALTH PROVIDERS.

The Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall develop resources to educate mental health providers about the culture of Federal, State, tribal, and local law enforcement agencies and evidence-based therapies for mental health issues common to Federal, State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers.

SEC. 4. SUPPORT FOR OFFICERS.

The Attorney General shall—

(1) in consultation with Federal, State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies—

(A) identify and review the effectiveness of any existing crisis hotlines for law enforcement officers;

(B) provide recommendations to Congress on whether Federal support for existing crisis hotlines or the creation of an alternative hotline would improve the effectiveness or use of the hotline; and

(C) conduct research into the efficacy of an annual mental health check for law enforcement officers;

(2) in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the head of other Federal agencies that employ law enforcement officers, examine the mental health and wellness needs of Federal law enforcement officers, including the efficacy of expanding peer mentoring programs for law enforcement officers at each Federal agency;

(3) ensure that any recommendations, resources, or programs provided under this Act protect the privacy of participating law enforcement officers; and

(4) not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a report to Congress containing findings from the review and research under paragraphs (1) and (2), and final recommendations based upon those findings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2228, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today we are voting on H.R. 2228, the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act. This bill is designed to equip local law enforcement agencies with information and resources to address mental health challenges faced by officers.

Our policemen and -women report for duty every day, facing and responding to danger on our behalf. We often see them and we always appreciate them. However, we often don't consider the mental aspect of the challenges facing our officers who put themselves in harm's way to protect our communities.

Today we consider the toll their jobs take on their psychological well-being. Every day, these brave men and women face some of the highest stress situations one can imagine. When officers hang up their badges at the end of a shift, they cannot easily hang up the lingering effects of their high-stakes encounters. As this stress accumulates, it can lead to serious physical and mental health problems. Research has shown time and again that police officer occupational stress is directly correlated to heart disease, divorce, alcohol abuse, and major psychological illnesses, including acute stress disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, and anxiety disorders.

Over 900,000 men and women serve as sworn law enforcement officers in the United States. Each year, more of them die from suicide than from gunfire and traffic accidents combined. Many departments have started mental health programs as preventative measures. These programs have been successful in reducing the number of police officer suicides from 300 in 1998 to 126 in 2012. But in departments where mental health and wellness programs remain absent, these problems continue. We must address this gap.

H.R. 2228 directs the Department of Justice, in consultation with the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs, to equip local law enforcement agencies to address mental health challenges faced by police officers. It also permits DOJ's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services to award grants to peer mentoring pilot programs, and it directs the Attorney General to make recommendations on how to make these and other programs more effective.

Mr. Speaker, we all recognize the profound challenges faced by law enforcement in this country. Today we

also acknowledge the unseen toll that these challenges can take on the health of these brave men and women.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. BROOKS from Indiana for introducing this bill, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this important step in providing law enforcement agencies with the resources to treat severe mental and physical stress. Our men and women in blue deserve the appreciation and support of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I wish and hope that all of my colleagues and Americans had a wonderful Thanksgiving.

I thank the men and women of the United States military for their service. It is particularly noteworthy that they serve in this time when families are gathered.

I thank Mr. GOODLATTE for collaborating on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2228, the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017. Ensuring the mental health and well-being of our law enforcement officers is paramount to the safety of our communities and the people our officers take a solemn oath to protect.

I am also very pleased to acknowledge VAL DEMINGS, a colleague and a member of the Homeland Security Committee, of which I serve. We are better off for the experience, commitment, and professional career that she had as a law enforcement officer and chief. She is one of the cosponsors of this legislation and I look forward to hearing from her.

Let me also take note of the fact that Texas experienced a depth of sadness over the holiday weekend when we lost one of our Department of Public Safety officers, who was killed by a perpetrator during the Thanksgiving weekend. We pray for him and his family.

H.R. 2228 is intended to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers. I support this legislation as a good first step towards Congress addressing the various matters surrounding the mental health of our law enforcement officers.

We must recognize that law enforcement officers play a special role in our communities, with exceptional responsibilities to protect and serve where they see, encounter, and respond to horrendous situations that are dangerous, stressful, and often life-threatening.

Imagine those officers who came upon that scene Sunday morning in Texas a few weeks ago where 27 Texans were murdered in church and 20 were injured. Imagine churches that are frightened about worshipping. Imagine, as I left my hometown Houston, that

there were law enforcement officers who were gathered to meet with pastors to give them comfort. They are there for us.

As well, for example, law enforcement officers have had to respond to several recent tragedies, which include the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida, where 49 people were killed and 53 others were wounded; the killing of 5 officers and the wounding of 9 other officers, along with 2 civilians in Dallas, Texas; the San Bernardino, California, shooting of 14 innocent employees; the Las Vegas, Nevada, massacre, where a gunman killed 58 innocent concertgoers and injured nearly 500 others; and, again, most recently, as I indicated, on November 5, the deadliest mass shooting by an individual in Texas, the fifth deadliest mass shooting in the United States, as well as the deadliest shooting in an American place of worship in modern history, where 26 were gunned down in Sutherland Springs, Texas, including an 18-month-old child, a pregnant mother, and where 20 others were injured.

These horrific occurrences have become all too common in today's society. These chilling tragedies continue to affect us all. Imagine the impact that they have collectively on our law enforcement officers with whom these traumatic situations remain long after the threats are reduced. Everyone has returned home and communities they serve have regained a renewed sense of safety.

Imagine that officer that comes upon a horrific traffic accident that kills a family. Imagine their pain and their concern. Requiring these officers to continue to serve without providing them an effective avenue to process the day-to-day crisis does an injustice to them. That is why this is a very important initiative and I am really excited to support it.

I want to also raise for my colleagues that I have been a longstanding advocate for helping police officers, as we have worked together with the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee.

I want to make mention of the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act, which takes a comprehensive approach to addressing policing issues, including recognition of the importance of sustaining the mental well-being of our officers.

This piece of legislation addresses tragedies where we have seen actions take place. Countless unfortunate incidents have happened maybe because of the lack of deescalation.

□ 1730

This bill, I hope we can move along, as this bill that we have, the underlying bill, requires the Attorney General to perform an initial analysis of existing law enforcement accreditation standards and to recommend areas for development. That gives training, and it also takes into account mental health needs and funding needs.

It authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to States, units of local government, Indian tribal governments to study law enforcement agency management and operations and to develop pilot programs to implement best practices.

It requires the Attorney General to study the prevalence and impact of any law, rule, or procedure that allows a law enforcement officer to delay the answer to questions posed, as quickly as possible, by any of the authorities investigating situations.

It authorizes appropriations for expenses related to criminal and civil enforcement activities by the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department.

It requires the Department of Justice to establish a task force to assist in local investigations, and it requires each Federal, State, and local law enforcement agency to report to the Attorney General on the actions in that particular department to help that department assess its own work.

It requires the Department of Justice to cooperate with the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund—something that was very important to me—to create and provide a distinctive medallion to be issued to the survivors of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty or memorialized on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

This is in sync with the task force that was held in the last administration that offered to discuss ways to improve policing and to help our individual police officers.

We want to be partners for safety and security and community police relations, and we want them to have good health and the ability to serve the public in a good health mindset.

Under today's bill, the Attorney General shall review current mental health practices and services of Federal agencies and report to Congress, develop resources to educate mental healthcare providers about the law enforcement culture across the board, and develop evidence-based therapies as a result.

I believe this legislation and the Law Enforcement Integrity Legislation, if passed, will create an atmosphere where law enforcement officers will be comfortable in sharing their thoughts or their assessments or best practices.

Under this bill, the underlying bill, the Director of Community Oriented Policing Services shall conduct case studies that focuses on programs designed primarily to address officer psychological health and well-being and submit such a report to Congress.

The Attorney General shall also consult with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the heads of Federal agencies to examine the mental health needs of Federal law enforcement officers and the efficacy of expanding peer mentoring programs; ensure the recommendations, resources, or programs protect the privacy of officers—that is extremely important—and report these

findings to the Congress no later than 1 year after enactment.

Mr. Speaker, the key to all of this is to build the trust between community and police, the police community and the police families and families of those who come within the range of law enforcement.

If we can all work together, we can trust each other, we will have a better system of justice. This bill is a good first step, and I look forward to working as well with other law enforcement bills, including the Law Enforcement Integrity bill that I have just so noted.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2228, the "Law Enforcement Mental Health Act of 2017." Ensuring the mental health and well-being of our law enforcement officers is paramount to the safety of our communities and the people our officers take a solemn oath to protect.

H.R. 2228 is intended to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers.

These horrific occurrences have become all too common in today's society. These chilling tragedies continue to affect us all. Imagine the impact they have collectively on our law enforcement officers, with whom these traumatic situations remain long after the threats are reduced, everyone has returned home and communities they serve have regained a renewed sense of safety.

Requiring these officers to continue to serve, without providing them an effective avenue to process these day-to-day crises does an injustice to them.

For example, law enforcement officers have had to respond to several recent tragedies which include: the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida, where 49 people were killed and 53 others wounded; the killing of five officers and wounding of nine other officers along with two civilians in Dallas, Texas; the San Bernardino shooting of 14 innocent employees; the Las Vegas massacre, where a gunman killed 58 innocent concert-goers and injured nearly 500 others; and again, most recently on November 5, the deadliest mass shooting by an individual in Texas, the fifth-deadliest mass shooting in the United States, as well as the deadliest shooting in an American place of worship in modern history, where 26 were gunned down in Sutherland Springs, including an 18-month-old child and a pregnant mother, and where 20 others were injured.

This is why I have been a longstanding advocate for adoption of the "Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act," which takes a comprehensive approach to addressing policing issues, including a recognition of the importance of sustaining the mental well-being of our officers.

This piece of legislation addresses the tragedies in some of our most recent cases such as: Tamir Rice, Brown, Freddie Gray and Garner and the countless others that do not receive publicity.

The bill provides seven substantive approaches towards improving law enforcement management and misconduct prosecution tools:

(1) It requires the Attorney General to perform initial analysis of existing law enforcement accreditation standards and to recommend areas for development.

(2) It authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to States, units of local government, Indian Tribal Governments, to study law enforcement agency management and operations and to develop pilot programs to implement best practices.

(3) It requires the Attorney General to study the prevalence and impact of any law, rule or procedure that allows a law enforcement officer to delay the answer to questions posed by a local internal affairs officer, prosecutor, or review board on the investigative integrity and prosecution of law enforcement misconduct.

(4) It authorizes appropriations for expenses related to criminal and civil enforcement activities by the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department.

(5) It requires the Department of Justice to establish a task force to coordinate the investigation, prosecution and enforcement efforts of Federal, state and local governments in cases related to law enforcement misconduct.

(6) It requires each Federal, State, and local law enforcement agency to report to the Attorney General data on the following: (1) traffic violation stops; (2) pedestrian stops and detentions; and (3) the use of deadly force by and against law enforcement officers.

(7) It requires the Department of Justice, in cooperation with the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, to create and provide a distinctive medallion to be issued to the survivors of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty or memorialized on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

These are all measures similar in nature to those undertaken by the Obama Task Force Initiative. In short, the Law Enforcement Integrity and Trust Act would help law enforcement officers do their jobs, knowing that they have our support. This is why it was endorsed by a broad range of legal, community-based and law enforcement groups nationwide.

Under today's bill, the Attorney General shall review current mental health practices and services of Federal agencies and report to Congress, develop resources to educate mental health care providers about the law enforcement culture across the board, and develop evidence-based therapies as a result.

Under this bill the Director of Community Oriented Policing Services shall conduct case studies that focus on programs designed primarily to address officers' psychological health and well-being and submit such report to Congress.

I support this legislation as a good first step towards Congress addressing the various matters surrounding the mental health of our law enforcement officers.

We must recognize that law enforcement officers play a special role in our communities, with exceptional responsibilities to protect and serve, where they see, encounter, and respond to horrendous situations that are both dangerous and stressful, and often life-threatening.

The Attorney General shall also consult with the Secretary of Homeland Security and head of Federal agencies to examine the mental health needs of Federal law enforcement officers and the efficacy of expanding peer mentoring programs; ensure the recommendations, resources, or programs protect the privacy of officers; and report these findings to Congress no later than one year after enactment.

As this is a good first step, I support the bill and ask my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding. I also want to thank the gentleman for his leadership of the House Judiciary Committee and for his many, many years of support for law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her support of this bill and for being the leading voice today to talk about trust between the law enforcement community and the communities which they protect. I believe that this bill will go a long way in helping our law enforcement and that the communities in which they serve to protect should recognize the types of trials and tribulations that our law enforcement officers face every day.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who, before coming to Congress, were leaders in the law enforcement community—including the gentlewoman from Florida, whom, I believe, we will hear from—who, day in and day out, served and protected their own communities.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act because our Nation's law enforcement officers often deal with the unthinkable. They daily face situations that can be hard to process and impossible to forget.

The work our Nation's law enforcement officers undertake puts incredible strains on them, on their families. It places them in situations that increase their chances of developing mental disorders.

According to the National Alliance on Mental Illness, between 7 and 19 percent of police officers have symptoms of PTSD. In comparison, only 3½ percent of the general population experience PTSD. Furthermore, the suicide rate for our Nation's law enforcement officers is double the rate at which officers are killed by violent felons.

In the Fifth District of Indiana, Boone County Sheriff Mike Nielsen desperately and publicly pleaded for better mental health services after his daughter, also a police officer, tried to take her own life. She was struggling with PTSD after responding to a case involving the murder of a mother and her 4-year-old son.

Our police officers face a culture of silence when it comes to mental health challenges, and we know they need better access to mental health services to allow them to cope with these horrific types of unforgettable situations.

As a former deputy mayor of Indianapolis responsible for public safety, I know firsthand the struggles our law enforcement community members face in their work. The Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department recognized

this problem several years ago and began a pilot program that provides mental health services to officers, including counseling and referrals to doctors, psychologists, and clinicians to get them the help they need, and that program actually inspired this bill.

Recognizing the tremendous work already being done by the Veterans Administration and the Department of Defense on behalf of our Nation's servicemembers, this bill will require the Justice Department to consult with those Federal agencies to determine which mental health practices they have developed that would be most useful in the law enforcement setting.

We also have to encourage our officers to share their experiences with their colleagues who can understand and empathize with them about the traumatic events they experience while serving in the line of duty. To that end, this bill establishes a grant program within the Justice Department to establish peer mentoring mental health and wellness pilot programs within State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that affects the law enforcement community across the country. I urge my colleagues, and I want to thank my colleagues for joining with me, to support this important proposal.

Our Nation's law enforcement officers are duty bound to protect and serve, and it is only fair that we work to protect them as well from the stress and trauma that they face to keep our communities safe.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks. We are working together to build that trust and to safely secure the community and our officers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS). She brings to the United States Congress very important contributions as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Affairs. These voices are well needed. Congresswoman VAL DEMINGS is the former chief of police of the City of Orlando, Florida.

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for being a leading voice on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act, which I am proud to cosponsor with my friend and colleague, Representative SUSAN BROOKS from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank all of my colleagues for their support on this very important issue.

Our law enforcement officers respond to some of the most horrific scenes and situations. After 27 years in law enforcement, how well I know. They respond without regard to their own personal safety, and they are the thin blue line that stands between a safe place and the dangers that lurk in our society.

We should all thank God for the men and women who patrol our streets, our

neighborhoods, our businesses, our schools, and our highways to keep us safe.

Being a law enforcement officer is not just what they do, it is who they are—all the dangers, the unknowns, the graphic crime scenes, split-second, life-and-death decisions. Don't be fooled. There is no other job quite like it.

The national president of the Fraternal Order of Police said this: "Unlike many other professions, sometimes you can't leave the job at the office."

Mr. Speaker, as a former law enforcement officer, I am proud to cosponsor the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act. This important piece of legislation would ensure that agencies are better equipped and officers have the resources needed to effectively deal with the stress and mental health challenges associated with the job.

Mr. Speaker, what an amazing opportunity we have to pass legislation to protect the mental health and overall well-being of the men and women in blue as they continue to protect and take care of us.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a distinguished and senior member of the Judiciary Committee, the chair of the Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, and the Internet.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act. This bill would take a number of steps to help protect the mental well-being of those who take extraordinary steps to protect all of us.

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services at the Department of Justice reports that law enforcement has an occupational fatality rate three to five times higher than the national average for the working population. Officers respond to horrible situations that are dangerous, stressful, and sometimes life-threatening.

In addition to protecting law enforcement officers from the physical hazards associated with doing their daily jobs, we must also do more to protect them from the mental and emotional difficulties resulting from their work. That is why I support this bill, which would initiate several efforts to help the mental wellness of our law enforcement officers.

The bill calls for the collaboration of the Justice Department, the Defense Department, and the Department of Veterans Affairs to determine which mental health practices and services from the military agencies may be adopted to help civilian law enforcement.

The bill would expand the allowable uses of existing Justice Department grants to include establishment of

mental health and wellness programs within State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies.

The bill would direct the Justice Department and the Department of Health and Human Services to develop educational materials for mental health providers about the culture of law enforcement agencies.

Finally, the bill would consider improvements to crisis hotlines to better serve those from law enforcement who seek to use them.

Although I am particularly proud of New York's finest, I am glad that this bill will help law enforcement officers in every jurisdiction across the country. Their service certainly deserves the assistance this legislation will provide. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill today.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, again, let me thank the two prior speakers, Congresswoman DEMINGS and Congressman NADLER, for very insightful, very important remarks on this particular legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL), someone who I know has a passion for first responders, as we have worked together even more closely after the heinous tragedy of 9/11.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the chairman, who has distinguished himself in law enforcement since he has been here.

As the co-chair of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus and an original sponsor of H.R. 2228, I rise today in strong support of the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act, and I want to join with so many of the organizations that are supporting this: the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Officers, the Major County Sheriffs of America, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the National District Attorneys Association, and the Sergeants Benevolent Association.

I was proud to have worked with my co-chair, DAVID REICHERT, and Representatives SUSAN BROOKS, VAL DEMINGS, and DOUG COLLINS on this important piece of legislation for the law enforcement community.

We all agree that the brave men and women in law enforcement put themselves in difficult—if not dangerous and sometimes life-threatening, situations every day.

□ 1745

We teach officers how to handle every different situation, whether it is a domestic dispute, whether it is a hostage dispute, or any other; but we need to think about the officer who comes away from that particular experience with himself; that is about it. He goes home to his family.

It is absolutely critical we provide our law enforcement officers with all

the resources they need to effectively do their job. I have consistently fought for new equipment and advanced technology to provide physical protection for law enforcement when they are on duty. However, we must also ensure law enforcement has the resources and support and training to address mental health issues as well.

The stresses on law enforcement have continued to grow in recent years. This can have a big impact on officers' physical and mental well-being; that is why officer mental wellness needs to be a priority from the day of hire to the day of retire. We know too many officers struggle with depression, suicidal thoughts, post-traumatic stress disorder.

As co-chair of the Traumatic Brain Injury Task Force in the Congress of the United States, myself and Dr. Collins, who was the Republican from Pennsylvania, started out 20 years ago; we could fit the number of people in a telephone booth. We just about knew what we were talking about, and that has changed how we approach our military forces on the field.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCARELL. According to the Badge of Life, a group that studies post-traumatic stress disorder among police, we have heard tonight of how many suicides we are talking about. Tragically, many police officers with PTSD are not even aware they have the problem. Often they remain on their beat, doing the job without help or support.

By discussing the importance of improving an officer's mental health, we can reduce the stigma surrounding mental health issues in the law enforcement community. I think that this bill will bolster the connection between local mental health professionals and law enforcement. I urge passage, and, hopefully, the Senate will do it justice.

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

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

Let me, first of all, thank Congresswomen BROOKS and DEMINGS for a very astute initiative, and I look forward to us working together, along with the chairman, on other items that impact the service of our officers and the better police practices. And I cite, of course, the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the chairman, I wanted to make mention of the fact that we have been meeting on police issues for almost 2 years in the Police Working Group, and it has been very impactful. I look forward to us igniting another meeting and being able to hear from both police and community, because we want a safe community and we want safe law enforcement.

Let me also say, as I close, that many police officers are veterans, and they have been in a war situation, and that means they have faced crises, they have faced the violence of war, and they, obviously, have experienced bouts, possibly, of PTSD or, as we know that they do, they may not yield to it and may not know it and go right into serving; whether they are fire or police, they go right into serving the community. Therefore, this legislation will be enormously helpful to them.

So, as I said earlier, this is a good first step to helping to enhance the mental health or the mental well-being of our law enforcement officers. These officers endure stressful events on our behalf in the interest of protecting their communities, and so we will all benefit from the effective implementation of this legislation.

Therefore, I support this bill, even as I encourage us to continue our work on additional legislation to help foster better coordination between our police officers and the communities they serve.

One final point, that I have listened to officers, and they have said to me, with all that they deal with, coming upon a circumstance where a child has been injured or killed is one of the most devastating experiences they have had to have. Just imagine that.

This mental health bill will work on all of the issues that they have to address, and I ask my colleagues to support the underlying legislation, which is the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017, H.R. 2228.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, this is a good first step to helping to enhance the mental well-being of our law enforcement officers.

These officers endure stressful events on our behalf, in the interest of protecting their communities. And so, we will all benefit from the effective implementation of this legislation.

I therefore support this bill, even as I encourage my colleagues to work together on additional legislation to help foster better coordination between our police officers and the communities they serve.

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

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

I want to again thank the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS) for their leadership on this issue.

I will say again how much I appreciate the work of the gentlewoman from Texas on a whole host of law enforcement and criminal justice reform issues; and it is my hope that we will move a great many of these reforms through this House in the very near future. The gentlewoman certainly has my support for working together in a bipartisan way to accomplish that. This piece of legislation is a great step in that direction.

You can't expect law enforcement to keep all of us safe if we are not looking out for their mental health, which I

can only imagine how stressful the job is. I have had the opportunity to do several ride-alongs over the years with police officers in my district, and they have my utmost respect.

I hope that every Member of this House will vote for this important legislation.

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2228, the Law Enforcement and Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017.

Our nation's law enforcement officers put their lives on the line each and every day to keep us safe. The resulting stress can take a tremendous toll on their mental health, and this bill seeks to address that problem. I am the son of a retired police officer and the brother of two others currently serving in law enforcement, and so I am particularly appreciative we are considering this bill today.

In the Judiciary Committee markup of H.R. 2228, I offered an amendment which would have required the Attorney General to study the specific effects of gun violence on officers' mental health as well as provide recommendations to reduce such violence. Gun violence is an epidemic in our society, and law enforcement officers are not immune. In fact, in 2016, 64 police officers died in firearm-related incidents. That was up 56 percent over 2015, according to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund. The potential of facing deadly violence at every turn only adds to the stress faced by law enforcement.

I withdrew my amendment during our markup after Chairman BOB GOODLATTE agreed to include language in the Judiciary Committee's report on the bill reflecting the goals of my amendment. I want to thank him for following through on that commitment and including the following language in the committee report: "In conjunction with the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Justice must develop educational resources for mental health providers regarding the culture of law enforcement agencies and therapies for mental health issues common to law enforcement officers. In developing these resources, the Department of Justice should examine the effect of gun violence on the mental health of officers and what can be done to solve those aspects of gun violence." Incorporating how law enforcement officers' mental health is affected by gun violence and proposing ways to reduce such violence as directed by this language will only improve the resources for law enforcement developed as a result of this bill.

Again I want to thank Chairman GOODLATTE for putting this directive regarding gun violence in the committee report. I encourage all Members to support H.R. 2228.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2228, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1829

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3017, BROWNFIELDS ENHANCEMENT, ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT, AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3905, MINNESOTA'S ECONOMIC RIGHTS IN THE SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST ACT

Ms. CHENEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-429) on the resolution (H. Res. 631) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3017) to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to reauthorize and improve the brownfields program, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3905) to require congressional approval of any mineral withdrawal or monument designation involving the National Forest System lands in the State of Minnesota, to provide for the renewal of certain mineral leases in such lands, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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. 2768, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3115, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

FOWLER AND BOSKOFF PEAKS DESIGNATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2768) to designate certain mountain peaks in the State of Colorado as "Fowler Peak" and "Boskoff Peak", 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 Colorado (Mr. TIPPON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 638]

YEAS—409

Abraham	Curtis	Huffman
Adams	Davidson	Huizenga
Aderholt	Davis (CA)	Hultgren
Aguilar	Davis, Danny	Hunter
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Hurd
Amash	DeFazio	Issa
Amodei	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Arrington	DeLauro	Jayapal
Babin	DelBene	Jeffries
Bacon	Demings	Jenkins (KS)
Banks (IN)	Denham	Jenkins (WV)
Barletta	Dent	Johnson (GA)
Barr	DeSaulnier	Johnson (LA)
Barragán	DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)
Barton	Deutch	Johnson, E. B.
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam
Beatty	Dingell	Jones
Bera	Doggett	Jordan
Bergman	Donovan	Joyce (OH)
Beyer	Doyle, Michael	Kaptur
Biggs	F.	Katko
Bilirakis	Duffy	Keating
Bishop (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (IL)
Bishop (MI)	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (MS)
Bishop (UT)	Dunn	Kelly (PA)
Blackburn	Ellison	Khanna
Blum	Emmer	Kihuen
Blumenauer	Engel	Kildee
Blunt Rochester	Eshoo	Kilmer
Bonamici	Española	Kind
Bost	Estes (KS)	King (IA)
Boyle, Brendan	Esty (CT)	King (NY)
F.	Evans	Kinzinger
Brady (PA)	Farenthold	Knight
Brady (TX)	Faso	Krishnamoorthi
Brat	Ferguson	Kuster (NH)
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Kustoff (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	LaHood
Brown (MD)	Flores	LaMalfa
Brownley (CA)	Fortenberry	Lamborn
Buchanan	Foster	Lance
Buck	Fox	Langevin
Bucshon	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (WA)
Budd	Franks (AZ)	Larson (CT)
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Latta
Bustos	Fudge	Lawrence
Byrne	Gabbard	Lawson (FL)
Calvert	Gaetz	Lee
Capuano	Gallagher	Levin
Carbajal	Gallego	Lewis (GA)
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Lewis (MN)
Carson (IN)	Garrett	Lieu, Ted
Carter (GA)	Gianforte	Lipinski
Carter (TX)	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Cartwright	Gohmert	Loeb
Castro (TX)	Gomez	Loftgren
Chabot	Gonzalez (TX)	Long
Cheney	Goodlatte	Loudermilk
Chu, Judy	Gosar	Love
Ciçilline	Gottheimer	Lowenthal
Clarke (MA)	Gowdy	Lowe
Clarke (NY)	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Clay	Graves (GA)	Lujan Grisham,
Cleaver	Graves (LA)	M.
Clyburn	Graves (MO)	Luján, Ben Ray
Coffman	Green, Al	Lynch
Cohen	Green, Gene	MacArthur
Cole	Griffith	Maloney,
Collins (GA)	Grijalva	Carolyn B.
Collins (NY)	Grothman	Maloney, Sean
Comer	Guthrie	Marchant
Comstock	Hanabusa	Marino
Conaway	Handel	Marshall
Connolly	Harper	Massie
Cook	Harris	Mast
Cooper	Hartzler	Matsui
Correa	Hastings	McCarthy
Costa	Heck	McCaul
Costello (PA)	Hensarling	McClintock
Courtney	Hice, Jody B.	McCollum
Cramer	Higgins (LA)	McEchin
Crawford	Higgins (NY)	McGovern
Crist	Hill	McHenry
Crowley	Himes	McKinley
Cuellar	Holding	McMorris
Culberson	Hollingsworth	Rodgers
Cummings	Hoyer	McNerney
Curbelo (FL)	Hudson	McSally

Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)

NOT VOTING—24

Black
Bridenstine
Butterfield
Castor (FL)
Conyers
Delaney
DeSantis
Gutiérrez

Herrera Beutler
Kennedy
Labrador
Lucas
Messer
Pittenger
Pocan
Posey

□ 1856

Messrs. SCHWEIKERT, MCKINLEY, and AMASH 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.

SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST LAND EXCHANGE 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. 3115) to provide for a land exchange involving Federal land in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Weeks Law, 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 Colorado (Mr. TIP-

TON) 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 309, nays 99, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 639]

YEAS—309

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Blunt Rochester
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kihuen
Kildee
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Eshoo
Estes (KS)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick

Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Suozzi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)

NAYS—99

Adams
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brownley (CA)
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cohen
Cole
Connolly
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Ellison

NOT VOTING—25

Black
Bridenstine
Butterfield
Castor (FL)
Conyers
Delaney
DeSantis
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler

Kennedy
Labrador
Lucas
Messer
Perry
Pittenger
Pocan
Posey
Renacci

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

□ 1904

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

CONGRATULATING THE EDEN PRAIRIE EAGLES

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Eden Prairie boys football team for winning their 11th

Minnesota State championship this last week.

The Eagles prevailed 38-17 in the championship matchup. They finished their 2017 season with an undefeated 13-0 record.

Eden Prairie was led by senior running back Solo Falaniko, who rushed for 90 yards on 22 carries and scored a touchdown, as well as senior all-purpose Antonio Montero, who had 58 yards rushing with three touchdowns.

Mr. Speaker, it takes commitment, perseverance, and hard work to become State champions. It is even more impressive, considering that these team members and student athletes consistently and successfully balance schoolwork and other extracurricular activities with their athletics. That is why I commend these athletes.

Congratulations to the players, the coaches, the parents, and all the fans of the Eden Prairie football team on your State title. Our entire community is very proud of your accomplishment.

Go Eagles.

HONORING THE WISHES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, recently, I met with a group of engineering and nursing students from Rutgers University. These young people have worked hard to get an education so they can help communities in need, but they came to the Nation's Capital asking for help that only Congress can provide.

These bright young minds are not U.S. citizens; they are what we call DREAMers. Each day that passes without Congress voting on the Dream Act darkens their futures. Like the 20,000 other DREAMers in my district, these are young people who fear that they will be detained and deported to places they have never seen or known before.

Mr. Speaker, the holiday season is supposed to be a time of joy and celebration, not fear and uncertainty. I implore my colleagues to honor the wishes of the American people and do the right thing by history. Let us finally pass the Dream Act.

MOURNING THE LOSS OF BORDER PATROL AGENT ROGELIO MARTINEZ

(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, as most of us were sitting down for our Thanksgiving meal with our turkey and dressing, there was an empty chair at the Martinez home because, just a few days before Thanksgiving, 36-year-old Texas Border Patrol Agent Rogelio Martinez was killed manning Texas' often violent southern border.

Initial reports indicate Martinez and his partner were ambushed by a group

of illegal immigrants attempting to cross into the United States. The illegals began throwing rocks, hitting the two officers over and over again. Both agents suffered broken bones and major head trauma. Martinez's partner is still in the hospital in critical condition.

Agent Martinez was killed by those seeking to enter the United States illegally by whatever means possible, ultimately, by killing him. The FBI is still investigating the homicide and seeks to bring those responsible to justice.

Rock throwers are not that uncommon on the Texas-Mexico border. Since 2003, 39-39—border patrol agents have been killed while on patrol.

Our agents are outmanned, outgunned, and sometimes outfinanced by the drug cartels trying to enter the United States. Our border protectors deserve our total admiration and support.

We mourn the loss of Border Agent Martinez. May God bless his family.

And that is just the way it is.

TAX PLAN RAISING TAXES ON MILLIONS OF AMERICANS AND EXPLODING THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, this Chamber passed a tax plan that would raise taxes on millions of Americans and explode the deficit. Now the Senate is having its turn. Their proposal would devastate working families through tax hikes and undermine Americans' healthcare through the stealth repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Just as the House Republican plan included a huge middle class tax increase, so does the Senate's. By 2027, 82 million middle class households would see a tax increase.

But the damage of the Senate plan goes beyond that. It would cut Medicare by \$25 billion next year alone and add \$1.4 trillion to the deficit, and it would destabilize healthcare for millions of Americans.

The Senate plan would leave 13 million more Americans without healthcare, while those keeping theirs would see premiums jump up by 10 percent per year for the next decade.

Republican Senators have already spoken out against this bill. The truth is we all should.

CONGRATULATING NEEDVILLE LADY BLUE JAYS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, it first happened in 1975, then 1976, 1977, and 1992. The fifth time was November 18, 2017, 2 weeks ago.

The Needville Lady Blue Jays won the Texas State volleyball champion-

ship. One word describes our Blue Jays, and that word is "domination." They swept the playoffs, losing 1 out of 22 sets.

All of Texas 22 is proud of our coaches—Schultz, Bradford, and Smyers—and the stars who took us on the drive for five: Janssen, Sydney, Kailey, Peyton, Hayden, MacKenzie, Kaitlyn, Samantha, Anna, Baley, Madison, Evan, Treasure, and Maddy.

Mr. Speaker, get ready, number six is coming in 2018.

Go Blue Jays.

□ 1915

CONGRATULATING TROY HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Flying Horses of Troy High School football team for an extraordinary achievement: winning a second consecutive New York State Public High School Athletic Association Class AA State Championship.

Troy's Flying Horses are the first team in section 2 history to accomplish back-to-back undefeated seasons and State championship wins.

Their 41-26 championship win this past Sunday over an impressive Lancaster Legends team showed the dedication and heart of each and every one of the players, their families, and their coach—their supercoach—Bobby Burns.

On behalf of countless proud fans and supporters throughout New York State's capital region, I wish the players great success in all of their future endeavors. I, again, congratulate them and salute their passion, their dedication, and their sportsmanship. They are, indeed, an inspiration to all of us.

RECOGNIZING LARRY HANSON

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Larry Hanson's 42 years of public service, including 22 years as the longest serving city manager for Valdosta, Georgia.

Members of the Valdosta City Council say that appointing Mr. Hanson to city manager was one of the most important events in recent history for the community.

One of Mr. Hanson's first initiatives after becoming city manager was to hire a new police chief, fire chief, city engineer, and reorganize the entire city marshal office. A testament to his efforts, he received countless awards, including Outstanding Public Official and Georgia Trend Magazine Excellence in Public Service.

On December 8, Mr. Hanson will officially retire from his position as Valdosta city manager. The next city

manager will certainly have large shoes to fill.

In Mr. Hanson's next move, he will become the executive director for the Georgia Municipal Association, overseeing 500 Georgia cities, which I am sure will benefit from his assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Larry on his years of public service, and best wishes for his future endeavors.

NATIONAL DAY OF GIVING

(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, today is Giving Tuesday, a global day dedicated to giving back.

Last week, we celebrated Thanksgiving, and families across the country gathered to celebrate and give thanks for all their blessings.

Today, on the National Day of Giving, many come together for a common purpose: to celebrate generosity and to give.

Giving Tuesday kicks off the charitable season when many focus on their holiday and end-of-year giving to worthy causes. Charitable giving is a force for good, which is why the tax reform package, approved by the House, maintains this important deduction.

Charities, families, businesses, community centers, and people around the world will lend their time or their personal resources to philanthropic efforts across the Nation.

Giving Tuesday also brings together the collective power of a unique blend of partners—nonprofits, civic organizations, businesses and corporations, as well as families and individuals—to encourage and amplify small acts of kindness.

As a global movement, Giving Tuesday unites countries around the world by sharing our capacity to care for and empower one another. That is something we can all celebrate.

RECOGNIZING ERIN HAMLIN

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Erin Hamlin, a hardworking and outstanding constituent of the 22nd Congressional District, who has just qualified for her fourth consecutive Winter Olympic Games.

Erin hails from a beautiful hamlet in Oneida County, known as Remsen, New York.

Erin started her career in luge in 2005. Her first major international victory was achieved in 2009, in Lake Placid, at the World Luge Championships, where Erin earned a remarkable gold medal.

At the 2014 Sochi Winter Olympics, Erin became the first American ever—both male and female—to medal in a

singles luge competition when she brought home the bronze for Team USA.

Next year, Erin will represent Team USA in South Korea by again competing in the singles luge competition.

Please join me in wishing the best of luck to our hometown rock star Erin Hamlin and all of Team USA in next year's Winter Olympic Games in Pyeongchang, South Korea.

TAX REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMUCKER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about a bill that poses a great danger to our country and a great danger to our people, particularly our people who are struggling, who are living from paycheck to paycheck, because this bill, contrary to the assertion of our Republican colleagues, will not help them, and we are going to talk about that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee, and my friend.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our whip for trying to whip some common sense into this debate.

I want to focus on the claims of the Republicans that this is a middle class tax cut. Halloween is over, but the masks of the Republican are still on. I think the largest and the most dangerous one is the claim that this is a middle class tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote the President: "It is a tax bill for middle class."

Again, the President: "We will cut taxes tremendously for the middle class—not just a little bit, but tremendously."

The Speaker: "The focus is on middle class tax relief."

The chairman of the committee: "The truth is this is whole tax reform is designed for the middle class family that is working so hard or that Main Street business that is working so hard."

The majority leader in the Senate:

To keep growing again, like we need this code to do, to get new jobs, opportunity, and significant tax relief for the middle class.

Mr. Mnuchin: "On the personal tax side, middle-income people are getting cuts and rich people are getting very little cuts or, in certain cases, increases under the Republican bills."

Mr. Mnuchin again: "Any reductions we have in upper income taxes will be offset by less deductions, so there will be no absolute tax cut for the upper class."

Senator HATCH: "Tax reform will provide relief and bigger paychecks to low- and middle-income families, make America a better place to start and grow a business, and allow American

businesses to compete in the global marketplace."

The Joint Tax Committee and other entities have shown that this is not at all a middle class tax cut. The main beneficiaries are the very, very wealthy.

Also, in terms of passthrough, there is so much talk that this will help the small-business person. The truth of the matter is that the vast majority of the benefit for passthroughs is going to go to the very wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. HOYER has been taking the lead on this and I salute him.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to close by saying one thing about the deficits. You know, I don't think they called Mr. HOYER a deficit hawk because he always wanted a balance, and he always said: "Look, deficits by themselves aren't the only issue, but they are deeply relevant."

Mr. HOYER and I have stood together with others. When bills came up, which seemed so attractive, but were unpaid for, hundreds of billions of dollars, we said to the Republicans and anyone who voted with them: "You are increasing the deficit, and it is very risky."

Mr. Speaker, as true as that may have been—and Mr. HOYER and I thought it was some years ago, or last year included—it is now even more relevant and more dangerous because here we have a proposal in the House and it is going to be duplicated in the Senate. It is going to increase the deficit at least \$1.5 trillion, and the notion is it will be taking care of growth.

Mr. Speaker, I close by saying maybe that is the second biggest Halloween mask on the bill here and in the Senate. The notion of "Don't worry about tax losses all of a sudden, don't worry about the deficit increasing, because growth will take care of it," we have seen that mask before.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to join Mr. HOYER, but also to salute him for his dedicated and endless determination to really talk sense and talk the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HOYER for yielding to me.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind comments and for the information he gave. As a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee he is, I think, as knowledgeable about the history of these tax cuts as anyone can be, so I thank the gentleman for joining us in this effort to educate our friends and colleagues and the American public on the consequences of this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. And I will keep doing it.

And now Mr. HOYER is going to yield to another champion who has worked how many years on these issues?

Don't say it is a long time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Several.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), one of the senior members of

the Ways and Means Committee, who has been very focused on sound tax policy, on policy to save Social Security for generations yet to come, who is one of the more responsible leaders in this House, and my friend.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Democratic leader for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan for joining us here.

As Mr. HOYER stated at the outset, this is a very dangerous bill and a very dangerous precedent for this body and the other body and for Congress in general.

It was Lincoln who said: "A House divided cannot stand."

And in this bill, when you pit the sick against the well, the poor against the wealthiest 1 percent, blue State against red State, small business against large corporation, you begin to see the inequity in the bill.

RICH NEAL, the lead Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee, lamented that this was a lost opportunity—a lost opportunity because there was ample time to come together both in the committee and here on the floor to do something constructive for the country, put the Nation back to work, and resolve issues that President Obama had put forward that I know have been on the front burners of everyone's concern to get lower taxes, and greater fairness in equity across the board, but that didn't happen.

Now, much is said about process, and people pooh-pooh that, but here are the facts:

It was Ronald Reagan who said: "The facts are a stubborn thing."

Back in 1986, the last time we impacted policy of this nature, the Ways and Means Committee, in fact, had 30 hearings in the committee, 12 subcommittee hearings, 450 expert witnesses, and 26 days of markup before it came to the floor for debate.

□ 1930

It was done bipartisanly, in fact, done between Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill because they knew that this would be the best way to get cohesive, comprehensive tax reform.

That is not what happened here. There were zero hearings in the committee on this bill, zero subcommittee hearings, no expert witnesses, not a single person from the State of Maryland or Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Commissioner of Revenue Services from the State of Connecticut that details factually, not based on averages, what happens to people in States who use itemized deductions like the State and local property tax deduction, like medical deductions, et cetera, all of which have a direct impact on them, all of which are going to find our citizens paying more money, in fact, not getting a tax cut, getting a tax increase so they can pay for lowering the rate of an individual who is already receiving \$11 million from an estate tax gift.

NOVEMBER 8, 2017.

Hon. JOHN B. LARSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LARSON: Thank you for opportunity to comment on the federal tax changes being considered in H.R. 1. We appreciate your leadership in trying to set the record straight as this partisan effort is rushed to judgment with no real input and much fiscal uncertainty.

Unfortunately, what we see so far from a national and state perspective is very troubling. Some of the proposals to reduce taxes on corporate and pass-through business income could provide needed economic stimulus nationally and for states like Connecticut. Unfortunately, on balance, H R. 1 is fundamentally flawed:

Even the low estimate of a \$1.5 trillion cost is not paid for and is really massive federal tax deficit spending. The nation has been down this road before and surely we should have learned something from the worst economic recession in modern times.

Otherwise unaffordable tax cuts have long been part of a political strategy to "starve the beast." Due to its long term unfunded cost, this Republican tax plan will compel big cuts in federal funding, such as Medicaid, that are important to states like Connecticut.

Contrary to all the talk of a "middle income tax cut," the plan actually represents a huge windfall to the very wealthiest federal taxpayers and is truly regressive. For our own state of Connecticut, over 75% of the tax cut goes to the top 1% who would pay 8.5% less on average. Everyone else would see a trivial 1.2% reduction in federal tax liability and many will actually owe much more in federal income taxes.

As discussed more specifically below, the proposed plan shifts most of the tax cost and the least of any tax benefit to states in the Northeast, Great Lakes and West Coast regions of the country. Thus, Connecticut and similar states will even more disproportionately pay in federal taxes far more than is received in federal benefits—further subsidizing regions of the country where states make far less of a state and local tax effort.

Drilling down a bit further, several aspects of this partisan plan will hit especially hard: Eliminating deductibility of state income tax paid is worth an estimated \$8.7 billion to mostly 1 middle income Connecticut taxpayers

Capping deductibility of local property tax paid at \$10,000 will increase federal income taxes for a significant proportion of Connecticut taxpayers who claim \$4.9 billion.

Any benefit to lower and lower moderate income taxpayers from higher standard deductions and child care credits will likely be more than offset by the shell game of imposing a higher lowest rate bracket of 12% and replacing the current \$4,050 personal exemption with a \$300 deduction that is proposed to end in 5 years.

Eliminating deductibility of medical/dental expenses will be \$1.6 billion hardship for Connecticut taxpayers at all levels who are out of work and have catastrophic medical costs.

Eliminating deductibility of student loan interest only adds a further financial burden for primarily younger taxpayers and their families already struggling with educational indebtedness.

Sadly, these and many other significant issues of fiscal irresponsibility and tax unfairness seem to be of no concern in the partisan rush to pass legislation before taxpayers see through the slogans and realize the costs. Indeed, glimpses of what may be in the Republican Senate version suggests that it will only get worse. Thank you for your ef-

forts to speak out for our Connecticut taxpayers and set the record straight.

Sincerely,

KEVIN B. SULLIVAN,
Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, if that weren't the cruelest cut, what is built into this legislation, and it is why process matters, because of the way this bill came to the floor through budget reconciliation primarily so the other body can get around their other arcane rule of cloture, but so that they could pass something with the minimal amount of votes.

So no hearings, no expert witnesses, and only a minimal amount of votes—51 in the Senate—to pass a bill.

I say that because there is a trigger mechanism here that the gentleman from Maryland knows better than anyone else in either Chamber called PAYGO, PAYGO provisions that he fought for to make sure were in the bill because of our ongoing concern about staggering deficits. It is why most people call for this bill minimally, including most Republican economists, to be revenue neutral. We would add that it be distributionally neutral as well so that it doesn't impact the middle and the lower classes.

But this bill here, the cruelest cut of all is that it triggers an automatic response that will result in a \$25 billion cut to Medicare. Nobody at home recognized this. Many people in this Chamber didn't even know that it existed because there were no public hearings, there were no expert witnesses. This was jammed through so that people could achieve a political win.

How about we focus on the American people winning for a change and doing something that is not going to put them in jeopardy?

I wondered why so many on the other side had professed to be concerned about the deficit but turned a blind eye as we passed what amounts to be \$2.3 trillion in new deficits. Then it dawned on me. This provision that is in there would allow sequestration to go forward without a vote and would cut Medicare by \$25 billion. I have asked people when we have held forums back in our district. People are writing, people are calling, people are calling their Senators in an effort to stop what is a blind, dangerous precedent that would take \$25 billion out of a program that desperately needs this.

I know the gentleman from Maryland knows this better than most. I know the State of Maryland, like the State of Connecticut, also itemizes deductions, and I believe it leads the country in that because, as they noted back in 1913, it would otherwise be double taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for allowing us the opportunity to come down here and speak to the dastardly nature of this bill and what lies ahead, and I thank him for his continued leadership in making sure that we wage this fight in every way to the end until we are able to stop that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his comments and particularly highlighting how the majority party, in considering this legislation, cut out the public entirely.

Speaker RYAN, when he took the speakership, talked about transparency. He talked about regular order. He talked about doing things so that the people would know what we are doing.

Not only were there no hearings in the House, not only were there no witnesses in the House, as the gentleman knows, there were no hearings in the Senate, there were no witnesses in the Senate.

In a short timeframe, the Republicans are trying to pass a massive increase in the national debt so that, in effect, as the gentleman knows, they say they are cutting taxes. I am going to talk about how that is not really true. Particularly for the middle class it is not true. But they are substantially raising taxes on every one of the children in this country who will become more indebted and in their time will have to pay back the money that is borrowed to give this tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for highlighting those very important facts and I thank him for his service on the Ways and Means Committee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of my Special Order, as we have seen, is the very dangerous tax bill that this House passed and that the Senate is now considering. In fact, of course, the Senate bill is worse than the House bill, if one can imagine that.

On November 16, the Republican majority in this House passed a bill to raise taxes on 36 million middle class households and place our country another \$1.7 trillion in debt.

Now, you will hear \$1.5 trillion and you will hear \$1.7 trillion.

What is the difference?

The difference is about \$200 billion that we will pay in interest to others to effect this tax cut. So not only is it going to be the \$1.5 trillion immediately impacted by the tax cut itself, it will be the \$200 billion additional that we will have to pay to borrow the money to give the tax cut and, as I am going to point out, give that tax cut essentially, for the most part, to the wealthiest enterprises in America.

227 Republicans voted to do that to their constituents. Every single Democratic representative who was present, joined by 13 Republicans, did what, in my opinion, many of their colleagues wanted to do, but for political reasons, not policy reasons, chose not to do.

They did so, Mr. Speaker, following impassioned remarks by Majority Leader MCCARTHY and by Speaker RYAN. Both addressed this House and the American people and claimed to be pushing these tax bills in order to help the working people of our country, a worthy objective, an important objective.

Perhaps one could justify this extraordinary escalation of the national debt, probably the largest increase in the national debt of any single bill that has been passed. They cited struggling families and the need to provide a leg up to those in our middle class. Those, of course, are very resonant messages, very important messages. Frankly, we ought to be talking about how we create jobs, not debt. They are being employed to sell a tax plan that would do exactly the opposite of what they say.

In his speech on the floor, Speaker RYAN lamented: "Seventy-eight percent of our workers in this country today are living paycheck to paycheck. . . . Instead of thinking about getting ahead, families are struggling just to get by."

He is right about that and he is right to be concerned about that. What he is wrong in is his response.

Those living paycheck to paycheck will be the ones hurt the most by this tax scam. Let me repeat that. The Speaker talks about those living paycheck to paycheck. That concern is an absolute legitimate concern for every one of us in this House and every Member of the Senate.

Unfortunately, he has offered a bill, however, that will hurt the very ones he says that he wants to protect. They will see their taxes go up over the next decade. In that same period, as middle class families are struggling to get by, they will watch the wealthiest get farther and farther ahead.

This is not about class warfare. This is about a judgment of who needs help, who needs lifting up.

He talked about the people who need lifting up. The problem is that he didn't lift them up. They will watch the wealthy be lifted up, and they are very high right now. God bless them.

Why, I ask, would the Republican tax plan take \$1.7 trillion away from our children and grandchildren and give 62 percent of it to the top 1 percent?

Mr. Speaker, the people get it. The people think this bill is not going to help them. That is what polls show, and they are right.

Under the Republicans' plan, it is wealthy individuals like Donald Trump who win, and regular working Americans and our middle class who are trying to get ahead who lose.

House Republican leaders cajoled their members. Cajoled is a very polite word. They pressured and they scared their members. They said: If you don't pass this bill, you are going to lose the election not because the people are for it, but because, as one Member said from New York, their donors demanded it.

They urged their members to vote for a flawed bill many of them did not want and that none of them believed would become law. They did that so they could hand the reins to the Senate to send back a version no one had yet read or contemplated. They put their House majority on the hook to accept whatever the Senate would pass word for word. We will see whether they do that.

That Senate bill that is now being considered would deeply harm middle class families, particularly those in congressional districts across the country where more taxpayers choose to deduct their State and local taxes, like my State and other States.

Dozens of House Republicans from such districts voted enthusiastically to move the process along. In other words, they voted against their taxpayers and for their party—party above people—to move it along by supporting the House tax bill with the promise that it would be improved in the Senate.

These members would be asked to make further concessions against the interests of their constituents to vote for the Senate bill, were it to come to this floor, because it is worse for their constituents, not better.

That is not how Congress is supposed to work, Mr. Speaker. That is not regular order.

The American taxpayers and American businesses seeking to grow in our economy have been asking Congress to enact tax reform that is bipartisan and permanent.

You heard Mr. LARSON talking about the 1986 bill. It was a bill that was worked out between President Reagan; Speaker Tip O'Neill; Chairman Dan Rostenkowski, a Member from the Democratic Party from Illinois; and the gentleman from Oregon, the chairman of the Finance Committee, a Republican.

The Republican bills in the House and the Senate can be called neither bipartisan nor permanent.

So what can we call them?

In his floor remarks before the vote on their House bill, Speaker RYAN called it: "The single biggest thing we can do to grow the economy, to restore opportunity, and to help middle-income families that are struggling."

That is not true, Mr. Speaker. However, it is the single biggest thing we can do to put our children and grandchildren further into debt. I have heard so many of my Republican colleagues stand on this floor and say that we cannot spend this money because our children will have to pay the bill, and they are right.

□ 1945

We have a pay-for problem, Mr. Speaker. We ought to be paying for what we buy. Here, we are not paying, we are borrowing \$1.5 trillion, as I said earlier, to give to some of our wealthiest citizens; for that is what their plan would do, raise taxes on the middle class today, and on our children and

grandchildren tomorrow, to pay for the wealthiest few to get tax cuts that they don't need and that won't grow our economy.

Let me stress, I think everybody in this room, everybody in the country, would like to be wealthy. This is not talking about penalizing the wealthy. It is simply to say: God bless you. You have done well, but we need to make sure that others do well as well.

The University of Chicago's Booth School of Business released a survey, Mr. Speaker, on November 21, just a few days ago, in which 42 expert economists were asked whether the Republican tax bill would produce the higher economic growth promised by its authors; 42 of the most prominent economists. Only one—only one—said that it would do so and, ironically, later admitted he had misread the question.

None of the 42, not one, agreed that the tax cuts for the very wealthy included in the Republican bill would eventually pay for themselves; and that is why we say, it is one of the greatest debt-creating pieces of legislation that any of us have considered.

Former Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin, who presided over the basis for 4 years of balanced budgets, so he has some real credibility on how to bring balance to our fiscal posture in America—he served at the time of historic budget surpluses. He pointed out this fallacy in his op-ed in *The Washington Post* on November 15. He said this: "The tax cuts," he wrote, "will not increase growth and, given their fiscal effects, would likely have a significant and increasing negative impact."

He went on to make several compelling arguments about the dangers of the Republican tax proposals. Mr. Speaker, I include in the *RECORD* a copy of his op-ed piece.

[From the *Washington Post*, Nov. 15]

OP-ED: THE REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN'S FIVE WORST DANGERS

(By Robert E. Rubin)

The deficit-funded tax cuts advancing through Congress are a fiscal tragedy for which our country will pay a huge price over time. While the details of the tax plan remain in flux, its fundamental contours will not change. Nor will its \$1.5 trillion of deficit funding, the amount stipulated in the recently passed budget resolution.

Perhaps it's hopeless to expect those in Congress who have long bemoaned deficits and the debt to oppose the plan. If, however, as a matter of conscience or renewed reflection they decide to take heed, here are the fiscal dangers posed by the plan.

To start, the tax cuts will not increase growth and, given their fiscal effects, would likely have a significant and increasingly negative impact. The nonpartisan Tax Policy Center's latest report estimated that, over 10 years, the average increase in our growth rate would be roughly zero, counting the crowding out of private investment by increasing deficits but not counting other adverse effects of worsening our fiscal outlook. The Penn Wharton Budget Model, using the same approach, estimates virtually no increase in long-term growth. Goldman Sachs projects an increase of 0.1 percent to 0.2 percent in the first couple of years and an average increase over 10 years of just 0.05 percent

per year, not counting any of the adverse fiscal effects.

These estimates reflect three underlying views held by mainstream economists. First, individual tax cuts will not materially induce people to work more. Second, corporate tax cuts will likely have limited effect on investment or decisions about where to locate business activity, given the many other variables at play. Third, deficit-funded tax cuts will have little short-term effect on growth, except perhaps for some temporary overheating, because we are at roughly full employment.

With no additional revenue from increased growth to offset the tax cuts' cost, the publicly held debt of the federal government would increase by \$1.5 trillion. An additional danger is that the actual deficit impact would be increased by abandoning the Congressional Budget Office's nonpartisan evaluation that has been used for decades by both parties in favor of partisan calculations by those pushing the tax cuts.

Adding \$1.5 trillion or more to the federal debt would make an already bad situation worse. A useful measure of our fiscal position is the ratio of publicly held government debt to economic output or gross domestic product, called the debt/GDP ratio. In 2000, the debt/GDP ratio was 32 percent. The ratio is now 77 percent. Looking forward, the CBO projects the debt/GDP ratio to be 91 percent in 2027 and 150 percent in 2047. After \$1.5 trillion of deficit-funded tax cuts, those future ratios have been estimated to increase to roughly 97 percent in 2027 and 160 percent in 2047. These estimates likely substantially understate the worsening of our fiscal trajectory. That's because they do not account for the increasingly adverse effect on growth of the difficult-to-quantify effects of fiscal deterioration.

Exacerbating our already unsustainable fiscal trajectory with these tax cuts would threaten growth in five respects. These are highly likely to be substantial and to increase over time.

First, business confidence would likely be negatively affected by creating uncertainty about future policy and heightening concern about our political system's ability to meet our economic policy challenges.

Second, our country's resilience to deal with inevitable future economic and geopolitical emergencies, including the effects of climate change, would continue to decline.

Third, funds available for public investment, national security and defense spending—a professed concern of many tax-cut proponents—would continue to decline as debt rises, because of rising interest costs and the increased risk of borrowing to fund government activities.

Fourth, Treasury bond interest rates would be highly likely to increase over time because of increased demand for the supply of savings and increased concern about future imbalances. That, in turn, would raise private-sector interest rates, which could also increase due to widening spreads vs. Treasuries, further reflecting increased concern about future conditions. And even a limited increase in the debt/GDP ratio could focus attention on our fiscal trajectory's long-ignored risks and trigger outside increases in Treasury and private-sector interest rates. The ability to borrow in our own currency, and to print it through the Federal Reserve, may diminish these risks for a while, as might capital inflows from abroad. But these mitigating factors have their limits; at some point, unsound fiscal conditions almost surely would undermine our currency and debt markets.

Finally, at some unpredictable point, fiscal conditions—and these market dynamics—

would likely be seen as sufficiently serious to cause severe market and economic destabilization.

We have an imperative need to address our unsustainable longer-term fiscal trajectory with sound economic policies. Few elected officials want to face this fact, but, at the very least, they should not make matters worse. We can only hope that responsible elected officials will prevent this irresponsible tax plan from being adopted.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, furthermore, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, a nonpartisan group, Speaker RYAN was flat wrong, flat out wrong, to say that their plan would ensure that "the average family at every income level gets a tax cut." The Joint Committee on Taxation says that is not true.

I presume the Speaker was misinformed, because taxes would go up on all income groups below \$50,000. Perhaps the Speaker misspoke.

Speaker RYAN said: "I am a chart guy."

Well, I like charts myself, Mr. Speaker, and I want to bring up this first chart. I will bring this a little closer so I can explain this.

The Speaker claimed that a family of four making \$59,000 would get a "\$1,182 tax cut in the first year alone." Well, now if you hear that, that sounds, I suppose, like a pretty good deal.

Unfortunately, for that family, their cut would shrink every year. This is the shrinkage. And then it would drop precipitously. By 2024, it would become a tax increase, increase, increase, increase. And, as you see, that increase escalates the 4 years: 2024, 2025, 2026, and 2027. So starting in the seventh year of this program, middle America, \$50,000, you get a tax increase.

But guess what? That is not what happens to the wealthiest in America.

It is even worse. The Speaker mentioned the family making \$59,000 a year, and what he said is: They get \$1,182 a year in a tax cut. What he didn't say is what the upper 1 percent get. They get \$1,198 per week—52 times more than the middle class families that the Speaker spoke about and lamented the fact that they needed more dollars in their pocket.

He didn't talk about the wealthiest. He didn't say what they got. I don't blame him because, in his bill, he decided to give \$1,198.52 a week to the wealthiest, and \$1,182 a year to that middle class family he says is struggling and living paycheck to paycheck.

What kind of fairness is that? What kind of rationale is that? What kind of real help to the middle class is that?

That is about, by the way, \$25 per week versus \$1,198.52 per week.

Speaker RYAN showed us a chart that highlighted how, under the House bill, those middle class families promised a tax increase get to see an extra \$1,182 in savings the first year. We put it down, and then we put 52 layers above that for the people in the upper 1 percent.

Under that same plan, as their cut shrinks—you saw that in the last

chart—the wealthiest taxpayers would see an average tax cut of \$1,198 every week. And it is even a wider disparity under the Senate bill. Now, that is a gulf of disparity, a gulf of unfairness, a gulf of not helping the average working person in America. But the Senate bill—the Senate bill—is even worse.

The Senate GOP tax scam would increase taxes on 82 million—remember I said in the House bill, 36 million middle class taxpayers got an increase? Well, the Senate has doubled that, actually more than doubled that. Eighty-two million middle class households will get a tax increase under the Senate tax bill.

And with substantial tax increases on 36 million middle class households over the next decade in the House bill, it is hard to imagine a worse plan, yet, somehow, Senate Republicans achieved it.

The Tax Policy Center, another non-partisan analytic group, found that, under the perverse structure of the Senate bill, sunseting individual benefits in a few short years, even as it offers permanent—get this, follow this. We are talking about—Speaker RYAN spoke from that rostrum, talked about these struggling Americans living paycheck to paycheck. He offered a bill, and the Senate is now doubling down on the proposal of making sure those struggling Americans got, over the life of this bill, less and less and less, and then finally, paid more and more and more, while the wealthiest had no cut.

The Tax Policy Center said that the sunseting individual benefits in a few short years, even as it offers permanent corporate tax cuts, 82 million middle class individuals and households will pay more in taxes than they would under the current system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make that point again. The Tax Policy Center says people are going to pay more under this tax bill, some 82 million of them, than they would under the current system.

On top of that, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has pointed out that, under the Senate bill, undermining the Affordable Care Act—so not only will their taxes be increased over the life of this bill, but 13 million Americans would lose their healthcare under the Senate bill—not the House bill, but under the Senate bill. And that is what the House is going to be asked to vote on. I hope the Senate doesn't pass that.

Mr. LARSON talked about sequester and the PAYGO Act requiring a \$25 billion cut in Medicare as a result of this bill. The Senate has added in there legislation to adversely affect the Affordable Care Act, which will adversely affect 13 million Americans; some of them may be the same people who get the tax increase, some may not. They would kick 13 million off healthcare.

So the Republican tax plan is not bipartisan, and it is not permanent tax reform. The way you achieve those, as I said at the beginning, is through bi-

partisan cooperation. But, as Mr. LARSON pointed out, there was no intention to do that, no intention to include the public, no intention to have markups over a period of time. They did have markups, but they were very short in duration, and no American had the opportunity to weigh in and give their opinion. There were no hearings, and there were less than zero witnesses. I guess there can't be less than zero. There were zero witnesses.

So the bill is not a tax cut. Speaker RYAN has also tried to describe it as a job-creator. Now, again, we are talking about, correctly, the folks in this country who are living paycheck to paycheck and having a hard time, and we need to help them. We need to work on creating them jobs.

By the way, there is no jobs bill that has been sent down here from the President, but they claim this is a jobs bill. As a matter of fact, they claim that it not only explodes the debt, costs taxpayers \$1.9 trillion, but it would create, they say, 890,000 new jobs.

Now, in order to create what they say are 890,000 new jobs—and, by the way, going back to Secretary Rubin, he does not believe that will happen. He is the one that led us to balanced budgets.

In fact, every one of those jobs, every single job is going to cost \$1.9 million to create. That is what the Speaker said. This is going to create 879 million, we are going to borrow \$1.7 trillion to do it. By golly, you could give everybody 100,000 bucks, and you would be way ahead of the game. But that is not what was done.

We are creating large, large debt, and we will not create the jobs the Speaker said. And if we did, they would cost \$1.9 million per job.

According to the conservative Tax Foundation, using the most optimistic model projecting economic growth so far presented, that may be technically true, over 10 years now.

But with a price tag of \$1.7 trillion in added debt over the same period, that means that each job would cost \$1.9 million, while 82 million working Americans, those struggling Americans of which PAUL RYAN spoke, would get a tax increase under the Senate bill—nearly \$2 million of added debt to create a single job. Nearly \$2 million of added debt to create a single job. So this clearly isn't a jobs bill either.

□ 2000

This has already been discussed, but let me reiterate the key point I made earlier.

It can't be called bipartisan. Republican leader after Republican leader after Republican leader has lamented the fact that we passed the Affordable Care Act without it being bipartisan. The difference, of course, was we had literally thousands of meetings, scores—well over 60—of hearings, amendments offered by Republicans and Democrats. It took over a year of consideration by the country, well vet-

ted—controversial, but well vetted. This bill has been rushed through without hearings, without any kind of consideration and input from the public—in 1986, 30 hearings; in 2017, zero hearings.

I am repeating what Mr. LARSON said, but it is important to understand the dramatic difference: a bipartisan bill with President Ronald Reagan and Speaker Tip O'Neill leading the way for bipartisanship and agreement on a bill that, by the way, was revenue neutral, it did not create any new debt, as opposed to the \$1.7 trillion—that is with a T, trillion—that will put every child in America deeply in debt for decades to come.

In 1986, 450 witnesses; in 2017, zero. Bipartisan support, yes; bipartisan support, no.

Markup, I mentioned markup. That is when you put the bill together, when you give it thoughtful consideration. You offer amendments. You try to perfect it. Twenty-six days in 1986; 4 days in 2017.

This is a bill of over 600 pages. I remember everybody saying how long the Affordable Care Act was and you possibly couldn't do it. Again, over a year and a half of consideration of that bill; 4 days, introduced, the next week markup, 4 days, on the floor.

I was here in 1986, Mr. Speaker, the last time we rewrote our Tax Code. That was a truly bipartisan process. I hope everybody read the remarks of Senator JOHN MCCAIN when he came back to the Senate and voted to move the process forward on the Affordable Care Act but then voted against the final product.

He voted, and he gave a speech in which he said, speaking to the president of the Senate:

Mr. President, I have been here for some period of time, and my experience has essentially been that, when we did things in a partisan way, they were neither lasting nor very good. But when we do things in a bipartisan way, they are much better and they are much more permanent. There is much more competence in that product that was reached in a bipartisan way.

Speaker RYAN made a point in his remarks about how long overdue we are for a tax overhaul, and he said it has been 31 years since we last did this. Now, of course, he didn't say: I was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for 11 months and didn't report out a single tax bill.

I am not sure why, but that was the case.

We did bipartisan in 1986. We did permanent tax reform. We did it together, and we did it in a way that was paid for. That is not what this is. Neither the House bill nor the Senate bill achieves those key aims.

The Republican tax overhaul process is dangerously flawed precisely because it is partisan, because it rejects the benefits of compromise in favor of the pitfalls of expediency.

I called it, in my speech in opposition to its adoption, "reckless and feckless." It was reckless because it would

heap that \$1.7 trillion with a T, \$1.7 trillion of additional debt on our party, on our country, on our children, on our people. Bob Rubin, in that column which I referred to, said that that debt would undermine expansion because it would rob the capital markets of money that could be used to build small businesses and to build medium-sized businesses and invest in large businesses to create and keep jobs.

It is feckless because the same people who used to call themselves fiscally responsible—Senator MCCONNELL, Speaker RYAN, Senator HATCH, others whom I could name—have all stood on the floor of the House or in a press conference and said we need to have the debt reduced, and yet they offer a bill that adds \$1.7 trillion to the debt; feckless because the same people who used to call themselves fiscally responsible are now choosing to ignore fiscal sustainability in favor of a short-lived political win.

This is not about policy. It is about politics. It is about appealing to a relatively small group of very, very connected people, but it is our country that will lose.

I told people during that speech that I have been in office for some time. I served in the State senate and now in the House. It takes no courage—no courage—to vote for a tax cut. What takes courage is to pay for what you buy, whether it is national security, which I support, whether it is education, which, if we don't invest in, our country will not be great. It is great in part because we have invested in our education system.

Unless we invest in the health of our people, which is the health of our society, we will not be great, and unless we invest in the security of our people domestically, in law, in order, enforcement, in protection for our people.

It will not be great unless we invest in basic biomedical research to make sure that the diseases that exist now and that may exist in the future can be met with medical cures and palliatives.

We will not be great if we sink our country deeply, deeply, deeply into debt and do not have the courage to say, in this generation, we will pay for what we need and not simply buy and pass the debt along to our children and to our grandchildren, because that is what we are doing in this tax bill.

It is not only an intellectually bankrupt policy, it is an immoral policy that we pursue. As the Senate version takes shape, Mr. Speaker, Republicans who voted grudgingly for the House bill ought to be deeply concerned; and I hope, for the sake of their country, they are good people.

There are good people on both sides of this aisle. There are conscientious people on both sides of this aisle. There are Americans on both sides of this aisle, Americans who have sworn to protect and defend the Constitution of our country and have, as well, sworn to protect the people of this country.

There ought to be deep concern among people of good conscience, con-

cern that it does not meet the very same criteria that Speaker RYAN set forth in laying out what tax reform ought to achieve and what he claimed their House bill achieved. Neither does it adhere to the Speaker's clear promise not to package together separate matters into the same legislation.

Make no mistake, the Senate bill House Republicans will be asked to vote for isn't just a tax hike for the middle class, although that it is. It is also a repeal of a significant component of the Affordable Care Act, which will hurt that same middle class. It may have been difficult for Republicans to cast their votes for vague promises on November 16, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, it will be even more difficult to do so for a legislative product that puts their constituents, those the Speaker talked about struggling just to get by, people who, if they have a \$500 debt, are not sure they can pay it, it will affect those folks and put them in even greater danger should the Senate bill make it back to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to reject this bill. I urge my colleagues in the House to look deeply into their souls and not at their polls and reflect upon what they are doing to their country by perpetuating the fiscally irresponsible policies of borrowing, of borrowing, of borrowing and not having the courage to pay this generation's bills now and not pass them along to our children and to our grandchildren.

Every Member of this House and of the Senate, Mr. Speaker, ought to look themselves in the mirror and say: When I gave those speeches, when I referenced that to the press, was I being honest? Am I following a policy today that is consistent with that assertion? I think they will come to the inexorable answer: No. If I vote for this tax bill, I am not.

Therefore, I hope that all of us will reject this partisan piece of legislation that vastly increases our debt, increases the taxes on middle class workers, threatens Social Security with a \$25 billion cut, and threatens our economy.

Let us have the courage to serve our people honestly and take the tough vote and then come together in a bipartisan fashion and do what we showed we could do in 1986: pass a bipartisan bill that, yes, makes our corporations competitive internationally and, yes, gives the bulk of the tax cuts to those who the Speaker referred to as struggling. They are the ones who need relief, and we could do that in a bipartisan fashion, and we can pay for it.

David Camp showed us the way. I didn't agree with all of his bill, but he showed the courage—a Republican from Michigan who was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—and put up a bill on tax reform that was paid for. The Republicans were in charge of this House and they dismissed it out of hand, too tough.

Mr. Speaker, let's do the right thing. Let's reject this bill.

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

□ 2015

ISSUES OF THE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we had a lot to be thankful for this Thanksgiving. Anybody who was in America, in the United States, has a lot to be thankful for. People are counting on us across the country to make sure we don't mess the country up because we have done a great deal of damage from Washington, much of it done by bureaucrats.

But the only way they can do it is when Congress relegates and delegates obligations that we should have to bureaucrats, especially unaccountable bureaucrats like those at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

It is time to get power back to where there is accountability. And there is a better chance of having accountability right here in Congress than there is in some agency, some bureau that thumbs its nose at the executive, legislative, and judicial branches and says: We are above the Constitution. We are above everything else in the country. We do what we want to, and nobody can say otherwise.

Well, they are finding out at the CFPB that that is not the case. Everybody in America has some accountability somewhere.

It makes me smile to hear friends from across the aisle talking about running up a deficit because I remember that talk in 2006, and we were properly excoriated on the Republican side of the aisle for running up a deficit of around \$160 billion more than we brought in. We were castigated. We were beat up in all kinds of ways, and Democrats were right.

Who would have ever dreamed that the people who were belittling Republicans for allowing a \$160 billion deficit would soon be so very proud since they had the majority in the House, the Senate, the Presidency, just a couple of short years later, they would have a \$1.5 trillion to \$1.6 trillion deficit?

We would be treated to the first 4 and the first 8 years in our Nation's history under a President during which the economy never grew up to 3 percent. It never grew up to 3 percent. It did not, the whole time the Democrats had the majority in the House and the Senate, those 4 years they had the majority in the House and Senate.

That time when they had the House, the Senate, and the White House, they managed to run up the debt higher than anyone has ever come close to before. But the good news for those who have forgotten that the talk of \$160 billion deficit being so outrageous before

they ran up a \$1.5 trillion to \$1.6 trillion deficit, those who don't remember those days can be reminded of those now as we begin to hear the rhetoric about the current proposed appropriation.

We passed all 12 appropriations here in the House. We did our work. It is time the Senate did their work. Now we are being told: Oh, well, you have got to get over all that stuff you did. All of that hard work, all the cuts to Planned Parenthood, all the things you did standing on principle down there in the House, you have got to forget about that because we don't work like that down in the Senate. We are just going to be lucky to fund the projects we are interested in. We have no interest in taking up the hard work that the House of Representatives did.

But it is time the Senate tried that. I think if they will look into the appropriation bills the House passed, they will find out we actually did some very good, solid, amazing work.

For some reason, before we ensure that the Second Amendment applies everywhere across the country that the Constitution meant for it to apply, we are going to take up a background check bill tomorrow. The abbreviation is NICS, which gathers information on people's backgrounds who want to buy a gun. Despite all of the inaccurate information that is often touted about the lack of background checks, of how you can order online or at gun shows, these kind of things, there are background checks when you order online.

It is really unfair to the gun stores who didn't actually make the sale, but anybody who orders a gun online still has to have the background check, and they still have to go in and pick it up at a store and meet the requirements of the law and the background check.

We have heard many times about how the background checks have prevented 3 million Americans who should not have guns from getting guns, but that is not true nor accurate. Apparently, the last year that the Obama administration decided to bless us with actual information about background checks, they reported that about 73,000 Americans were prevented from getting a gun on the first check under the law as it exists. There are five different checks. And because the first check does not take all of the information that someone buying a gun has to fill out, not the date of birth, not Social Security number, not any of the information that is replete on the document being filled out, none of that is used.

They take a phonetic—well, the pronunciation of the name and use the phonetic pronunciation to do a background check. That is why they have so many millions of hits since this has been going on is because if someone's name just sounds a bit like somebody else's, it comes up as a hit and an initial denial.

But then at each stage, each one of those five checks, more and more are found to not be the person who should

be prevented from having a gun. In the last year—we have data—I was talking to John Lott about this earlier this afternoon, but in 2010, there were 73,000 denials, approximately, of the ability to buy a gun.

As they went through each of those five checks, they found out that so many actually were not the person who should have been blocked from buying a gun. When the Obama administration got down to the bare facts, they found that out of about 73,000 initial denials, there were only 42 cases that were referred to be prosecuted for potential prosecution.

If I recall correctly, the Obama administration only prosecuted about a fourth of what the Bush administration prosecuted. So out of the 42—and I don't mean 42,000 out of 73,000, I mean 42.0 out of 73,000—the Obama administration only decided to get 13 convictions.

Mr. Speaker, there were 73,000 initial denials. It tells you the system doesn't work very well at all. It doesn't make sense that we would have a system that would use all of the information that somebody provides to look for hits of somebody who should not be able to buy a gun. Use the date of birth. Use the Social Security number. Use the information there to check to see if someone is ineligible to buy a gun.

Then we can get serious about better gun enforcement, especially since we now have a Department of Justice—except for the special prosecutor that is interested in just them, just us kind of justice—except for that special prosecutor's group, we do have a Department of Justice that truly is interested in doing justice.

So when it comes to background checks, yes, we will continue to have them, but I hope we make some needed changes in the law, and I also hope that we are able to pass a bill this week out of committee, get it to the floor, pass it out of here, and hopefully the Senate will do their job on it. But that would allow reciprocity for people who are allowed to carry a gun in one jurisdiction to be able to carry that gun across the country. It is something we are working on.

Mr. Speaker, I was so greatly encouraged seeing an article about Poland. Those people have always been such an independent-minded people, even though they have been yanked to and fro. Whether it is Russia, Prussia, Germany, they have had a difficult time—Austria. They have had a tough time. But they have always been independent-minded. As President Reagan and as the former Polish Pope noted, and as President Trump has noted, Poland, generally speaking, understands what people who go through the 12-step program understand. There is a higher power.

But by the grace of God, we would not have this incredible little experiment in self-government. We would never have lasted as long as we have. There are miracles where the divine

hand of God truly stepped in during the Revolutionary War, during the early days as a nation when we could have, and probably should have, fallen, one after another. As the Founders would say, divine providence protected this little experiment, and it is in trouble right now.

There are so many people who have been taught across the country that America is an embarrassment and owes the world an apology.

□ 2030

Bill Ayers and all of those who were hippies—not all of them, but so many of them who were hippies—found that, as terrorists like Bill Ayers was, they didn't get the results they were seeking by blowing up things or people. They got a lot more done by moving into universities, becoming tenured professors, and teaching future teachers an improper history and an inaccurate history of these United States so that now we have, we are told, half the people coming out of college thinking socialism would be a better way of living.

They don't understand. They have never thought it through. They don't look at what has really happened because they haven't been taught true history. They don't understand. They don't know that every time socialism—progressivism if you would rather call it that as so many in this body do—always failed and always will fail to the end of the age as long as there is jealousy, greed, avarice, and even common sense.

As I have mentioned here on the floor, the Russian farmer who said, "I make the same number of rubles here in the shade, if I am in the shade here or if I am out there in the sun, so I am in the shade," that explained why socialism does not, will not, and cannot ever work. It always fails.

The only way you can have it is where people share across from those according to their ability to those according to their need. What a lie. It didn't come from those according to their ability. Once socialism sets in, so does malaise. There is no incentive to work harder and harder except if you can get politically entrenched sufficiently, then those in political power. As a Russian college student told me back when I was a college student over there in the Soviet Union: In America, you can advance yourself by making more money and working harder. Here in the Soviet Union, we can only advance ourselves by stepping on others and trying to get political power by stepping on others.

This is a better system, even with all its flaws. Churchill said that capitalism is the worst form of government except for all the others. But it allows people to succeed or fail as they are driven to do. It is called freedom. We have had it. We have been losing it.

When the Democratic House and majority set up the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, they set up an

agency, a bureau, that didn't have to answer to Congress. They could violate the Constitution's Fourth Amendment and Fifth Amendment. They didn't care. They are all powerful. In fact, they are so full of themselves that they think no one can hold them accountable and they can do whatever they want. They don't need money from Congress. They get it from the Federal Reserve. They are a perpetual bureau that is not answerable to the President, to the Congress—not to anybody. They are finding out today that is not the case, but they sure thought it was.

When I was a felony judge, if the government wanted someone's bank records, they had to either get that person's permission or they had to come to a judge like me; and with either live or affidavit testimony sworn under oath, they had to prove that a crime was probably committed, that this particular person probably committed the crime, and that these bank records were needed because of the probable cause that existed from the evidence. I would consider the evidence and then decide if probable cause existed. If it did, I would sign the warrant, and the government only then could get the bank records.

Not so with the CFPB. They are in the protection racket. It is right there in their name, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. It is a protection racket like the mob used to be in. They got their money from the Federal Reserve, and they are here to protect us all.

So they gather up people's banking records and debit and credit card activities. Why? Because they are there to protect us from greedy, evil banks.

Some have said: Wait a minute, though. How about you just leave my privacy alone, and if a bank messes me around, then I will come tell you? You don't need to get all of my private records.

But since the CFPB has the unmitigated gall and arrogance to think they are totally unaccountable, they don't care what the Constitution says or what some court says. They don't need a warrant. They get whatever records they want to. Why? Because they are in the protection racket, out to protect us. You do what they say or they ruin you.

What a racket, not accountable to anybody. That has got to change. The President is doing what he can to change that. Thank God and thank President Trump, both. We have got a chance of reining in an unconstitutionally acting body. Fortunately, there is at least one judge who recognized that, and hopefully there will be more.

Those in Poland are amazing. As I continue to meet people who have lived in areas like Poland under the Soviet boot or who were alive during the ravages of World War II, those people here in the United States seem to understand more what is at stake right now than most any natural-born American. They know what it is like not to have

freedom. They know what it is like to have a government watch every move and tell you what you can or you cannot do and sometimes punish on a whim just to keep citizens terrified of the totalitarian government, a totalitarian government that has to exist in order for socialism, communism, and progressivism to exist.

In fact, when I was in college, I was doing research and saw back in the days, I believe it was around 1960, '61, in that time, that the Premier of the Soviet Union, Khrushchev, understood that, under the idea of communism or progressivism, everyone would share and share alike; and the ultimate form of that progressivism or communism or socialism would be, when there was no need for government, everyone just shared and shared alike from those according to their ability, according to their need. Everyone shared.

Of course, in the Soviet Union in 1960, '61, under Premier Khrushchev, it was indeed a very totalitarian country, not as bad as it had been under Stalin, but those millions and millions of Ukrainians who lost their lives when Stalin saw to their starvation, those who lost loved ones during that period of starvation at the hands of Stalin, they understand what freedom is and what it isn't. They understand the only way a progressive or communist or socialist can exist is you have got to have that totalitarian government forcing or taking money or goods away from those who earn them and work for them—created them—and giving them to those who did not.

So Khrushchev realized that, in the ultimate form of communism and progressivism, there is no government. So he appointed a committee or commission to study the issue and figure out how we eventually achieve that perfect state where there is no government and everyone is sharing and sharing alike. How do we get to that place?

They were always big on having 5-year plans in the former Soviet Union, so he thought perhaps this commission, this group of learned people, could set up the plan for how they could move forward each year until there was that state of perfection, there was no government, but just people sharing and working, working together, sharing together, sharing with those who had not and could not.

But as I learned from studying, Khrushchev eventually had to disband the commission. They realized there is no way you ever reach that perfect state of progressivism or socialism or communism. You can't ever achieve that in this world. There will always have to be a totalitarian government that has taken away people's freedom and tells them what they are allowed to do. That has been the direction of this government for years now: Let's lure people in to total dependence on the government, and then we get to tell them where they will live and what they will do.

Do you think that is a stretch? Look at what happened when the Democratic

House and Senate voted to take over all college loans. That is a lot of power. When the Federal Government takes over all college loans, it enables the Federal Government to get into an area of governance that the Soviet Union did. The friends I came to know that summer I was there, the government told them whether they were going to be allowed to go to college. They told them what they would study in college. They told them where they were going to go work when they finish college. They told them what they were going to do in that place that the government directed them to go.

Heck, there were 15 states in the former Soviet Union. You couldn't even cross the states without having a visa to go between the states. I was shocked by that.

But if you are going to have progressivism or socialism or communism, the share-and-share-alike mentality, spreading the wealth—as our former President liked to say: If you are going to take from the sweat of someone else's brow and give it to someone who did not earn it, you are going to have to have a totalitarian government.

When the Federal Government here in the United States took over all college loans, it put itself in a position of being able to say: Okay. We know, historically, what the Soviet Union did, and we like that kind of power, so here is what we are going to do.

□ 2045

You do this job or that job or go to this place and we will start forgiving that huge amount of debt you owe for your college loans that we are in charge of. That is power.

When the Federal Government takes over flood insurance, it gives the Federal Government the power to tell people where they can or can't live. Thank goodness we finally were allowed to reform the flood insurance. That is why—probably, the biggest reason—some of us didn't vote for the second swath of money for the disasters this fall.

There were no reforms that we were promised that would be there, like for the lady who said she had to rebuild her home in the same place 21 different times. There were so many homes the Federal Government has paid for since we took over flood insurance because, apparently, you had to build where your home flooded, even though you wanted to move elsewhere so your home wouldn't flood again. If you wanted the money, you had to rebuild right there.

That is what one lady was explaining. She didn't want to still be there, but she couldn't sell her lot with a destroyed, flooded home on it for enough money to build anywhere else. So she had to keep rebuilding where her home kept flooding.

We needed a reform so people could move and we wouldn't have to keep paying for people's homes over and over again in the same place. If they want to pay for private insurance and

live in the same place, fine. The Federal Government shouldn't be forcing people to build in the same place and keep them there as financial prisoners.

At least in the House, we finally passed some reforms recently. That was a good thing, and I am grateful we did.

Through all of these decades, for the last 100 years, the people of Poland understood what freedom is and they understood when they didn't have it.

I can recall back in the seventies being on a train coming—I believe it was—from Gradna, on the border between Poland and the Soviet Union, coming across Poland, which was considered to be one of the satellite nations over Soviet domination.

An American made the mistake of saying in the presence of a Polish gentleman: This land looks just the way it had for the last couple of days.

The man became outraged. He said: No, no. In the Soviet Union there are huge farms and you can't tell what is cultivated and what isn't because they are not farmed very well. You look out here at the farms in Poland and they are much smaller because we own our own farms and work our own farms.

He got very upset. I thought it was kind of a beautiful thing, how proud he was of his country, and the difference between a progressive or socialist-style government that rewards sluggishness. He pointed there in Poland to a place where their hard work actually showed.

We keep heading in the direction of the countries that have failed as they have tried this progressivism that always fails. It doesn't make sense to keep trying it. It never works. It didn't work in the New Testament. It didn't work for the pilgrims. It will work in Heaven, in a perfect world, in paradise, with no jealousy and everyone pulling the same direction, loving, caring. But in this world, it will not ever work.

In Poland—I was reading yesterday—their government leaders have come to the conclusion that life was better when they followed a Biblical example and had 1 day of the week where people rested and they were with their families. They went to church and they worshipped God. They found that is not a bad idea.

Now there are people in Poland in leadership positions who are saying: We have had 7-day workweeks, but families have suffered significantly. Maybe we should look back at that Biblical example of having 1 day of rest, 1 day together to worship; a day to be with family, a day to rest, and to love each other.

It seems like sometimes we get moving so fast that we forget the best things in life. It looks like that is what some of the Polish leaders are now saying.

They have also made clear to the EU that, just as President Trump has here, as leaders of a nation, a leader owes to that nation the protection that they were elected or hired to provide and

survive. Survival is supposed to be what the leaders are ensuring. Flourishing.

As a result of the policies we have seen change in the last 11 months, we now have had 2 months—1 month was a record for the last 8 years—but now we have had 2 months, as I understand it, where growth has gone over 3.4 percent in the economy. We can keep that up and continue to grow. We are going to have plenty of money to pay this country's bills.

In fact, the only way we will ever get out from under the massive debt we are about to leave and impart to our children and grandchildren is if we grow the economy sufficiently to grow our way out of that indebtedness.

I believe the Laffer Curve is true. It is a truth economically. If you tax up to a certain point, then at some point, the more you tax, the more you overburden the work, and there gets to be less and the economy is brought down, you end up yielding less as a percentage of what you were bringing in.

As Arthur Laffer explained to President Reagan and his aids, if the goal is to maximize Federal revenue, you want to hit that percentage of tax that encourages work and growth to the greatest extent, and then you will bring even more money in.

The trouble is, like in Ireland, when they dropped their corporate tax rate so low—apparently, in the eighties, tax rates were dropped—revenue starts flowing in better and better and Congress started spending. They did the same thing in Ireland. Record revenue comes in, even bigger record spending took place. We can't be doing that.

There is an article here today in The Washington Times by Dave Boyer: "Pence, commemorating Israel's birth, says Trump 'actively' seeks to move U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem."

We have had Presidents saying for years that they would move the embassy to the true capital of Israel. It has been the capital of Israel since King David moved it there about 3,000 years ago.

I know that there are some that are very upset and say: No, no, you cannot move the Israeli capital from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

Well, Jerusalem is the capital. But perhaps a compromise might be that, since we know when King David became ruler over all of Israel, he first went to Hebron—I have been there a few times. I have stood there at what is strongly believed to be the tomb of King David's father, Jesse. They think they found the small synagogue he created. It looks like that is what it was.

Hebron is where Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are all buried. In fact, Abraham made a big deal. He wanted to pay for the land where he and his family would be buried so that there would never be any question that it was their land where they were buried.

The town of Hebron is where King David first went and ruled over Israel for 7 years and 6 months. After 7½

years, he then moved the capital to Jerusalem. So I would be fine if we wanted to compromise and say: Okay, you need time to get used to the idea, then let's move the capital from Tel Aviv to Hebron and make that the capital of Israel for 7½ years, like King David did.

Then, following King David's example, after 7½ years with Hebron as the capital, move it to Jerusalem. That would give people time to get used to the idea.

I do want to make a comment. The Senate—at least some, but not all Senators—is dragging its feet on getting something passed in the way of tax reform. I was totally shocked to hear that some Senators were saying they wanted to have the corporate tax rate cut, put off, for a year. That seems crazy.

As someone who has been to China and met with different CEOs and asking, "Why did you move all these manufacturing jobs from America to China," I thought the answer would be labor unions, it would be over regulation.

Well, those were all problems for them, they said. But I loved hearing repeatedly corporate leaders saying: Our best quality control, our best workers were in America.

I loved hearing that. They seemed sincere. The reason we moved to China is because of the corporate tax rate being about half of what it is in China as compared to what it is in the United States.

They said: So we have saved so much money by more than cutting our tax rate in half.

What a corporate tax is, as Steve Moore said, which is such a great way to explain what it is: We like to say we are making the greedy corporations pay.

No. Actually, you are making their customers and clients pay.

If a corporation does not, whether it is subchapter S or a C corporation, pass those taxes on to their customers, their clients, they can't stay in business. So it is a part of the price of their goods and services.

I have advocated doing away with it. You will have so much more people working, so many more people making so much more money. The income taxes from the individuals will make up for it. It will be a beautiful thing. It is not a zero sum game. Everybody can do better and better and better.

□ 2100

It would be a beautiful thing to see the economy expand like that, and it could. We could get those jobs back. But a corporate tax, the corporate tax here in America is the highest tariff any nation puts on its own goods or services, anything made in corporate America. It is a tariff on our own goods.

Why do we do that? We could be so much more competitive around the world if the government didn't put this burden on corporations.

I was hoping that President Trump's figure of 15 percent that undercuts the Chinese at least a little bit would be even more incentive to bring back manufacturing jobs to America, because any nation, any powerful nation that does not produce what they need in a time of war—because there will always be wars—is not going to remain a powerful nation beyond the next war.

We need to be producing steel and rubber and all the things we need. We need to produce them right here in the United States. There is no reason we can't, but we drive those jobs away because of the corporate income tax.

President Trump had the right idea, 15 percent. He compromised, so it is at 20 percent. Thank goodness he didn't let them work him up any beyond that, but there are some in the Senate trying to work beyond that—huge mistake.

This economy can explode. It is already the top 3 percent, and it can keep climbing. Dr. Laffer tells me that after the final part of the 30 percent tax cut kicked in, in 1983, they hit over 7 percent growth in the economy. That is just unheard of.

There were people saying, in the Obama administration, you know, we will probably never ever hit 3 percent again. It may just be an impossibility. No, it is not. You get rid of the corporate tax or at least get it down to where we are not putting such an enormous tariff on our own goods and services, and that economy can grow like that again, and we can get our manufacturing jobs back.

An article here, Todd Starnes—he and I were both honored recently with an award that people like Tom Landry, Cal Thomas, and others have received for being Christians and speaking up for our faith, our beliefs. Todd Starnes, today, has this story: "Thank you, Mr. Trump, for bringing 'Merry Christmas' back to the White House," and I certainly echo those feelings.

It is amazing, this story from Maxim Lott, FOX News: "Media twist tax plan studies to claim it hammers middle class."

I have been hearing people here on this floor talking about how the tax proposal that we passed here in the House was going to hammer the middle class. Actually, the corporate tax cut alone will get the economy going so strong everybody is going to benefit. But I wish we had just had an across-the-board flat tax created: you make more, you pay more; you make less, you pay less. That is where I wanted to go. That is true reform.

But politics being what it is, because the Republican leadership did not want to have to fight a battle that, "Oh, we're just helping the rich," the highest tax rate is the only one we didn't change. The idea was, well, if the only tax rate we don't bring down is the 39.6 percent tax rate that the richest Americans have to pay, then the Democrats won't be beating us up. They won't be able to beat us up for raising taxes on

the poor and middle class to help the rich.

Well, they were wrong. Despite the fact that there will be more people now under the Republican tax plan that has passed here in the House—the Senate will just adopt it—there will be more people who will not be paying taxes. I kind of wish all of us, every American, had a little skin in the game. If they are making money, then they pay something. That is where a flat tax comes in. If you just make \$10, you only pay \$1. If you make \$100, you pay \$10. If you make \$1 million, you pay \$100,000. That is fair.

But anyway, we passed our bill. It gives a tax break to the poorest Americans. It is going to help the economy grow, but we have got to get it done. I am hoping and literally praying that the Senate keeps their elimination of the individual mandate from ObamaCare so that people have the freedom to get policies that are best for them and not something forced on them by the government.

And, yes, we know there will be unfair media that will do nothing but complain about millions who no longer have health insurance. Well, I can tell you, there are millions who are paying taxes now to the government because they can't afford an insurance policy that won't ever pay them because the deductible is too high, and they don't want to keep paying our income tax because they can't afford the ObamaCare policies.

There are people who are paying for ObamaCare policies where the deductibles are so high, they will never get any benefit. Yes, there is apparently a segment, a small minority who—maybe as much as 20, 25 percent—who, like in the Soviet Union, are getting their money from where somebody else has earned it, having that money pay for their insurance, some of that coming from people who can't even afford their own insurance. So they are paying higher income tax so this other group of Americans take their money from those working poor and pay for their insurance. What is fair about that?

Forcing the working poor in America to pay higher income tax or pay for policies where they will never get anything back because the deductible is too high; also, that some people who will vote Democrat will get their insurance for free, that is not the way America became the greatest Nation that it was and can be again.

And, yes, North Korea fired an ICBM today in the last 24 hours, and I am very grateful to President Trump for taking it seriously. I am so glad he is there. I am glad we don't have the same people who gave North Korea the ability to have nuclear bombs during the Clinton administration.

How foolish was it to basically say: Oh, look, North Korea, we will give you what you need to make nuclear weapons if you will just agree not to ever use those materials for nuclear weap-

ons. And, of course, the North Korean leader said: Sure, you do all that, all I got to do is sign. Sure, you give me all I need for nuclear weapons, I will sign saying I will never create nuclear weapons. And what do they do? They make nuclear weapons because that is what they do. That is what those leaders do. The people of North Korea deserve better. And Iran is the same way. They can't be trusted.

So we need a firm leader who understands enough is enough, and I am glad President Trump is that leader.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and November 29 on account of personal business in Oklahoma.

Mr. STIVERS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today through November 30 on account of his duties with the Ohio National Guard.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 29, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

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. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Supplemental report on H.R. 4182. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify probationary periods with respect to positions within the competitive service and the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-415 Pt. 2).

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3312. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3758. A bill to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1645. A bill to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to provide a temporary exemption for low-revenue issuers from certain auditor attestation requirements (Rept. 115-425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3093. A bill to amend the Volcker Rule to permit certain investment advisers to share a similar name with a private equity fund, subject to certain restrictions, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 995. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to amend regulations for racial appropriateness; with amendments (Rept. 115-427 Pt. 1). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2228. A bill to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. CHENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 631. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3017) to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to reauthorize and improve the brownfields program, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3905) to require congressional approval of any mineral withdrawal or monument designation involving the National Forest System lands in the State of Minnesota, to provide for the renewal of certain mineral leases in such lands, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-429). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 995 referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 4458. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to prohibit the use of public funds for the payment of a settlement or award under such Act in connection with a claim arising from sexual harassment committed by a Member of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4459. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the amount of certain qualified conservation contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 4460. A bill to improve the provision of disaster and mitigation assistance to eligible individuals and households and to eligible State, local, Tribal, and territorial governments and certain private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 4461. A bill to amend subpart 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend State court funding for child welfare,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 4462. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to prohibit certain reimbursements relating to disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MENG, Mr. KATKO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FASO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. REED, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 4463. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6 Doyers Street in New York, New York, as the "Mabel Lee Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4464. A bill to repeal the rule issued by the National Credit Union Administration titled "Risk-Based Capital"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. POLIS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 4465. A bill to maintain annual base funding for the Upper Colorado and San Juan fish recovery programs through fiscal year 2023, to require a report on the implementation of those programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 4466. A bill to provide funding flexibility to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, to grant authority to amend the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 4467. A bill to require the Federal air marshal service to utilize risk-based strategies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 4468. A bill to direct the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to study and report to the Congress regarding recreational vessel operator training; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4469. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to permit commercial filmmaking and photography on the United States Capitol grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4470. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a payroll tax exemption for hiring long-term unemployed in-

dividuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RENACCI, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. DONOVAN):

H.R. 4471. A bill to provide for the reporting to State and local law enforcement authorities of cases in which the national instant criminal background check system indicates that a firearm has been sought to be acquired by a prohibited person, so that authorities may pursue criminal charges under State law, and to ensure that the Department of Justice reports to Congress on prosecutions secured against prohibited persons who attempt to acquire a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 4472. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that it is unlawful to knowingly distribute a private, visual depiction of an individual's intimate parts or of an individual engaging in sexually explicit conduct, with reckless disregard for the individual's lack of consent to the distribution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 4473. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax credits to veterans for the establishment of franchises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 4474. A bill to enhance the security of surface transportation assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4475. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK (for herself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. POLIQUIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FASO, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. COHEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JONES, Mr. KILMER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SIRES, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mrs. HANDEL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. ESTY

of Connecticut, Mr. MEADOWS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BERA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. PAL-LONE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. BACON, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CORREA, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. MENG, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. FRELING-HUYSEN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. VELA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. BRAT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. FERGUSON, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WALKER, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SOTO, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. YOHO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HILL, Mr. BARR, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HURD, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BARTON, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. BURGESS):

H. Res. 630. A resolution requiring each Member, officer, and employee of the House of Representatives to complete a program of training in workplace rights and responsibilities each session of each Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. KINZINGER):

H. Res. 632. A resolution condemning the senseless attacks on hospitals and medical personnel in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. HURD, and Ms. SINEMA):

H. Res. 633. A resolution supporting the designation of “#GivingTuesday” and supporting strong incentives for all people of the United States to give generously; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 4458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 4460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 4461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to “provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.”

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 4462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 4464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 4466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia:

H.R. 4467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

[Page H3878]

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 4471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 4473.

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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 4474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4475.

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 this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 158: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 173: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 233: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 399: Mr. SOTO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 435: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 504: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 564: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 620: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 632: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 681: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 747: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 807: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 817: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 820: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 823: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 930: Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 947: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 949: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 997: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 1017: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. HUNTER, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1102: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1148: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1155: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. ROSEN.

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

- H.R. 1160: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1164: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
- H.R. 1178: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. GARRETT.
- H.R. 1192: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
- H.R. 1201: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. RUIZ.
- H.R. 1243: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 1267: Mr. RUIZ.
- H.R. 1406: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
- H.R. 1419: Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 1472: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. SCHRADER.
- H.R. 1481: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
- H.R. 1552: Mr. FASO.
- H.R. 1563: Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 1566: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 1733: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 1817: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 1825: Ms. TITUS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
- H.R. 1876: Mr. RUIZ.
- H.R. 1889: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
- H.R. 1905: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 1932: Ms. JAYAPAL.
- H.R. 1953: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 1972: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 2004: Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 2015: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 2068: Mr. SCHRADER.
- H.R. 2150: Mr. SHERMAN.
- H.R. 2158: Mr. MCEACHIN.
- H.R. 2161: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 2186: Mr. PERRY.
- H.R. 2224: Mr. WALKER.
- H.R. 2243: Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 2260: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H.R. 2327: Mr. WILLIAMS.
- H.R. 2366: Mr. CROWLEY.
- H.R. 2401: Mr. GOMEZ.
- H.R. 2556: Mr. BLUM.
- H.R. 2584: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. AGUILAR, and Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 2598: Mr. NADLER and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 2604: Mr. PERRY.
- H.R. 2616: Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 2666: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
- H.R. 2701: Mrs. LOVE.
- H.R. 2723: Mrs. HANDEL.
- H.R. 2735: Mr. BEYER.
- H.R. 2740: Mrs. DEMINGS.
- H.R. 2748: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. ADAMS.
- H.R. 2773: Mr. BERGMAN.
- H.R. 2790: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
- H.R. 2851: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
- H.R. 2902: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 2913: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 2920: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H.R. 2925: Mr. RASKIN.
- H.R. 2943: Mr. PANETTA.
- H.R. 2976: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 2987: Ms. HANABUSA.
- H.R. 3024: Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 3107: Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 3127: Mr. GUTHRIE.
- H.R. 3128: Mr. GUTHRIE.
- H.R. 3199: Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 3222: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 3265: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 3324: Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 3356: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mr. CICILLINE.
- H.R. 3368: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 3395: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
- H.R. 3415: Mr. ISSA.
- H.R. 3528: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 3533: Mr. PANETTA.
- H.R. 3541: Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 3596: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. WALDEN.
- H.R. 3641: Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. BUDD, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 3654: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 3692: Mr. MOULTON.
- H.R. 3712: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
- H.R. 3730: Mr. KIHUEN.
- H.R. 3751: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. KHANNA.
- H.R. 3754: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. ALLEN.
- H.R. 3759: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ESTES of Kansas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
- H.R. 3768: Mr. HIMES.
- H.R. 3784: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 3806: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 3812: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 3814: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
- H.R. 3864: Mr. KIND and Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 3867: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
- H.R. 3913: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 3923: Mr. WELCH and Mr. CLAY.
- H.R. 3939: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 3942: Mr. BARR, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SEN-SENRENNER, Mr. ROYCE of California, and Mr. ALLEN.
- H.R. 3968: Ms. ROSEN.
- H.R. 3975: Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 3976: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
- H.R. 3979: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
- H.R. 4007: Mr. CRAWFORD.
- H.R. 4022: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 4037: Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
- H.R. 4049: Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 4072: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 4077: Mr. LANCE and Mr. SARBANES.
- H.R. 4078: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
- H.R. 4082: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ and Mr. DEUTCH.
- H.R. 4101: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida.
- H.R. 4116: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. WELCH.
- H.R. 4117: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. WELCH.
- H.R. 4122: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H.R. 4131: Mr. ADERHOLT.
- H.R. 4143: Mr. BUCSHON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. CUELLAR.
- H.R. 4155: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FASO, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 4168: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.
- H.R. 4184: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 4190: Mr. MCKINLEY.
- H.R. 4207: Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 4229: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. MEADOWS.
- H.R. 4234: Mr. PEARCE and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
- H.R. 4238: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. MEEHAN.
- H.R. 4240: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 4253: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. LEE, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
- H.R. 4261: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. NADLER.
- H.R. 4265: Mr. COOPER.
- H.R. 4268: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. JAYAPAL.
- H.R. 4273: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 4274: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
- H.R. 4290: Mr. BEYER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 4300: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SIREN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. BERA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CRIST, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BASS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. LEE, Mr. PAL-LONE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
- H.R. 4306: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. SUOZZI.
- H.R. 4314: Mr. SUOZZI.
- H.R. 4328: Mr. BARR.
- H.R. 4339: Mr. DUFFY.
- H.R. 4363: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 4379: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
- H.R. 4384: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
- H.R. 4391: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. LEE.
- H.R. 4392: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TROTT, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GIBBS.
- H.R. 4396: Mr. BANKS of Indiana, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BACON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 4413: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
- H.R. 4424: Mr. COSTA.
- H.R. 4426: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BEATTY.
- H. Res. 15: Mr. KEATING and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
- H. Res. 220: Mr. UPTON.
- H. Res. 274: Mr. ROSKAM.
- H. Res. 283: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H. Res. 318: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H. Res. 393: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H. Res. 443: Ms. HANABUSA.
- H. Res. 445: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H. Res. 466: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H. Res. 570: Mr. COSTA.
- H. Res. 604: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico and Ms. GABBARD.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative GRIJALVA or a designee to H.R. 3905 the Minnesota Economic Rights in Superior Nat'l Forest Act, does not contain any

congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

67. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Council of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., relative to Resolution No.

22-285, urging the Congress to take appropriate action to inform the National Park Service and the General Services Administration that the statue of Albert Pike be removed; which was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2017

No. 193

Senate

The Senate met at 12:02 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable STEVE DAINES, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, You are the source of life and peace. Praised be Your Name forever. We know that it is You who can turn our thoughts toward peace and unity. Use Your power to transform our minds and hearts.

Lord, as our Senators face the challenges of today and tomorrow, give them a faith that will find opportunities in every adversity. May they cast their burdens on You, trusting Your loving kindness and tender mercies. Give them an understanding that puts an end to strife, mercy that quenches animosity, and forgiveness that overcomes resentment. May each day be for them a building block for making America a nation that glorifies You.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, November 28, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE DAINES, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DAINES thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Montana.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

Mr. DAINES. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY, DOCUMENT PRODUCTION, AND REPRESENTATION

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 343, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 343) to authorize testimony, document production, and representation in Arizona v. Mark Louis Prichard.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a request for testimony in a criminal action pending in Arizona State court. In this action, the defendant is charged with threatening to cause physical injury to Senator FLAKE and for trespassing on his Tucson, AZ, office. A trial is scheduled for November 29, 2017.

The prosecution is seeking in this case testimony from an employee in the Senator's office who witnessed the relevant events. The enclosed resolution would authorize that staffer, and any other current or former employee of the Senator's office from whom relevant evidence may be necessary, to testify and produce documents in this case, with representation by the Senate legal counsel.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 343) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. DAINES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S7337

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week many things will happen in Washington, but the focus in the Senate Chamber later in the week will be the Republican tax plan. It is a plan that has come upon us really quickly—in a matter of weeks—and it literally will affect the economy of the United States and virtually every taxpayer. There is hardly a measure we can entertain that has such broad and far-reaching impact on the future of this country and its economy.

What we are trying to do now is to analyze this plan. It has been put on a fast schedule. I can guarantee, as I stand here, that because of this hurry-up approach on tax reform, when it is all said and done, if anything is enacted into law, we can look back with regret for not having taken the time to do this carefully, not having measured the impact of any tax changes on individuals, families, and the economy, and, certainly, on our national debt.

So far we have a plan that was considered and passed by the House of Representatives, also on a fast schedule, and one in the Senate as well. The one in the Senate will be up for consideration this week. It is going to be a procedure, which was established in the Senate years ago, called reconciliation. For the outsider, it is a long word, which, by Senate definition, means that a simple majority vote is all that is necessary to pass this measure. It will not be subject to the traditional filibuster in the Senate nor to the need for 60 votes, as in most instances.

It was designed, in its inception, to be a way to reduce the budget deficit. Ironically, what we will see happen with the proposed Senate tax plan is an increase of our national debt instead of a reduction. But that seems to be the intent of the sponsors, and it is what we will consider.

We took a look at some of the proposals in the Senate Republican plan. It is no secret that this plan would bankroll massive tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America and the largest corporations, and it would raise taxes on middle-income families. If that seems like contrary thinking to what most Americans were looking for, it is.

Time and again we are told that the average American needs a helping hand. I certainly understand that in Illinois and across the Nation. This tax plan by the Republicans will not help working families. At best, it gives them a temporary tax cut, which later ends up as a tax increase.

However, if you happen to be among the wealthiest of Americans, there is good news in the Republican plan. There will be substantial tax cuts in permanent law. So the help for working families is temporary, the help for wealthy families is permanent, and the help for corporations is permanent.

To put it in perspective from the corporate point of view, we can understand those who argue that lowering taxes on businesses will incentivize them to expand their businesses. Yet there are a couple of things we have to acknowledge. As a percentage of the gross domestic product, corporate profits in America have never been higher. As a percentage of gross domestic product, corporate taxes paid have never been lower. Profits are at their highest, taxes are at their lowest, and the Republicans come to us and say: Well, clearly, what we need to do is to cut corporate taxes again. I disagree.

I asked Secretary Mnuchin at a hearing: Shouldn't our goal be to not only have a growing economy but to have more fairness in the economy for working families who continue to put in the hours and put in the work and watch their own wealth and their own income really fall behind against the expenses they face? Well, he agreed with my conclusion, but he couldn't explain how the Republican tax plan would meet that goal. I don't think it does.

I do not exaggerate when I say that this is a tax cut by the Republicans for the wealthiest. The nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation analysis of the Republican bill shows that by 2027, as corporations are enjoying a huge tax cut, on average, taxpayers who earn less than \$75,000 a year will see their taxes go up under the Republican plan.

You think: Oh, that must have been a press release from the Democratic National Committee. No, it was an analysis by the Joint Committee on Taxation, a nonpartisan group that we turn to in order to measure the impact of tax legislation. It is not the wealthy taxpayers, not a few taxpayers, not a couple of unfortunate exceptions; on average, taxpayers at every income bracket earning less than \$75,000 would see their taxes increase under the Republican plan.

How would the wealthy fair? Well, it is no surprise that under the Republican plan, the largest tax cuts under the bill go to the wealthiest households. I get a lot of letters and emails, telephone calls and contacts. There aren't a lot of rich people calling me and saying: We need a tax break, Senator. They are not asking for it. But they don't have to ask for it when the Republicans are writing a tax bill.

As Republicans throw huge tax breaks to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, here is what they do: They eliminate the alternative minimum tax, they lower the top income tax bracket, and they double the exemption for the estate tax. They go straight after a deduction that helps one-third of all taxpayers lower their

taxes—the State and local tax deduction. They cut that, but they give these tax breaks to people who are already millionaires many times over.

The Republican plan would eliminate the State and local tax deduction—a deduction that helps millions of middle-income families avoid being taxed twice on their hard-earned income—once at the State and local level and again at the Federal level. The State of Illinois is an example—and most other States—where people pay a State income tax. Currently, taxpayers can deduct that State income tax paid from any Federal tax liability. The premise is simple: You shouldn't be taxed on a tax. The Republicans turn that upside down. They would tax the tax you paid at the State and local level.

Eliminating this vital deduction makes it more expensive for families to fund local services such as schools, police departments, fire departments, and local roads and bridges. In my State, which has the fifth highest number of taxpayers claiming this deduction, nearly 2 million Illinoisans would no longer be able to claim more than \$24 billion in State and local tax deductions, as they did in 2015.

So what is the Republican motivation for eliminating this deduction that is so important for middle-income families? Well, that is how they pay for the tax cuts for those at the highest income levels, and that is how they help the largest corporations cut their tax bills.

This is wrong. If there was ever a question about who the Republicans are writing this plan for, look no further than the changes made during the committee session when they decided that they wouldn't stop at merely raising taxes on millions of middle-income families in order to pay for permanent corporate tax cuts, but they also were willing to raise families' health insurance premiums. It is not bad enough that tax bills are going to go up for most middle-income families. Under the Republican plan, they have devised a way to increase health insurance premiums at the same time. What a breakthrough.

Republicans can't help themselves. Even in the face of opposition from the American people, hospitals, patients, nurses, seniors, and faith leaders, their tax bill would pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent by repealing part of the Affordable Care Act.

This change alone means that 13 million Americans will lose their health insurance, and it means that the health insurance premiums paid by many others will increase by at least 10 percent a year—perfect. Not only are they going to raise taxes on working families, but they are going to raise the cost of health insurance for those buying policies and eliminate health insurance protection for 13 million Americans. Thirteen million Americans lose their health insurance, and millions more see their premiums spike—all to give corporations and the wealthiest people in America a tax cut.

To my Republican colleagues I ask: When is it enough? Haven't we helped the wealthy enough? At least for a day or two, shouldn't we focus on middle-income families?

Sadly, the threat to working families doesn't stop with a hike to their tax bill. In order to find even more money to fund tax cuts for corporations and the highest earners in America, Republicans agreed to add \$1.5 trillion to the national deficit—\$1.5 trillion. How many times have we heard Members of Congress—usually on the Republican side of the aisle—come to the floor and pose for holy pictures when it comes to the national debt? Well, they certainly have a lot of sermons to deliver when they have a Democratic President, but they suffer from political amnesia when they have a Republican President. Now they are going to add \$1.5 trillion to the national debt to give tax breaks to wealthy people and big corporations.

I have served in this body for many years. I have heard lecture after lecture from Republicans, until they are red in the face, about the importance of fiscal responsibility. I have listened to my Republican colleagues speak at length about the need for spending offsets. They wanted spending offsets for food stamps for hungry Americans. They wanted spending offsets for Hurricane Sandy victims when the hurricane hit the New York, New Jersey area. They wanted offsets for Meals on Wheels for seniors.

Where are these deficit hawks now? The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Mr. Mulvaney, who made a name for himself while in Congress railing against increasing the debt ceiling, is now advocating for the Republican tax plan saying: "We need to have new deficits." Spare me.

I have heard the calls from Majority Leader MCCONNELL, who once asked: "At what point do we anticipate getting serious here about doing something about deficit and debt?" Those are the words of Senator MCCONNELL.

To that Senator and my Republican colleagues I say: How about now?

So-called fiscally conservative Republicans are hiding behind widely debunked economic growth projections and the so-called "dynamic scoring," arguing that what looks like a \$1.5 trillion increase to the deficit will not actually be one.

The appropriately named "Laffer Curve" suggested that if you cut taxes on the wealthy, everybody gets well. It didn't work then, when he proposed it. It hasn't worked since, and it will not work now. Yet the Republicans find this as the only refuge for their increase to the deficit.

Over the weekend, however, it was announced that the Joint Committee on Taxation wouldn't have the time to produce a so-called dynamic score for the bill before the Senate.

So let me understand this. Not only did Republicans vote to explode the deficit, but now they don't want to

wait to see whether their weak defense for this fiscally irresponsible plan will actually work? This is hypocrisy. Maybe it is because Republicans know, as well as the American people, just how hollow their promises are on junk economics.

Do you want a preview of what dynamic scoring will hold? Last week the Penn-Wharton Budget Model released an analysis that shows that the Senate bill would fail the Republicans' own test, even when using their so-called dynamic scoring. Make no mistake, once this happens, Republicans will waste no time in making up the difference by calling for devastating cuts to America's vital programs.

The Republican budget even spells this out for us—where they are going to turn when their approach falls apart. Here is how they are going to do it. They are going to do it on the backs of hard-working Americans, with more than \$1 trillion of cuts in Medicaid, and—hang on tight—\$470 billion worth of cuts in Medicare.

The harmful impact to seniors and low- and middle-income families and some of the Nation's most vulnerable from these budgetary cuts apparently justify to them the \$1.5 trillion deficit hole they are going to create with this tax plan helping the wealthiest people in America.

Under our current law, known as the pay-as-you-go law, harmful cuts could start as soon as January, if this bill is passed.

Republicans are determined to have a "win" before the end of the year. That is because if you were suffering from insomnia and following the Senate business over the course of last year, you have to wonder why we were here. In the course of the year, two things happened of one moment. No. 1, there was filling a vacancy on the Supreme Court, and I will save my analysis of that for another day. No. 2, there was the passage of the Defense authorization bill. That is it—two things, 1 year.

So the Republicans, before we leave for the so-called holiday recess, want to have a feather in their cap. They want to be able to point to the fact that they have actually passed something. They are saying to their Members that this is a life-or-death proposal: We have to pass this or we will not be able to point to hardly anything that we did during the course of 1 year under Republican control of the Senate. That is why they are determined to do this, and do it quickly.

The Republicans' irresponsible deficit spending under this plan will trigger \$150 billion in automatic cuts to mandatory spending each year for the next decade. It includes regular cuts to Medicare.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you just can't have it both ways. You can't claim to be fiscally responsible and then vote for a plan that includes billions of dollars in budget gimmicks that would explode the deficit by up to \$1.5 trillion over the first

10 years and beyond, even with this great dynamic scoring theory that you are trying to sell. You can't claim to make a tax plan that prioritizes small business and then spend hundreds of billions of dollars giving huge multinational corporations—already enjoying record profits—a massive tax cut as well.

I might add that the Republican tax bill creates incentives—incentives for American corporations to move overseas, to take American jobs overseas. Why in the world would we create a tax code incentive for that to happen?

You can't choose to make the corporate tax cuts permanent at the expense of protecting working Americans and then still claim that this plan is going to help those same families. It is based on nothing more than a wink and a promise to extend half a trillion dollars in middle-income tax cuts that no one wants to pay for.

You can't pretend to be above special interest and then include a provision in this tax bill—in the tax bill—that would open drilling leases for 800,000 acres of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—one of America's last pristine, untouched wilderness places, home to more than 200 wildlife species, and deserving of preservation.

I have come to the floor over the course of many years in debate about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Senator Ted Stevens used to sit in that chair, and he couldn't wait until I finished my speech. He would stand up and say: The Senator from Illinois—he would point at me—doesn't even know where the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is. He has never been there. He has no idea what is going on up there. So he should not stand up on the floor and say things that he can't back up with his own personal experience and knowledge.

What I did at that point was that I decided I was going to call his bluff. So I picked up and went up to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I took a bush plane in and camped out overnight in the refuge. I trekked around. I took a look for myself so that I could back up some of the things I said on the floor.

We were right on the Canning River. You could look across the river at parts of the Refuge that were managed by the State of Alaska. On this side of the river where we camped, it was managed as a national wildlife refuge. There was a dramatic difference. Roadways had been built on the State side but not on the Federal side. We had a pristine refuge area. The net result was really beautiful and impressive.

I couldn't wait to get back to the floor to debate Senator Stevens since I had been there. I came back for the next debate. He never raised the question again about whether I had been there. So I didn't get to give the speech on the floor.

To give up all of this land to drill for oil at a time when we are saying to the Middle East that we don't need their oil as much as we have in the past, to

drill for gas when fracking is finding natural gas in areas all over the continental United States hardly makes sense. It certainly doesn't if you have ever been there and seen this beautiful piece of real estate.

I think the American people know what the Republicans had in mind with this plan. It really does help their deep-pocketed donors. Some Republicans in the House have been very open about this. One New York Republican Congressman said: Our donor said don't come back unless you give me a tax break. He is very honest about that, but, as far as I am concerned, that shouldn't be the motivation for passing tax reform.

One of the Republican donors I referred to—and I quote him directly—said: "My donors are basically saying, 'Get it done or don't ever call me again.'" Another one said: "Financial contributions will stop" if the Republican tax plan doesn't pass. Thank goodness for their honesty and candor.

There are special interests that will do well under this Republican plan, and wealthy people as well, but I think it is time for us to look at this plan, look at it clearly, and understand the negative impacts it is going to have on working Americans.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

THANKING THE SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend, former roommate, and colleague in leadership for, as usual, his articulate and on-the-money remarks about the tax bill.

ISSUES BEFORE CONGRESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we have a long to-do list before the end of the year, and time is running short. We had hoped to make progress with the administration on these issues in a meeting this afternoon. Unfortunately, this morning, instead of leading, the President tweeted a blatantly inaccurate statement and then concluded: "I don't see a deal." The President said: "I don't see a deal" three hours before our meeting, before he heard anything we had to say.

Given that the President doesn't see a deal between Democrats and the White House, Leader PELOSI and I believe the best path forward is to continue negotiating with our Republican counterparts in Congress, instead. Rather than going to the White House for a show meeting that will not result in an agreement from a President who doesn't see a deal, we have asked Leader MCCONNELL and Speaker RYAN to meet with us this afternoon.

We don't have any time to waste addressing the issues that confront us. So we are going to negotiate with Republican leaders who may actually be interested in reaching a bipartisan agreement. If the President, who already earlier this year said that "our country needs a good shutdown," isn't interested in addressing the difficult-year agenda and wants to make the government shut down, we will work with those Republicans who are interested in funding the government, as we did in April.

We have so many things to do. We have to fund the government. We have DACA. We have the Children's Health Insurance Program. We must reinstate cost sharing for health premiums and out-of-pocket costs. We have to deal with disasters. We have to fund our defense and our nondefense sides of the government in a reasonable way. There is so much to do. We are eager to get that done in a bipartisan way. Obviously the President isn't, but hopefully Leader MCCONNELL and Speaker RYAN are, and we look forward to sitting down with them to resolve this in an amicable way, as we did in April. When the President wasn't involved, we got it done.

REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

Mr. SCHUMER. On the Republican tax bill, we are only a few days away from a final vote, but from all reports, the Republicans are still debating significant changes to the text of the bill. Some are angling for a change to the passthrough provisions, feeling that a gargantuan new tax loophole for many high-income individuals needs to be widened even further. Right now, it is reported that 70 percent of these passthroughs go to the top 1 percent. The changes that are being proposed would make it even worse.

Help small business, yes. Don't open a giant loophole for wealthy hedge funds, big-shot law firms, and lobbyists. We don't need that.

Others are rightly worried about the impact this bill would have on the deficit and debt. What I would remind my Republican colleagues is that, with any more changes, it is virtually certain you will be voting on a bill without any expert analysis of its impacts; you will be voting without any estimate of whether it will grow or shrink the economy; you will be voting without a good sense of the long-term impacts of the changes you are making to the Tax Code.

Certainly, 1 week of markup in the Finance Committee, with only one expert witness, is not a satisfactory process, particularly considering the changing nature of this bill. Changing the Tax Code in broad brush is a difficult thing. There are so many unintended consequences.

If our Republican colleagues should pass this bill and it becomes law—and I hope it won't—week after week, we are going to find new things in this

bill—some intended, some not intended. The people who voted for it are going to regret it. The public will ask: Why didn't you know? With a tax bill, it is impossible to know all these things unless you let it sit out there in the Sun and bake so that people, experts from around the country—there are tens of thousands of tax lawyers paid to figure out ways around our Tax Code and help the wealthy, who are their clients. Unless you examine the bill carefully in sunlight, unless you have a lot of hearings, unless you hear from all kinds of witnesses, the result is usually quite bad for America, with so many unintended consequences.

Our Republican colleagues, in their rush to get a bill done, are legislating in an irresponsible way, especially when it comes to something as important and complex as the Tax Code. If the product were a great one, that would be one thing. We all know this is not a great product. We don't even hear our Republican colleagues bragging about this product, with a few exceptions. Everyone says this could be better, that could be better.

Every independent analysis has shown that the tax bill will end up raising taxes on millions of middle-class families, despite the early intentions of the President and Republican leaders. The Tax Policy Center estimates that 60 percent of middle-class families will see a tax increase—60 percent of middle-class families will see a tax increase—by the time the bill is fully implemented, while folks making over \$1 million a year would get an average tax cut of over \$40,000.

Some would say: Well, they are making more money; they should get a bigger tax break. No. I would like to take every dollar of that \$40,000 a millionaire gets and give it to the middle class. They are the ones who need the help, not the wealthy people. They are the ones who buy the products and keep the economy humming. They are the ones who, throughout the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, created the best economy America has ever had, not just the few millionaires. It is astounding.

If the President and Republicans in Congress set out to pass a middle-class tax cut, as they claim—if that is where they set out, this bill completely misses the mark. Meanwhile, the big winners—big corporations, the very wealthy—are doing great already. Estates worth over \$11 million get a tax break? Why is that? Why is that, when average middle-class people are struggling? Corporations get a permanent reduction in their rates, while individual tax breaks expire after a few years. The bill would even open up drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge because this tax bill wouldn't be complete unless they help Big Oil too.

All of this to saddle the next generation of Americans with larger deficits, even larger debt—something many of my friends on the other side of the aisle have labored against their whole

careers. We have heard so many speeches from the other side about deficit reduction. I think my colleagues were sincere. Why are they abandoning it now?

Every one of our colleagues knows that we could do a lot better job in a tax bill at reducing the deficit than we have here. From the very beginning, Democrats have told our Republican colleagues that we want to work with them on tax reform, we want to lower taxes on the middle class, we want to reduce burdens on small businesses, we want to erase the incentives that send jobs overseas and bring jobs back home, and we want to do all these things in a way that doesn't add to the deficit.

From the very beginning, Republicans have said to us: We are not interested in working with you. We are going to draft it ourselves and use reconciliation so we don't need your votes, and you can vote for our bill if you want.

That is not bipartisanship, what the Republican leadership has done.

I know there are some Republicans on the other side who wish we could work together. Well, we can. Today at 11 a.m., I think more than a dozen—certainly a large number of Democrats went to the Press Gallery and said: We want to work with our Republican colleagues to create a better bill.

They came and visited me last night. I encouraged them to do it. This leader—this leader—is not going to stand in the way of bipartisan reform that meets the goals we have talked about: helping the middle class, reducing the deficit, not unduly or in any way aiding the 1 percent.

Bipartisanship and compromise are very possible on tax reform. It is an issue crying out for a bipartisan solution. There are a lot of areas in which we agree. We have to work to find a middle ground that is acceptable to both parties. I daresay it would be a better bill for the American middle-class than the one we are looking at right now.

NOMINATION OF GREGORY KATSAS

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally and briefly, Mr. President, because I know my colleagues are waiting, on the Katsas nomination, the DC Circuit is often called the second most powerful court in the Nation because it adjudicates so many highly charged political issues, including cases that deal with the limits of Executive power and regulations issued by Federal agencies. As examples, major cases on climate regulations, the CFPB, and gun safety laws in the District of Columbia are now before that court. On such a court, we should prize independence and moderation and look warily at candidates with highly political backgrounds.

Unfortunately, Gregory Katsas has been intimately involved in a number of the most partisan and legally dubi-

ous Executive orders of the current administration. He was involved in the President's controversial travel ban, his decisions to terminate DACA, to end transgender service in the military, and to establish an election integrity commission based on the lie that 3.5 million people voted illegally in the last election.

His tenure and views in the Trump administration raise important questions about his independence and moderation, particularly on a court that will likely hear cases related to the very same issues he worked on in the White House. He appears to be another example of the Republican majority pushing judges from a political extreme of their party as a way of advancing their interests in lieu of a legislative agenda, which has floundered.

I will vote no on his nomination and urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Gregory G. Katsas, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 4 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:40 p.m., recessed until 4 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. STRANGE).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are 90 minutes of debate remaining on the Katsas nomination, equally divided between the leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

THE DEFICIT

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I want to address this body and talk about an issue that we do not talk about enough—the deficit. It is an issue that, for whatever reason, we have stopped talking about in Washington, DC. We talk about tax policy, which we should. We talk about disaster relief areas, which we should. We talk about healthcare policy, which we

should, and a lot of other things. We have stopped talking about the debt and deficit, and I think that is a mistake for us.

You see, after 2011, the trend moved from a high point. Deficit spending that year was \$1.3 trillion—overspending in a single year. After that point, the deficit went down a little bit each year until 2015. In 2016 our deficit number—that is a single year of overspending—started going back up. It went up in 2016, and it went up again in 2017. It is turning in the wrong direction. As you will recall and as many people in this body will recall, deficits were a major topic for us starting in 2010. Each year, Congress was trying to find ways to be able to reduce the deficit. That does not seem to be the issue anymore.

What I bring is a set of solutions and a set of ideas. How do we get out of this? Are there bipartisan solutions to actually deal with deficit overspending? There are priority things that we need to spend money on, and we should spend money on those things. Yet, as to the things that are nonessential for us and on which we might all find some way to agree that there is a better way to be able to spend our dollars, we should.

So this week I have produced our third annual "Federal Fumbles" book. We call it "100 ways the Federal Government has dropped the ball." None of these should be all that controversial, though we will not agree with all of them. But there are simple ways to look at what the Federal Government is doing, what it is not doing, where we are spending, where we are overspending, and where additional oversight is needed. There is no problem in this country that can't be solved, and, certainly, our deficit is an issue that can be solved. We just have to commit to each of us making the decision that this is actually important and that we are going to try to resolve this to try to get us back toward balance.

I have lumped all of these issues from this book back into a whole series of different process things because each one of the 100 things that we identify is not just a stand-alone; it is part of a bigger problem. So I have put them together into budget process reforms and grant process reforms, which allow for more transparency in how decisions are made and as to what decisions have been made. I would say, as well, that there are Senate rule changes that are going to be needed to be able to resolve any of these issues. We put together these four big blocks to be able to ask: What are we actually dealing with? Let me just give you a couple of ideas.

If we are going to actually deal with some of the budget issues, we are going to have to actually deal with the budget process. We are not going to get a better product until we get a better process. Since 1974, the Budget Act has only worked four times, and every year the American people have asked over and over: What just happened? How

come we are back in this budget fight? How come it is at the end of the year? How come this is not resolved? Because we have a bad process—that is why. Our process is not constitutional. It is the product of a law that was put in the Budget Act. We need to be able to change that, and I think there are some basic ways to be able to resolve that.

I would like to do budgeting and appropriations every 2 years. That would give us more time to be able to do more oversight, and that would give us more time for floor debate on it to be able to walk through this. There are multiple other areas that need to be resolved, like aligning our committees and other things that need to be done if we are actually going to get budget work done. In the meantime, we need to be able to push through what we can with the greatest efficiency, but, long term, we are going to have to fix the broken process that we have.

We should fix the grant-making process. There has been a lot of pressure to be able to move dollars toward grants because now we have put more and more restrictions on contracting. Because there are very few restrictions on grants, a lot of agencies are now spending more on grants than they are on contracting, and they are pushing dollars out the door with there being very little supervision.

We have to work on transparency. I am ashamed to say that for 6 years I have pushed on a very simple bill called the Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act. It passed unanimously in the House in 2 different years. It came over to the Senate, and it got tied up. The Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act is very simple. It asks every agency to list everything that it does. What a shocking thing it would be to actually know everything that every agency does—to be able to see what it does, what it spends on it, how many employees it allocates to it, and how many people it serves.

Every business in America can give a list of everything that it does except for the Federal Government. We cannot. We should. It would give the opportunity for agency heads to find out, before they start a program, and to know if someone else already does it in the Federal Government. I have talked to multiple agency individuals now, under two different Presidents, who have said that they have started a program, gotten it developed, committed people to it, and then a couple of months or years later determined that somebody else was already doing it. Even our agency folks do not know what the other agencies are doing. This should be a simple, straightforward solution to be able to help our agencies and to be able to help all of us have greater supervision over the budget.

The fourth thing is dealing with Senate rule changes. If we do not solve the issue of our nominations, we will never be able to get actual legislation on the floor and get back to debate again. We have stopped debating on major bills.

We have stopped debating on small bills. Because it takes so much time, it is easier to just not do it at all. That is not what the American people sent us here to do. When we say that the Senate cannot debate a topic, no one can believe it. That rule doesn't get better based on inactivity. It gets better when we actually fix the basic problem that we have, and that is getting us back to debate and solving the nomination process. Let's actually get this resolved.

In saying all of that, all of the things that are in this book this year are things that I and my staff and my team—and Derek Osborn, who has led in all of the compilation of this on my team—have put together. We have put together this basic package to say: Here are 100 items. Quite frankly, I would hope that all 100 Senators could go through budget areas and that everybody could find 100 items and could identify them and say: Let's compare our lists and then ask: What are we going to do to be able to deal with the debt and deficit? How are we going to deal with some of the spending and inefficiencies of the Federal Government? We would probably have 100 different lists, but I would bet that, of the 100 different lists, we would find a lot of common ground, and we would actually start to solve some things.

What type of things did we find on our list this year? Let me give you some examples.

The National Science Foundation did a grant this past year to study the effects and how things are going for refugees in Iceland. Now, I am sure that the country of Iceland would like to know how it is going for their refugees, and maybe even the U.N. would like to know, but I am a little stunned that the National Science Foundation used American tax dollars to study refugees in Iceland.

The National Endowment for the Arts did a grant this past year to help pay for a local community theater in New Hampshire in its performance of "Doggie Hamlet." "Doggie Hamlet" is an outdoor presentation in which a group of people yells and sings around a group of sheep and sheep dogs. I have watched the performance, and I think it is fine if the folks of New Hampshire want to do that performance. I am just not sure why the people of Oklahoma are being forced through their Federal tax dollars to pay for the production of "Doggie Hamlet."

Last year, the Department of Defense moved some equipment into Kuwait to be able to give it to the Iraqi army. So \$1 billion worth of equipment was moved into Kuwait to give it to the Iraqi army—Humvees, small arms, mortars. All of that is fine, as we were helping to equip the Iraqi army to allow them to be able to defend themselves. The problem is that we lost track of them somewhere between Kuwait and Iraq, and the DOD doesn't know what happened to \$1 billion of equipment after it was delivered to Kuwait.

The IRS has had multiple issues that we have tried to identify in different segments of this. One is that several years ago we noticed that the IRS was rehiring employees whom it had fired—the employees who were not paying their income taxes but were working for the IRS or the employees who were using their positions to spy on other Americans and pull up their tax information just because of their own interests. It is a fireable offense at the IRS—and it should be—to violate an American's privacy. The problem is that the IRS has started rehiring those same people right back. I don't know many companies that fire somebody and then later decide they are going to change their minds and rehire him, but, apparently, the IRS has become proficient at that. We identified it several years ago. The IRS said it would stop it. We did a check on that last year, and guess what. The IRS is still doing it—rehiring the employees it has fired, some of them even with their files that are stamped "do not hire." The IRS hired them anyway. We have to be able to stop that.

The IRS also did a study, through a program that it has, to be able to re-search tax compliance—not of changing tax rules, just of how people are complying with the tax rules and evaluating: Are they paying the correct amount of tax? Quite frankly, our tax system is so incredibly complicated that it is hard to be able to track what is the right amount, but the IRS should be able to look at it and determine whether someone is paying the right amount based on those figures. The IRS has developed some programs to be able to recommend, but the problem is that it has not implemented those programs. Over \$400 billion of taxes has never been collected by the IRS because it has not implemented the recommendations that it has in front of it already.

The IRS has also had an issue that we are trying to deal with, along with several other entities by the way: Who is alive and who is not alive? You see, the Social Security Administration keeps track of something called the Death Master File. It sounds wonderful; doesn't it? The Death Master File basically says who has passed away in America and what Social Security number is not functional anymore. The IRS is not fully implementing that list and, at times, it is still sending checks to people who died years ago. Then, some fraudulent people take a Social Security number from someone who has passed away and file a return on that Social Security number in January or February, and the IRS sends them a check simply because it has not listed that this person has passed away and that the Social Security number is not active. Yet the IRS is not the only one.

We also identified in the SNAP program—what some people call the food stamp program—that there are thousands of retailers who are using these

false Social Security numbers from people who have passed away. Last year, \$2.6 billion was sent out to SNAP retailers based on the Social Security numbers of the people who had passed away or on the numbers that are not operable. Those are things that are fixable. There is \$2.6 billion of fraud that is in the system.

We have asked the question about immigration, and immigration has been an important topic here. We talk about immigration as well and not just of the financial portion of it but of the fumble portion of things that are actually going wrong in immigration currently. A lot of folks—and some folks even in this body—say: If we will just enforce the law as it exists and build a fence, we will be fine. The problem is that 66 percent of the people who are in the country illegally came into the country legally, with a legal visa, but they overstayed the visas. They never left.

After 9/11, the 9/11 Commission said that one of the major aspects in dealing with immigration was to do an entry-exit visa system so that we would know who they were when people came in, and we would also know when they left. That was a recommendation from the 9/11 Commission, but it has still not been done a decade and a half later.

If we are going to deal with immigration, one of the key things that we have to have is not just a wall or a fence or some sort of barrier. We also have to deal with when people come in and when they leave under legal visa systems. I have heard comments about hiring more Border Patrol folks and more ICE folks. That is OK, fine. I am good with that, actually, but here is the problem. With the current system that is set up, it takes over 450 days to hire one person as a Border Patrol person because the process is so convoluted—450 days. What if you would like to apply for a job and you wouldn't hear back about it for a year and a half—450 days?

What about if we are going to add more immigration attorneys? We have a half-million-person backlog in our immigration courts right now. What if we were to hire more judges for that process? Great idea. Guess how long it takes to hire more judges in the immigration court? It takes 742 days right now to be able to hire a judge to add to the immigration courts. Our problems are not just in immigration. There are structural problems in the Federal Government right now in hiring, oversight, and in managing the reports.

I mentioned the IRS's not implementing one of the reports they have. There is also an issue with some other agencies that will put on the back of Federal vehicles their phone number with this question: How is my driving? What a great idea that is for a Federal vehicle. The problem is that when we looked at it, we found out that the agencies never actually read the reports that came in. If people called in

and said that this particular car number is driving crazy, no one is actually looking at it. It is the fear that Americans have that no one is really listening to them in the Federal Government.

CLAIRE MCCASKILL and I just worked to be able to pass something in this body to try to deal with solving this basic question: Can agencies ask: How am I doing?

When most of us get a rental car or a hotel room online, we will get an email after we check out of the room or stop using the rental car asking: How is our service? How can we improve?

Do you know that Federal agencies can't do that or that it has become so complicated that they can't produce a three-question e-survey to send out to people saying: How are we doing in Social Security disability? How are we doing in the Veterans' Administration? How are we doing in our HUD assistance to you? The reason for that is the Paperwork Reduction Act, of all things. An old law that was supposed to help us is actually now in the way, now in the modern age, of our trying to do basic surveys. We need to be able to resolve that. That is something this body can lead on to be able to change.

There are a lot of things we want to be able to identify and to say that we can do better. This is our list. Quite frankly, this is our to-do list for the next year, just as the previous two volumes have been. We have seen some things that we have been able to accomplish over the last couple of years from previous "Federal Fumbles" books, but we can't get started on them until we actually identify them and say: That is a problem. How are we going to fix it? Our simple question for the rest of this body is this: Here is our list; what is yours? What are the things we are working on? What are the issues that we are actually going to get done and solve for the American people? What are the crazy stories and things we are wasting money on? If we only identified it and said: Let's stop that, we could and would. Let's do it together.

There is no reason that reducing the deficit should have to be an issue that has become a partisan issue. Deficits and the growing debt affect every single American. So let's work on it together, and let's stop finding ways to not work on it and find areas of common ground where we can work on it.

Let's fix inefficiencies in Federal Government hiring. Let's fix inefficiencies in our system. We have a tremendous number of great Federal employees who are all around the country and who work extremely hard for the American people every day and do great work, but they are trapped in a system that slows them down, that prevents them from being as efficient as they would like to be. Let's help them out by fixing the broken things that are in these agencies and systems. Let's set them free to be able to serve people the way they want to be able to serve people.

There are things we can do. Let's get busy doing it. If you are interested in knowing more about "Federal Fumbles" go to our website at lankford.senate.gov. We will send a copy over. We will send you a link to our website because it is cheaper and we will not have to print it off, and you can look at it online.

The issue of the day is this: Let's find out what your list is; we have started ours.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, the judges Donald Trump appoints to lifetime positions on our Federal courts will be a lasting legacy, and he is determined to do whatever it takes to place as many nominees with an ideologically driven agenda on the bench as possible.

Today the Senate is debating whether to give Gregory Katsas a lifetime appointment to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit. Throughout his career, including as Deputy White House Counsel under Donald Trump and as a senior official in the Justice Department under George W. Bush, Mr. Katsas has demonstrated a profound conservative bias that is inappropriate for service on the country's second most important court.

As Deputy White House Counsel, Mr. Katsas has been deeply involved in crafting the legal justification for many of the Trump administration's most controversial policies. He also played a key role in deciding which court cases the administration would support or oppose and recommending candidates for various executive and judicial appointments.

The legal issues he has managed, the advice he has given, and the appointments he has recommended raise serious concerns about whether he should receive a lifetime appointment to the Federal bench.

In the early days of the administration, Mr. Katsas participated in crafting the legal justification for the President's Muslim ban, a policy at odds with the Constitution and our values as a nation. Mr. Katsas has also been involved in orchestrating the administration's opposition to LGBTQ rights in the courts. In particular, he openly admits his role in the Justice Department's decision to argue in a case before the Second Circuit that title VII in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. This position is inconsistent with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's 2015 guidance and with a recent en banc decision from the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

During his confirmation hearing, Mr. Katsas testified that he was involved in the administration's decision to file an amicus brief in the Supreme Court case of *Masterpiece Cakeshop v. Civil Rights Commission*. He thus supports the position that a private business

should be able to refuse to sell a wedding cake to a gay couple.

By elevating a corporation's religious views over the rights of their customers, Mr. Katsas and the Trump administration argued that businesses should be able to say that their work is an expression of their religious beliefs. This would allow them to discriminate against certain customers and turn our system of antidiscrimination protections in public accommodations on its head. These actions and positions should disqualify Mr. Katsas from serving on the DC Circuit.

But there is more.

We can also trace his record of pushing a partisan, ideological agenda during his time in the Bush Justice Department. In *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld*, Mr. Katsas argued that the military commissions the Bush administration established after 9/11 were legal and consistent with the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the Geneva Conventions. In *Boumediene v. Bush*, Mr. Katsas also argued that people deemed enemy combatants and detained at Guantanamo could not challenge their detention on habeas corpus grounds. The Supreme Court repudiated these arguments in their landmark decisions in both cases.

Mr. Katsas was also the public face of the Bush administration's opposition to the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act, also known as the Akaka bill. As the Principal Deputy Associate Attorney General in the Bush administration, Mr. Katsas testified in Congress that the Akaka bill was unconstitutional. He went so far as to say that it would "create a race-based government offensive to our Nation's commitment to equal justice and the elimination of racial distinctions in law."

What was really offensive was that his testimony was legally wrong and insulting to a Native people, the Native Hawaiians. In rebuttal, a bipartisan trio of highly respected former DOJ officials said in written testimony that Mr. Katsas failed to provide a credible and coherent legal argument against the Akaka bill. They argued that his testimony presented "a caricatured view of the text of [the bill] and the governing law, and should not be considered an authoritative guide for resolving legal disputes in this area."

I agree. The Akaka bill did not confer status to a group of people based on race and ancestry. It did so by virtue of residency and sovereignty. With no grounding in fact or law, Mr. Katsas advocated treating Native Hawaiians differently from other indigenous people.

Mr. Katsas' position on Native Hawaiian rights is of particular concern at a time when the DC Circuit could hear legal challenges to the 2016 Interior Department rule through which the Native Hawaiian community could reestablish a government-to-government relationship with the Federal Government.

Mr. Katsas has a disturbing record of pushing a partisan conservative agenda not based on sound law that has no place in the DC Circuit. We cannot simply ignore his record and decouple his past actions from the person responsible for them. Mr. Katsas has clear policy preferences that are red flags as to how he will decide cases should he be confirmed to this lifetime position.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this nomination.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today the Senate is voting to confirm Gregory Katsas to serve as U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia Circuit. Mr. Katsas's 28-year legal career has prepared him well to serve as a Federal judge. His nomination has garnered widespread support in the legal community.

Mr. Katsas graduated with his A.B. from Princeton University in 1986 and from Harvard Law School in 1989. After graduating from Harvard Law School, Mr. Katsas clerked for Judge Edward Becker on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals and for Justice Clarence Thomas on the DC Circuit and on the U.S. Supreme Court. Following his clerkships, Mr. Katsas joined the DC office of Jones Day, where he worked in the issues and appeals section of their litigation group.

From 2001 to 2006, Mr. Katsas served as a Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Division at the Department of Justice, where he argued, briefed, and supervised a number of significant appeals handled by the Federal Government. He then served as the Principal Deputy Associate Attorney General from 2006 to 2008 and the Acting Associate Attorney General from 2007 to 2008. In 2007, President Bush nominated Mr. Katsas to serve as the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Division at the Department of Justice. The Senate confirmed him by voice vote in 2008, and he served in that role until the end of the Bush administration.

Mr. Katsas rejoined Jones Day as a partner in 2009, where he handled many important litigation matters. In January of this year, Mr. Katsas again left the private sector to serve the President as deputy counsel in the White House Counsel's office.

One only has to look at his professional record to understand how eminently qualified Mr. Katsas is to serve as a Federal appellate judge. Over the course of 28 years, Mr. Katsas has briefed hundreds of cases and argued more than 75 appeals, including three cases in the Supreme Court and 13 cases in the DC Circuit, the court to which he is nominated.

I am pleased to support Mr. Katsas's nomination, and I urge my colleagues to vote for his confirmation.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Greg Katsas to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, but I want to begin with some general observations.

This year, the Republican-controlled Senate has repeatedly fallen short when it comes to serving as a meaningful check and balance in our constitutional system. Senate Republicans have abandoned longstanding norms of due diligence and careful scrutiny, all in the name of advancing the agenda of President Trump.

We saw this when Senate Republicans voted in near lockstep to confirm President Trump's Cabinet nominees. Republicans simply looked the other way when nominees failed to pay all of their taxes, did not disclose millions in assets, had conflicts of interest, or could not even answer basic questions at their hearings. Senate Republicans have repeatedly tried to rush through partisan bills in the dark of night. Remember when they revealed the text of the TrumpCare bill just a few hours before the Senate voted on it? Now Senate Republicans are trying to pass massive tax cuts for the largest corporations and wealthiest Americans, by ramming through an enormous bill with little debate and public scrutiny of how the bill would explode the deficit and raise taxes on many in the working class.

This pattern, of the Senate abandoning its responsibility to do basic due diligence when it comes to the agenda of President Trump, has also infected our process of considering judicial nominees. When it comes to President Trump's judicial nominees, we are seeing the Senate's constitutional responsibility of "advice and consent" turn into "rush through and rubberstamp."

All year, Senate Republicans have been removing guardrails that help ensure that judicial nominees have the qualifications, temperament, and integrity that we need for lifetime appointments to the Federal bench. Don't just take it from me. Take it from the conservative Wall Street Journal. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a November 20 article from the Wall Street Journal entitled "Checks on Trump's Court Picks Fall Away" at the conclusion of my remarks.

This article talks about the series of procedural changes Senate Republicans have made this year to expedite Trump's judicial nominations—most recently, the November 16 announcement by Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that he would hold hearings on nominees who do not receive positive blue slips from both home-State Senators, something that never happened under the Obama administration. The article begins by saying:

The Republican head of the Senate Judiciary Committee has curtailed one of the last legislative limits on a president's power to shape the federal courts, giving Donald Trump more freedom than any U.S. president in modern times to install his judges of choice, legal experts said.

Consider the other changes Republicans have already made in just the first year of the Trump administration.

First, President Trump subcontracted the selection of Supreme Court nominees out to rightwing special interest groups like the Federalist Society. President Trump publicly thanked the Federalist Society for assembling a list of candidates from which Justice Neil Gorsuch was selected. The White House even asked Leonard Leo of the Federalist Society to call Justice Gorsuch to let him know he was a candidate for the job. Never before had a President credited a special interest group with serving as a de facto selection committee for the Federal judiciary. For anyone who wonders what the Federalist Society is all about, I urge you to watch the video of this group laughing and applauding at their convention a few weeks ago when Attorney General Sessions joked about meeting with Russians. It was shameful.

Senate Republicans also changed the rules of the Senate in order to get Neil Gorsuch confirmed. He couldn't get 60 votes on the Senate floor, so the Republicans changed the rules to make 50 votes the threshold for appointments to the Supreme Court.

When it comes to lower-court nominees, the Trump administration and Senate Republicans are doing half-hearted vetting at best. We are constantly learning information that nominees initially failed to disclose. For example, Alabama District Court nominee Brett Talley failed to disclose that his wife was an attorney in the White House Counsel's Office and that Talley had apparently posted online comments defending the early KKK and calling for shooting death row inmates. Court of Federal Claims nominee Damien Schiff failed to disclose that he had called Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy a "judicial prostitute" in a blog post. North Carolina District Court nominee Thomas Farr reportedly failed to fully disclose his role in an African-American voter suppression effort during the 1990 campaign for Senator Jesse Helms. Yet all of these nominees were reported out of the Judiciary Committee on party line votes.

There are other changes that Republicans have made to the nominations process this year. Republicans have decided not to wait for the American Bar Association to do their nonpartisan peer review of a nominee's qualifications before holding a hearing. When the ABA unanimously finds nominees not to be qualified, Republicans still support the nominees anyway. Republicans have also begun regularly holding hearings on two circuit court nominees at a time. Why? Apparently, they are afraid to let each of their nominees stand on their own two feet and face questioning from Senators individually. The circuit courts have the final word on tens of thousands of cases every year. Every single lifetime appointment to these courts deserves to be scrutinized on its own individual merits.

Furthermore, Judiciary Committee Republicans are looking to relax the standards for nominees with a history of past drug use. Republicans repeatedly blocked judicial candidates proposed by President Obama who had smoked marijuana in the past, but Republicans now want a more lenient standard for Trump nominees. I am open to a different standard, but it must not be a double standard for Democratic versus Republican nominees.

That takes us to the changes to the blue slip. Republicans now want to disregard this 100-year-old tradition—meaning they will ignore the vetting that home-State Senators do for nominees from their State. Remember, blue slips were respected throughout the Obama administration. Republicans sent a letter in 2009 asking President Obama to respect blue slips, and he did. Republicans then proceeded to block 18 Obama nominees by withholding blue slips. Now, Republicans have announced that they are doing a 180-degree turn for Trump nominees and that they will disregard blue slips whenever they feel like it.

Why are Republicans abandoning so many longstanding traditions and guardrails when it comes to judicial nominations? It is because many of President Trump's nominees simply wouldn't pass muster under the traditional ground rules. Many Trump nominees have minimal experience, a history of ideologically biased statements, serious questions about their temperament and judgment, or a lack of independence from President Trump. Senate Republicans want to rubberstamp these nominees anyway—and confirm them as quickly as possible in their effort to pack the courts.

Just look at some of the judicial nominees who have already been confirmed this year—like John Bush, confirmed to sit on the Sixth Circuit, who blogged about the false claim that President Obama wasn't born in the United States and said at his hearing that he thinks impartiality is an aspiration for a judge, not an expectation; or Stephanos Bibas, now a judge on the Third Circuit, who wrote a lengthy paper calling for corporal punishment, including putting offenders in the stocks or pillory and applying multiple calibrated electroshocks.

Now, consider DC Circuit nominee Greg Katsas, who is before us today. Mr. Katsas works in the White House for President Trump. He is a Deputy White House Counsel. He testified that he has been personally involved in many of the Trump administration's most controversial policies, ranging from the Muslim travel ban to the creation of the Pence-Kobach election commission, to ending the DACA program, to the Trump administration's rollback of protections for LGBTQ-Americans.

Mr. Katsas also said that, while working for President Trump, he has given legal advice regarding the

Emoluments Clause, advised on the administration's efforts to cut off Federal public safety funds to cities because of disagreements over immigration enforcement, and even provided legal advice on the Special Counsel's Russia investigation.

This is a laundry list of Trump administration controversies that Mr. Katsas has been personally involved with. It is likely that many of these issues will end up in litigation before the DC Circuit. I don't think appointing President Trump's staff lawyer to the DC Circuit will strengthen the American people's confidence in the fairness of our justice system. Instead, we need nominees with a strong track record of independence and good judgment.

Let me talk for a minute about Mr. Katsas's judgment.

At his hearing, I asked Mr. Katsas some simple questions about the torture technique known as waterboarding. I was deeply troubled by his answers. I asked him if waterboarding is torture. He said, "I hesitate to answer the question in the abstract, not knowing the circumstances, the nature of the program." I asked him if waterboarding is cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment. I noted that Senator JOHN MCCAIN, the author of the 2006 law that made it clear that cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment is illegal, has said "waterboarding, under any circumstances, represents a clear violation of U.S. law"—so did all four Judge Advocates General—the top lawyers in the military—during the Bush administration. But Mr. Katsas responded evasively, saying "anything that is cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment would be clearly unlawful." I then asked Mr. Katsas if waterboarding is illegal under U.S. law. He said "to the extent it constitutes either torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment, yes it is."

What a pack of weasel words. Mr. Katsas's tortured logic about waterboarding is unacceptable. Mr. Katsas should have said, with no equivocation and no uncertainty, that waterboarding is illegal, that it is cruel, inhuman, and degrading and that it is torture. That is the law, and a Federal judge should know it.

I am concerned that Mr. Katsas's refusal to give those answers reflects a troubling ideological viewpoint when it comes to questions of torture and interrogation techniques. My concerns were amplified by a speech Mr. Katsas gave in April 2009 when his speech notes said "high bar—a lot of coercive interrogation does not equal torture."

This is a clear-cut issue for me. I have voted against nominees in the past who gave the wrong answers to questions about waterboarding, and I will do it again. In my view, Mr. Katsas has not demonstrated the independence and judgment that we need for the critical position of DC Circuit judge. I cannot support his nomination.

Here is the bottom line. Before I was a Senator, I was a lawyer in downstate Illinois, and I looked up to Federal judges. I thought that, to get that job, you had to be a cut above. Otherwise, you wouldn't make it through the Senate's rigorous advice and consent process. Sadly, this Republican Senate is turning advice and consent into "rush through and rubberstamp." Republicans want to pack the courts with judges who will support President Trump's agenda, and so they are hurrying to confirm as many of his picks as possible—even if they are unqualified, ideological, hiding things from the Senate, or too close to President Trump. Our Federal judiciary is being diminished as a result.

I wish my Republican colleagues would stand up for an independent judiciary and a meaningful advice and consent process. We should fill this vacancy on the DC Circuit with someone who is independent of President Trump, not one of his staff attorneys. We should choose nominees who are unafraid to say what the law is on torture, instead of what they might wish the law to be.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Katsas nomination.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 20, 2017]

CHECKS ON TRUMP'S COURT PICKS FALL AWAY
(Joe Palazzolo and Ashby Jones)

MOVE TO CURTAIL 'BLUE SLIPS' GIVES THE PRESIDENT, AND SUCCESSORS, WIDE LEEWAY IN PICKS FOR FEDERAL BENCH

The Republican head of the Senate Judiciary Committee has curtailed one of the last legislative limits on a president's power to shape the federal courts, giving Donald Trump more freedom than any U.S. president in modern times to install his judges of choice, legal experts said.

Last week, Sen. Chuck Grassley (R., Iowa) reined in a tradition that empowered senators to block federal appeals-court nominees from their home state. His decision came about four years after Democrats, citing Republican filibusters of President Barack Obama's circuit-court nominees, eliminated a Senate rule that required the majority party to mount 60 votes to advance a nominee to a confirmation vote.

Together, the threat of a filibuster—or delaying tactic—and use of "blue slips"—so named because senators indicate support or opposition to nominees on blue slips of paper—guarded against lifetime appointments for nominees deemed far outside the mainstream, court experts said. Getting rid of these checks could foment distrust in judges' work if Mr. Trump and later presidents prioritize ideology over experience or legal talent, some of the experts said.

"When judges lose legitimacy in the public eye, they lose the ability to enforce unpopular decisions," said Arthur Hellman, an expert on the federal judiciary and law professor at the University of Pittsburgh. "And that's when you see an unraveling in the rule of law."

Others said the changes were part of a natural progression away from Senate traditions that allowed the minority party to stall nominations for partisan reasons.

"If you're not a fan of the Senate-wide filibuster, you're probably not a fan of a fili-

buster by one senator," said Ilya Shapiro, a senior fellow in constitutional studies at the Cato Institute, referring to the practice of senators blocking nominees from their states.

So far, the Republican-controlled Senate Judiciary Committee has approved two nominees pronounced unfit to serve by the American Bar Association, including Brett Talley, a Justice Department lawyer who has never argued a motion in federal court and whose wife is the chief of staff for the top White House lawyer.

"If Senate Republicans will confirm him, then there is no realistic sense of checks and balances," said Christopher Kang, who worked on judicial nominations in the Obama White House.

The White House declined to address criticisms of Mr. Talley.

The ABA's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has deemed two other Trump nominees "not qualified"—ratings Republicans on the Senate Judiciary Committee dismissed as the product of what they called a liberal advocacy group.

The ABA has rejected that criticism, saying it has rated potential judges for more than 60 years, drawing on dozens and sometimes hundreds of interviews with a nominee's colleagues and other peers.

Hogan Gidley, a White House spokesman, said Mr. Trump has delivered on his promise to nominate "highly qualified judges."

"We appreciate the hard work of Chairman Grassley and [Senate Majority Leader Mitch] McConnell, and we urge the Senate to confirm all of the remaining nominees because it's what the American people deserve," he said in an emailed statement.

Mr. Grassley said on Thursday that he would hold a hearing on two nominees—David Stras, a nominee to the midwestern Eighth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, and Kyle Duncan, a nominee to the Fifth Circuit in New Orleans—over the objections of home-state senators Al Franken of Minnesota, a Democrat, and John Kennedy of Louisiana, a Republican.

The blue-slip practice began in the 1910s and, for a large portion of its history, "gave Senators the ability to determine the fate of their home-state judicial nominations," the Congressional Research Service, a research arm Congress, said in a 2003 report.

Mr. Grassley said that after his recent move, a negative blue slip would be a "significant factor" for the committee to consider but wouldn't prevent a hearing, a break with the practice of Senate Judiciary Committee chairmen since at least 2005.

He blamed the Democrats for abusing the blue slip after eschewing the filibuster.

"The Democrats seriously regret that they abolished the filibuster, as I warned them they would. But they can't expect to use the blue-slip courtesy in its place. That's not what the blue slip is meant for," he said on the Senate floor last week.

Mr. Grassley also has parted with common practice by stacking two circuit court nominees in a single confirmation hearing, reducing time for preparation and questions, and holding hearings before the ABA finished its judicial evaluations.

"Taken together, it's clear that Republicans want to remake our courts by jamming through President Trump's nominees as quickly as possible," said Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D., Calif.), the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, in an emailed statement.

The median time from nomination to Senate confirmation for circuit-court nominees was less than a month in the administrations of presidents Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon, said Russell Wheeler, a visiting fellow at the Brookings Institution who

studies federal courts. That number rose through the 1980s and 1990s and ballooned to 229 days during President Barack Obama's two terms, he said.

Ms. HIRONO. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this week we are engaged in what is perhaps the most momentous subject that we haven't dealt with in recent times, and that is, after 30 years, updating and reforming our Nation's convoluted, complex, and self-destructive Tax Code.

Those who are interested in getting to yes and who will cast a "yes" vote, I believe, will be casting a vote for growing the economy, voting for more jobs, voting for higher wages, and voting for more take-home pay. Those who vote against this endeavor are really saying yes to stagnant wages, less jobs, and a lower standard of living. They are willing to accept the reality that American jobs are going overseas because our country has the highest Tax Code in the civilized world, and bringing the money earned overseas back home basically means having to pay double taxes. So what people do is they do what you would logically do, and they spend the money overseas and hire foreign workers in foreign countries rather than Americans and make things stamped "Made in America."

Simply stated, this bill is about the dreamers and the doers, the small businesses and the hard-working American families who need tax cuts and tax reform. This is about helping the middle class.

Actually, what this bill does—the Senate version of the bill—is it reduces the tax burden on every tax-paying cohort. In other words, all of the tax rates come down. In order to do that, both on the personal side and the business side, we had to eliminate a lot of what I call the underbrush, which are the tax deductions, the tax credits, and the other subsidies that have made our Tax Code so incomprehensible to everybody other than accountants and lawyers. That is one reason people are so frustrated with our Tax Code—it costs them so much money just to comply with their legal obligations.

It has been a long time since we took up this important topic, and I know the reaction is, well, this is just another going-through-the-motions effort, but I assure you that is not the case. These reforms are not only possible, they are very important because they will positively impact real people's lives.

Arthur Brooks of the American Enterprise Institute has said that "some believe that taxation is a dry topic

with no moral significance, but nothing could be further from the truth." For example, by doubling the standard deduction, we will limit the number of people who have to itemize their tax deductions in order to claim the full legal deduction. That means that now only 1 out of every 10 taxpayers will have to itemize and 9 out of 10 will just claim the standard deduction, which will now be doubled.

We are also going to double the child tax credit, which will help working families provide the things they need in order to take care of their growing families. It will mean that more people will have more money left over after paying Uncle Sam to spend on their own families, to invest in their children's education, maybe to even take the first vacation they have taken in 10 years or more.

Mr. President, \$2,200 is what a median family of four will save in taxes under our proposal. Maybe they want to get their pickup truck fixed. Maybe they want to build a little financial cushion because they have been living paycheck to paycheck. I can't remember the precise statistic, but the number of people in America who could not meet their financial needs if they experienced an unexpected \$400 cost—maybe your car broke down, or maybe your house flooded, whatever the case may be. We need people to be able to keep more of what they earn and build a cushion so they don't have to live with the anxiety of living paycheck to paycheck, knowing that if the unexpected happens, it could put them in deep trouble. That \$2,200 a year could mean a couple hundred dollars each month to put toward your mortgage, to pay down your mortgage, or to provide a little breathing room.

This plan is also designed to increase wages, and it is estimated that the combined benefit of this bill, together with the economic growth we are anticipating, could mean as much as \$4,000 in additional income. So it not only lowers the tax burden, but it raises the income levels. Frankly, as I mentioned a moment ago, our Tax Code incentivizes American businesses to send jobs overseas. Why in the world wouldn't we want to incentivize them to bring those jobs back home and invest here?

Not only can we make this Tax Code better, but I want to emphasize why we should. We have a historic opportunity, and we shouldn't squander our chances to take a bit of the pressure off of frustrated workers and struggling families who are trying to make ends meet.

This country has long been a leader in the world, with the strongest economy and the strongest people, but the reality is, our Tax Code is no longer a world leader. As I indicated earlier, we have one of the highest tax rates in the world, particularly for businesses. So what happens when countries like Ireland or the United Kingdom lower their tax rates for businesses? Well, those businesses move to those countries.

People who want to start a new business say: Well, if I have a choice where to start that business, why should I start that business in a country that punishes us with the highest tax rate in the world?

The current tax system penalizes success by taxing American ingenuity and hard work at rates that are uncompetitive, and it discourages our free enterprise system. What I mean is that it sends messages to Americans like, don't work so hard because, you know what, you are not working for yourself, you are working for the government. We ought to be sending the message that by working harder, you can keep more of what you earn and spend it the way you see fit.

Companies, of course, have no particular loyalty to our country, so they don't really have a need to stick around because they are going to go to countries where they can make the most profit, where they can keep more of what they earn.

My basic point is that the messages our convoluted and archaic Tax Code is sending are counterproductive. They are counterproductive to workers who are looking for jobs, they are counterproductive to workers who are looking for a little more in their paychecks, and they are counterproductive to families who want to save and provide for their own future.

In 2016, the Tax Policy Center projected that almost 44 percent of Americans will pay no or negative individual income tax for 2017 under current law, and some smaller number even get more money back from the government in the form of refundable tax credits than they pay in taxes. We need to make sure that everybody participates in our government.

One thing I have heard a lot during this tax debate is that America is horribly in debt. Sadly, that is true. But it is not because of our Tax Code. It is not because Americans aren't taxed enough. It is not because we spend too much money defending our country against threats here at home and abroad. It is because we have a spending problem.

Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues, who suddenly got religion when it comes to deficits and debt after doubling the national debt during the Obama administration, want to use this as a reason not to cut the taxes for hard-working American families, and I think it is terribly misplaced.

Is the deficit important? Is debt important? Yes, it is, and we know what we need to do to fix that. But denying the American people and hard-working American families the tax relief they need and deserve and failing to get the economy growing again is the wrong way to do it.

Let me quote from Arthur Brooks again. He said: "If income tax rates are 100 percent, income tax revenue will be zero. Why? Because with a 100-percent tax rate, nobody will bother to work. And companies won't produce" either.

On corporate taxes, we are seeing a lot of hypocrisy from our friends across the aisle who had previously championed some of the very provisions we have included in this legislation. For example, the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, our Democratic friend from Oregon, had previously championed a 24-percent corporate rate because he recognized that a 35-percent corporate rate chased companies, businesses, and jobs overseas. Now he calls our reduction in corporate taxes a giveaway to corporations. You could consider the statements made by President Barack Obama in 2011 when he said to a joint session of Congress—he said that one of the things Republicans and Democrats need to do together is to work on lowering the corporate tax rate because he, too, recognized that this was self-destructive, that it was chasing jobs overseas, that it was preventing the U.S. Treasury from collecting its taxes, and frankly that it was hurting the bottom line for American families who maybe couldn't find work or whose work was not rewarded with fatter paychecks and more take-home pay.

For corporate taxes, economists have said that actually lowering the corporate tax rate will bring more investment and more jobs back home. If it were lowered, expanded production and investment would increase domestically.

Even though it might seem a little counterintuitive, Barack Obama; the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN; and the minority leader, Senator SCHUMER from New York, were correct when they called for lowering the corporate rate, and it is unseemly to now try to demagogue this issue by calling it a giveaway when it is not. We are doing what they said we should do years ago.

When it comes to these corporate rates, some of my colleagues have raised concerns about passthrough businesses. It is true that a number of businesses operate here in America not as corporations but as passthrough entities, meaning that they pay their business income on an individual tax return. These concerns are legitimate, and we have worked hard to try to address them.

Earlier, we were working with the National Federation of Independent Business, which is one of the largest trade associations in the country representing small- and medium-sized passthrough businesses. We were able to come up with a solution which addressed their concerns and which benefits those passthrough businesses. We still have some more work to do, but that demonstrates what we can do when working together to try to answer the concerns people have raised along the way during this legislative process.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Federation of Independent Business, which I mentioned a moment ago, and nearly all major small business advocacy groups support this legislation. We had a press conference

here in the Senate, just off the floor, earlier this morning, and it was uniform—everybody said this is good for small businesses. And small businesses are what create the vast majority of jobs in America.

I know that those who have continued questions or issues about the legislation have had productive discussions with all of us and today with the President, who came to visit us. I am confident that if we keep working at it in good faith, we can come up with a way to address the remaining issues so that we are all satisfied as much as possible.

There is an expression: Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. If you are waiting around for perfection, particularly here in the legislative process, you are never going to get anything done. That is not an excuse for not making it as good as it can possibly be, I believe, working together, preferably on a bipartisan basis. But if our Democratic colleagues refuse to participate, as they have done so far, then we have no choice but to do it ourselves.

So in the end, a vote against tax reform is a vote for economic stagnation. It is allowing the perfect to be the enemy of the good. The Wall Street Journal, as they said yesterday—the question we need to ask ourselves is not whether the tax bill is perfect but whether it is a net benefit to the United States. I think it clearly is, and I think that, with the policies embodied in this bill, we can restore America's economic vigor.

America must continue to prosper if it is to remain the economic beacon of the world, and we need to remain a strong country economically so we can defend ourselves and our friends and allies abroad. The rest of the world—it is true—is just waiting for a sign that America's best days are ahead, and passing this important tax legislation is an indication that it is the case that America's best days still lie ahead.

It is time to awaken the slumbering giant of the American economy. By lightening the load on workers and companies alike, we can make sure new opportunities abound for those just coming into the workforce. We will make everyday drivers of the economy excited once again about our country's future. The President noted today, when he was with us at lunch, that consumer confidence is literally at an alltime high. People have seen the stock market go up and their retirement funds that are invested in pension funds or in their IRA or elsewhere skyrocket since the Trump administration came into office. I think that is because people are sensing we are on the verge of a great economic recovery.

Accepting a stagnant, anemic recovery is not something we have to do. We know what we need to do to rev up the engine of the American economy and get it moving again to benefit all of us. Through tax reform, let's show that the American dream of allowing men and women to work hard and earn suc-

cess isn't just a bygone notion, and it is not just a figment of our imagination. We can do it if we pass this tax reform bill this week, which we intend to do.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION AND THE BLUE-SLIP COURTESY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to address two elements of the Senate's process for evaluating judicial nominations: the role of the American Bar Association and the so-called blue-slip courtesy. Each can influence the appointment process, and we must be diligent to ensure that neither is abused.

The Eisenhower administration was the first to request the input of the ABA—American Bar Association—on prospective judicial nominations. Speaking to the 1955 ABA convention, President Eisenhower thanked the ABA for helping him and his advisers to “secure judges” of the kind he wanted to appoint. If that sounds as though the ABA was a part of the administration, it was.

The ABA evaluated individuals before they were even nominated. Individuals deemed not qualified by the ABA were almost never nominated. No other interest group was given such a quasi-official veto over nominations to any other office.

What could justify such a special role for an interest group? What could do that? The theory is that the ABA was a nonpolitical professional association concerned only with the legal profession and the practice of law.

At its 1933 annual meeting in Grand Rapids, MI, for example, the ABA's executive committee considered changing the ABA constitution to allow “discussion and expressions of opinion on questions of public interest.” After arguments that this would revolutionize the scope and purpose of the ABA, no one—not one person—supported the amendment, to the best of my knowledge.

In February 1965, ABA President Lewis Powell, who later served on the Supreme Court, wrote that “the prevailing view is that the Association must follow a policy of noninvolvement in political and emotionally controversial issues.” If that view actually prevailed in 1965, it did not last.

The ABA House of Delegates soon crossed the political Rubicon and began taking positions on a host of issues through Federal arts funding, affirmative action, the death penalty, welfare policy, immigration; you name it, and the ABA has endorsed the lib-

eral position, oftentimes the most liberal position. The ABA not only opines on such issues through resolutions but also lobbies legislatures and files briefs in court cases.

The ABA has done exactly what it chose not to do back in 1933 and revolutionized the scope and purpose of the organization. It abandoned nearly a century of noninvolvement in political issues, the condition that was said to justify a special role in the judicial appointment process. It hardly seemed reasonable that the ABA could somehow seal off its evaluation of judicial nominees from all of this political activism so that its conclusions could still be trusted.

In 1987, several members of the ABA evaluation committee said that Judge Robert Bork was not qualified to serve on the Supreme Court. I said at the time that the ABA was “playing politics with the ratings.”

Three years later, several of us on the Judiciary Committee, including now-Chairman GRASSLEY, expressed the same view in a letter to Attorney General Richard Thornburgh. We wrote that the ABA “can no longer claim the impartial, neutral role it has been given in the judicial selection process.”

This conclusion has been bolstered by academic research. In 2001, Professor James Lindgren of Northwestern University law school published a study in the *Journal of Law & Politics* that examined ABA ratings for nominees of Presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton. Controlling for race, gender, and a range of objective measurable credentials, Professor Lindgren found that Clinton nominees were 10 times—10 times—more likely than Bush nominees to be rated well qualified by the ABA. In fact, he found that “just being nominated by Clinton instead of Bush is better than any other credential or than all other credentials put together.” Professor Lindgren concluded that “the patterns revealed in the data are consistent with a conclusion of strong political bias favoring Clinton nominees.”

A decade later, three political scientists published a study in the *Political Research Quarterly*, looking at ABA ratings for U.S. Court of Appeals nominees over a 30-year period. Applying recognized social science methods, they concluded that “individuals nominated by a Democratic president are significantly more likely to receive higher ABA ratings than individuals nominated by a Republican president. . . . [W]e find . . . strong evidence of systematic bias in favor of Democratic nominees.” You don't say.

President Trump recently nominated Steven Gras for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit. The distinguished Senators from Nebraska have, in the Judiciary Committee and here on the Senate floor, detailed Mr. Gras's extensive experience and wide support throughout the legal community. He served as chief deputy attorney general of Nebraska for nearly a

dozen years, during which time he defended the constitutionality of the State's law banning partial-birth abortion. That might have been his most serious sin in the eyes of the ABA, which has aggressively embraced the abortion agenda for more than four decades.

In 1969, the ABA formed a committee on overpopulation, which immediately launched a project on the law of abortion and endorsed the Uniform Abortion Act in 1972, even before the Supreme Court's now-infamous *Roe v. Wade* decision legalizing abortion on demand. The committee endorsed Federal funding of abortion in 1978, and in 1990, by more than two to one, they opposed any requirement of parental notification before abortions are performed on minors. The ABA, again, fully embraced the abortion agenda in 1992 and never looked back. It is no wonder that they would deem someone like Mr. Grasz not qualified for the bench.

President Trump has also nominated Brett Talley to the Federal district court in Alabama. Tally attended Harvard Law School. He spent years in a prestigious clerkship at the Federal appellate and trial court levels. He has worked here in the Senate. He has served as a deputy solicitor general of the State of Alabama. He has served in the Justice Department most recently as Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Policy. He enjoys the support of both of Alabama's home State Senators and has a sterling reputation in the legal community. Yet he, too, has been deemed not qualified by the ABA. How is that possible? That determination is nakedly political and should not be taken seriously.

The ABA once defined its purpose in terms of the legal profession and the practice of law. It has, however, chosen a different path. By doing so, the ABA has not only abandoned what once might have justified its role in judicial selection but has also cast serious doubt on the credibility and integrity of its judicial nominee ratings. The ABA was, of course, free to do so, but it should not expect that its actions have no consequences.

The other element of the judicial confirmation process that I want to address is the so-called blue-slip courtesy. This is an informal practice, begun in 1917, by which the Judiciary Committee chairman seeks the views of Senators regarding nominees who would serve in their States. This practice really gets noticed only when the President and Senate majority are of the same party. In that situation, as we face today, the question is whether a home State Senator can use the blue-slip courtesy to block any Senate consideration and, therefore, effectively veto a President's nominees.

Since the blue-slip courtesy was established, 19 Senators, including myself, have chaired the Judiciary Committee—10 Democrats and 9 Republicans. Only 2 of those 19 chairmen

treated the blue-slip courtesy as a single-Senator veto. One of them, apparently, was to empower southern segregationist Senators to block judges who might support integration.

The other 17 chairmen fall into two categories. The early chairmen allowed objecting home State Senators to present their views in the nominee's confirmation hearing. In the last few decades, chairmen of both parties have said that a negative blue slip would not veto a nominee if the White House consulted in good faith with the home State Senators. That is the approach that Chairman Joe Biden took and that I continued when I was chairman, each of us under Presidents of both parties.

The blue-slip courtesy, then, has been a way to highlight the views of home State Senators and to encourage the White House to consult with them when choosing judicial nominees. And it works. When chairmen of both parties have chosen, only a handful of times, to proceed with a hearing for a nominee who lacked two positive blue slips, their decision was consistent with this approach.

Today, Democrats want to rewrite the history of blue slips and redefine the very purpose of the courtesy behind the process. They want to weaponize the blue slip so that a single Senator can, at any time and for any reason, prevent Senate consideration of judicial nominees. They want to change the traditional use of the blue slip because they can no longer use the filibuster to defeat judicial nominees who have majority support.

Democrats opposed filibustering judicial nominees during the Clinton administration. Then, in just 16 months during the 108th Congress, Democrats conducted 20 filibusters on judicial nominees by President George W. Bush. These were the first judicial filibusters in history to defeat majority-supported judicial nominees.

The filibuster pace dropped by two-thirds under President Obama when Republicans conducted just 7 filibusters in 30 months. Claiming that declining filibusters were nonetheless a crisis, Democrats in 2013 abolished nomination filibusters for all executive and judicial nominations except for the Supreme Court.

Democrats took away the ability of 41 Senators to block consideration of judicial nominations on the Senate floor, but now they demand that a single Senator have that much power in the Judiciary Committee by turning the blue-slip courtesy into a *de facto* filibuster. Like the ABA's rating of nominees, nothing but politics explains this flip-flopping and manipulation of the confirmation process.

On October 31, I addressed this issue here on the Senate floor and suggested that the history and purpose of the blue-slip courtesy could help guide its application today. I still believe that. The views of home State Senators matter, and the White House should sincerely consult with them before mak-

ing nominations to positions in their States. Home State Senators enjoy countless ways to convey their views to colleagues here in the Senate, and every Senator may decide whether and how to consider those views. But in the end, the blue slip is a courtesy, not an absolute veto. This distinction matters because tomorrow the Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing on a nominee to the U.S. court of appeals from a State with two Democratic Senators. One has returned the blue slip; the other has not.

Chairman GRASSLEY's decision to hold a hearing is completely consistent with the history and purpose of the blue-slip courtesy. Democrats falsely claim that Chairman GRASSLEY is eliminating what they say is a long-standing precedent that home State Senators may automatically veto appeals court nominations. No such precedent exists, or ever has, unless the practice of only two chairmen for only a fraction of the last century constitutes controlling precedent—and we all know it shouldn't.

It is beyond hypocritical for Democrats to pretend they actually care about the confirmation process precedent. They began the practice of forcing time-consuming rollcall votes for nominees with no opposition at all. They began the practice of using the filibuster to defeat majority-supported nominees. They began the practice of forcing the President to renominate individuals multiple times. They began the practice of forcing cloture votes on unanimously supported judicial nominees and then delaying a confirmation vote for days. These weren't actions undertaken by Republicans. There is one side, and one side only, that has continuously pushed this envelope.

Democrats cite a 2009 letter to President Obama from the Republican conference and an op-ed I publishing in 2014 defending the blue-slip courtesy. In each situation, the Democratic majority was actually threatening to abolish the blue-slip policy altogether. In my op-ed, I emphasized that the blue-slip courtesy is intended to encourage consultation by the White House with home State Senators.

When he became chairman in 2015, Senator GRASSLEY explained the blue-slip process to his constituents in a *Des Moines Register* op-ed. He wrote that the process has value and that he intended to honor it. He is doing just that by returning to the real history and purpose of the blue-slip courtesy.

My Democratic colleagues seem to think that the confirmation process should be whatever they want it to be at whatever moment they so choose. Now they demand that, contrary to most of the last century, a single Senator should be able to do informally what 41 Senators can no longer do formally. They demand following precedent that does not exist while creating new obstruction precedents of their own. Democrats have forced the Senate

to take 60 cloture votes on nominations so far this year, 13 of them on judicial nominations. That is nearly nine times as many as during the first year of all new Presidents—all new Presidents—since the cloture rule was applied to nominations in 1949.

I have been in the minority a number of times, multiple times. I get it. Democrats want their way, and they don't always get it. That hardly means that the majority in general and Chairman GRASSLEY in particular are not being fair, consistent, or evenhanded. The blue-slip courtesy has a history, and it has a purpose. It exists to allow home State Senators to share their views with the Judiciary Committee and to encourage White House consultation with them before making nominations.

Neither a liberal interest group like the American Bar Association nor abuse of the blue-slip courtesy should be allowed to further distort and politicize the judicial confirmation process.

It is a disgrace. It really is a disgrace, the way the Democrats changed the rules automatically, overnight, without even consulting with Republicans, and doing it solely to give advantage to their side, even though this is a process that really ought to have fair treatment on both sides at all times.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I know we are scheduled for a vote in a few minutes. We will have plenty of time to talk about this in the days to come.

I think one of the core things that I hope tax reform will be about is empowering the American worker. By "the American worker," I mean the people whom they don't make Netflix series about and we don't see movies about too often anymore. There was a time when the American worker was a hero in our country. People looked up to the American worker and idealized them. Today, obviously, entertainment focuses on other professions. There is nothing wrong with that, but we have forgotten about their hard work and the millions and millions of Americans across this country who truly remain the backbone of our economy and our Nation.

There are hard-working men and women who are struggling to get by, not because they are not working hard but because everything costs more—something you quickly find out as your family begins to grow. That is why I have spent so much time talking about the child tax credit. A lot of people confuse that with the childcare credit, which is important as well.

The child tax credit takes into account the reality that raising children

is an expense. It is a blessing, but it costs money. At the end of the day, it doesn't always matter only how much you make; it also matters how much you spend. And when you are raising children and raising a family, the costs are often out of your control, and they increase substantially every single year. So perhaps the best way to illustrate to my colleagues the impact that tax reform has on working families is to talk about real people and their real lives—how much money they make and what tax reform would mean for them.

I want to start with a real family, a particular family my staff has been communicating with; that is, the Starling family, Richard and Emily, a very young family from Jacksonville, FL. They have a 2-year-old daughter, and they are expecting their second child in March. Richard is a pastor, and he works part time at Starbucks. He makes about \$25,000 a year. His wife Emily stays home and cares for their daughter while he is at work.

Because of their income, the Senate tax bill's nonrefundable child tax credit increase would actually be worth very little to them. A lot of people have said to me: Well, we have increased it to \$2,000. Isn't that great? It is. But what it means that people don't understand is, if the majority—if all the taxes you pay are payroll taxes, it doesn't help a lot.

I, frankly, get offended when I hear people say: These are Americans who don't pay taxes. They do pay taxes—not income tax, but they pay payroll taxes. They take it out of your check every month. Trust me, it is a tax. It is less money than what was supposed to be there after the tax.

So the tax credit, while we increased it to \$2,000—and that is great for a lot of people—it does nothing for them. The total effect is only about \$115 for the family. That is how much they will be saving in their taxes from the current year—\$115.

But here is where it gets worse. The Senate bill—which I am largely supportive of, but I just want to tell my colleagues what the numbers are so we can see where the changes need to be—the Senate bill would actually increase taxes in March when they have a child. You say: How can that be? Well, for some families in their income range, the nonrefundable increase for the child tax credit is less valuable than the current lost personal exemption. So we take away the personal exemption and we put in this additional child tax credit, but it is nonrefundable. They can't get to that tax credit because they are not paying income taxes, and the result is that if they make \$26,000 instead of \$25,000, the Senate bill would actually take away \$15 from their per-child tax cut.

So these families work hard and pay their taxes, they raise children, they are contributing an extraordinary amount to our country, and they need our help more than ever before.

There are a couple other examples, and I will go to the first chart. Let's

take for example a tire changer and a preschool teacher with two children in Gainesville, FL—the home of the university in Florida, the finest learning institution in the Southeast—an editorial thing, but it is a matter of fact. But I digress. Let me get back to chart No. 1 and talk about this family.

The husband, as I said, works at a local auto shop as a tire changer. His wife is a preschool teacher. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, with these two jobs, their combined income would be \$28,300. Because the increase to the child tax credit is nonrefundable—the extra money we put in—this family wouldn't nearly have enough income tax liability to take advantage of the full credit. So the bill as it is currently written gives them a tax cut of \$200—about \$50 per person.

But what if we did what Senator LEE and I are proposing, which is to make the child tax credit fully refundable, even against payroll tax. Well, then their tax cut would not be \$200, it would be \$1,570. Trust me when I tell you that for a family making \$28,000 a year, a \$1,500 pay increase in real cash matters. It matters. It doesn't solve all of their problems, but it helps.

Here is another one. Take this example. The husband is a private in the Army National Guard, and his wife is a waitress at a local restaurant. They have three children. He is on Active Duty at Camp Blanding in Starke, FL. She works full time. They have a combined income of \$33,832, according to the National Guard base pay.

Because the increase, again, is nonrefundable in the child tax credit, they don't have enough income to take full advantage of the tax credit. The bill as currently written cuts their taxes by \$388. The proposal that Senator LEE and I have outlined would cut their taxes by \$2,100. So a \$2,100 pay increase for this working family in cash will matter. It will matter. It doesn't solve all of their problems but, trust me, \$2,100 for this family, more than what they have today, will help them a lot, and it rewards the work they are doing.

What about a single mother. Let's say she is a childcare worker. She has one child and is living in Miami, FL, where I live. She works full time. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the median wage for that job is \$14,800 a year. She gets a tax cut under the current bill of about \$100. If we do what Senator LEE and I are talking about doing, she will get a \$1,000 tax cut. I am not telling you that \$1,000 solves all of her problems, but a \$1,000 pay increase for a single mother making \$14,800 a year will matter.

How about a loading dock worker and a cashier in Northwest Florida after having two kids. Here is what we point to: a glaring blind spot in the way this is structured. Again, for many working families, because the child tax credit is nonrefundable, it will actually be less valuable to parents than the dependent exemption and the existing child credits are under current law today. I think

this is the opposite of pro-family policy.

Let's look at this example. He works as a freight mover at a lumber warehouse, and she works as a cashier. They both work and live full time in Live Oak, FL. Their average combined income is about \$28,650. Under the current Tax Code, the way the law is today, if they have two kids, their tax cut would be \$2,776. That is what they would save. Under the current bill, their tax cut would be \$2,656. So, in essence, under the way the bill is structured now, they would be getting \$120 less—or keeping \$120 less—than what they would under the law today, for a family making \$28,000 a year.

We can fix it, because under the proposal Senator LEE and I will have, they are going to see a tax cut of \$4,000 for having that additional child. That is \$1,200 greater than the current law. That is a raise of \$1,300 more than would happen under the bill as it is currently structured.

I don't think this is an intended consequence. But this is a working family. They work. They pay payroll tax. They make \$28,000, \$29,000 a year. Trust me when I tell you this money will matter. It won't solve all of their problems, but it will help. It is a pay raise.

Last but not least, I live in West Miami, FL. I have lived there since 1985. It is a working-class neighborhood. According to the census, the average family income in West Miami, where I live, is \$38,000—let's say \$39,000. That doesn't mean that West Miami is poor. I know the people there. They work hard. They pay their taxes. They raise their children well. They go to work 5 days a week for 8 or 9 hours a day, sometimes on the weekends. But because it is a working-class town, the nonrefundable increase we put in for the child tax credit doesn't do much.

As an example, based on the census data for West Miami, for that ZIP Code that I live in, more than 2,500 children in this ZIP Code—meaning more than half of the total number of children living in that area—would be receiving less than the full credit than they would otherwise be eligible for. Why? Because for their parents, their primary tax liability is the payroll tax. And you cannot help working families with a tax cut if you do not allow the cut to apply to the payroll tax. It is as simple as that.

We have to do that. If we want to help people in this country, if we really want to help them have a little bit more in their pocket, then let's implement the proposal that Senator LEE and I have put forward.

By the way, I hear these economists and other people say: Well, it won't do anything for growth.

You really don't understand how working Americans live. Someone who makes \$38,000 a year or \$35,000 a year basically spends every penny they make. They have to. If you make \$38,000 a year, with two kids, you are spending every penny you make and

then probably having to put the extra on your credit card, unfortunately. This proposal will drive consumer spending. It will allow them to pay for some things they can't buy now. These kids outgrow their shoes so fast. The bookbags don't make it through a year. There are so many things we could be helping families with, and our tax reforms should do that.

Everybody in this town has a trade association, has a lobbyist, has newspapers that write about them. Who writes about them? Who writes about these working Americans—working Americans, not people asking for anything from the government. They go to work. They work hard. They work every day. Who fights for them? Who talks about them? Who represents them? That is supposed to be us.

If we are serious about representing them, then let's prove it. Let's amend this bill and change it so we can give working Americans the raise they deserve, and that they need, to strengthen our country and strengthen our families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Katsas nomination?

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 283 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Strange
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—48

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Harris	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Heitkamp	Sanders
Cantwell	Hirono	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	Kennedy	Shaheen
Casey	King	Stabenow
Coons	Klobuchar	Tester
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Udall
Donnelly	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Corker

McCain

The nomination was confirmed. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Katsas nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 1519.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 165, S. 1519, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

TAX REFORM

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the tax relief bill, which the Senate is working very hard to try to pass. I brought some charts with me to show the impact this bill will have in terms of reducing the tax burden for hard-working American taxpayers and also helping to grow our economy.

It is important to understand this is not just about making sure American taxpayers can keep more of their hard-earned wages and income but also this is about making sure we have a growing economy, that we have more jobs, and that we have rising wages and rising income for American workers. Here are just some of the statistics that show that. These statistics are according to the nonpartisan Tax Foundation and also the Council of Economic Advisers. What you see from this first chart is, this tax relief package is about real economic growth, not just making sure our taxpayers get a tax cut but about growing our economy. This top number, which comes from the Council of Economic Advisers, is \$4,000 that workers, on average, would receive from the economic growth created by the combination of reducing the regulatory burden, which is something we have been working on all year with the administration—reducing that regulatory burden—and combining that then with tax relief to generate more

economic growth. As I said, according to the Council of Economic Advisers and the nonpartisan Tax Foundation, it also generates almost 4 percent in terms of a larger economy.

So this is about reducing the tax rates but growing the base and making sure, as I said, there are not only more jobs but also rising wages and income from that demand for labor that comes with a growing economy, that comes with investment, and that comes with job creation. For an average family of four, the tax cut is about \$2,200 under the Senate bill. It generates about 925,000 new jobs over the scoring period and, as I said, almost a 4-percent larger economy.

This next chart shows that across all income groups, across every income group, you see tax relief, and that is because we start by reducing the tax rates. So across the board, we work to make sure you are applying a lower tax rate to whatever income cohort you are talking about. So new rates are 10 percent, 12 percent, 22 percent, 24 percent, 23, 35, and a 38.5-percent top rate, but when you combine the lower rates along with an increased standard deduction—we increase the standard deduction. We about double it, from around \$6,000 to about \$12,000 and \$24,000 for married filers, \$18,000 for a single filer with a dependent. The result is, across every income group, we reduce the amount of tax they have to pay.

At the same time, we preserve and expand many of the current tax provisions that are important to our American families. For example, the child tax credit, which is something the Presiding Officer has worked on very diligently, would be doubled. We double the child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$2,000. More family-owned small businesses and family farms will be protected from the death tax because we double the exemption amount. Right now, the unified credit is about \$5.5 million, and we double that to more than \$11 million so that if you have a small business or a farm, you are able to pass that from one generation to the next without being forced to sell it. To help save for college, expecting parents will be able to open a 529 savings account, again, helping families with children. Businesses will be encouraged to provide paid family and medical leave by giving them a tax credit to partially offset an employee's pay while caring for their child or for a family member.

We do all of this while maintaining tax deductions that are important to many Americans. These include continuing the mortgage interest deduction—very important for homeowners—continuing the deductibility of charitable contributions to ensure that charities continue to receive contributions that are so important to them, continuing the child and dependent care tax credits, the adoption tax credit, the earned income tax credit, and the deferred treatment for 401(k)s and

individual retirement accounts. That was something that came up earlier. There was some concern about reducing the limits on what could be contributed to retirement accounts on a tax-deferred basis, and we continue those levels so individuals can continue to save for retirement. We also continue the medical expense deduction, which is important to seniors who have significant medical expenses.

The resulting increase in aftertax income will allow families more financial freedom and empower them to save for their retirement or perhaps for their children's education. Considering 50 percent of Americans are living paycheck to paycheck and over one-third of all families are just \$400 away from serious financial difficulty, this is much needed relief, and it is certainly overdue.

This tax relief is also very important for small businesses, so our third chart really goes to small business, which of course is the backbone of our economy. In my State, farming and ranching is incredibly important, but across the country, the backbone of our economy is small businesses. Ninety percent of the businesses in America are small businesses, and what this chart shows is that for passthroughs, which typically small businesses are passthroughs, that there is income relief again at all income levels. Remember how these passthrough small businesses work. Whether you have a sub S corporation, a limited liability corporation, a limited liability partnership, or a regular partnership, all these different types of small businesses are passthroughs, meaning the income flows through the business entity and is taxed at the individual level. That is why it is very important that we show that across the board, at all different income levels, small businesses benefit from this tax reduction.

By reducing the maximum tax rate for sole proprietorships, partnerships, S corporations, and all the other passthrough entities I just mentioned, we are creating greater economic growth and opportunities as small businesses reinvest in their companies, reinvest in their employees, and reinvest in their communities. For many small businesses, equipment, business supplies, and other capital expenditures are very costly, and it cuts into their profit margin. So this is about helping them make those investments that enable them to grow their businesses, increase wages, and hire more employees.

Our tax bill also allows businesses to immediately expense or write off the cost of new investments, effectively reinvesting in our small businesses and driving economic growth, job creation, and higher wages for American workers.

We increase the amount allowed under section 179, something very important to small businesses, which essentially allows them to expense or write off their investments. This is a hugely important expensing provision

for farmers, for ranchers, and really for small businesses across the board, and we enhance that section 179 expensing.

All the while, we work to make sure we have stable government revenues through a broader tax base, a growing economy, and a more efficient tax system. That means we encourage investment, and it means the revenues that come to government come from a larger tax base and lower rates. So, individually, the hard-working citizens pay less of their earnings and businesses pay less as a percentage of their revenues, but because you have that economic growth—you have that rising tide that lifts all boats—government actually has more and stable revenues from economic growth not from higher taxes. That is some of what I showed in that first slide; that this is about growing our economy and driving that economic growth.

The bill ensures that we are competitive in the global economy. In fact, as a result of the tax relief and tax reform we are undertaking, there is something like \$2.5 trillion that is currently overseas that now has an incentive to come home and is invested here at home in our businesses, creating jobs in America and expansion of America's economy rather than having that money parked overseas or invested overseas.

So, for all these reasons, I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work to pass this tax relief, this tax reform. This really is about making sure hard-working American taxpayers decide what to do with their hard-earned dollars. Again, I ask that all of us work together, pass this bill through the Senate, get it into conference with the House, and get the very best tax relief product we can for the American people and that we get it done before the end of the year.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, in this season of Thanksgiving, let me say that I am thankful, as I rise for my 187th "Time to Wake Up" address, for the spirit of commitment and innovation that this great Nation devotes to tackling the challenge of climate change, even with this President.

The United States now is alone in the world as the only Nation not committed to the historic Paris Agreement, but at the U.N. Climate Change Conference in Germany, I saw firsthand that Americans are still committed to climate action. Corporate leaders like Mars, Microsoft, Facebook, and Walmart were there to discuss the role American corporations can take on climate change. American Governors, mayors, universities, and many other corporations all brought the same message to Bonn; that notwithstanding the corrupted Trump administration, America is still in.

Senators CARDIN, MARKEY, SCHATZ, MERKLEY, and I sent the message that most of our constituents and the majority of the American people believe

that climate change is a serious threat to our country and the planet and that American action and leadership is necessary.

An entire day was dedicated to the changes we are seeing in the world's oceans. This is where the industry liars and climate deniers get stumped. The oceans bear the brunt of our carbon pollution. Sea levels are rising, waters are warming, and seas are acidifying. These undeniable measurements have no answer from the climate denial apparatus, so the denial apparatus just chooses to ignore the oceans, but we can't ignore the oceans, certainly not in coastal States.

The reality of ocean climate change hits home along our coasts: Warming waters move our fisheries around, sea level rise erodes our shores, and we must prepare for more frequent and intense hurricanes and storms.

The Trump administration is more or less completely crooked on this subject, but even they had to throw in the towel and release without amendment the recent U.S. "Climate Science Special Report." They had no scientific rebuttal—none—to the dozen Federal Agencies and Departments that assembled the latest and best understanding of the effects of climate change on the United States. They couldn't rebut it. They chose to ignore it.

Will that report affect this administration's industry-paid climate policies? Of course not. Those policies are bought and paid for. But it is worth looking at the "Climate Science Special Report." This report gave special attention to storms. The report says:

For Atlantic—

That is, the ocean off my home State of Rhode Island—
and eastern North Pacific—

That is, the ocean off our western coast—

and eastern North Pacific typhoons, increases are projected in precipitation rates and intensity. The frequency of the most intense of these storms is projected to increase.

The report continues:

Assuming storm characteristics do not change, sea level rise will increase the frequency and extent of extreme flooding associated with coastal storms, such as hurricanes and nor'easters.

Extreme flooding matters quite a lot in Rhode Island.

The report continues:

A projected increase in the intensity of hurricanes in the North Atlantic could increase the probability of extreme flooding along most of the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf Coast states beyond what would be projected based solely on relative sea level rise.

It is going to happen just from projected sea level rise. This means that extreme flooding could exceed those predictions because of storm activity.

Humans are driving these changes, the report says, not the alternative explanation for these changes offered by the climate deniers. Oh, wait; that is right. They have no alternative explanation. They have nothing. They have

nothing but industry-funded denial. There is no alternative explanation to what the scientists say, which is actually consistent with the finding of the "Climate Science Special Report" that there is "no convincing alternative explanation."

That is not the only report. Last year, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office released a report titled "Effects of Climate Change and Coastal Development on U.S. Hurricane Damage: Implications for the Federal Budget." That report projected that by 2075, annual damage from hurricanes will increase by \$120 billion as coastal populations increase, sea levels rise, and U.S. landfalls of strong hurricanes become more frequent. That is the prediction. Of that increase, around 45 percent can already be clearly attributed to climate change.

In a presentation from early November, CBO summarized:

Expected damage from hurricanes will grow more quickly than GDP.

The share of the population facing substantial damage will grow fivefold by 2075.

On the basis of past patterns, Federal spending on hurricanes will also grow more quickly than GDP.

The World Meteorological Organization has also released a report connecting "extraordinary weather" to man-made climate change. Warmer temperatures spur increased precipitation, the report says, and higher sea levels amplify storm surge as driven by hurricanes and other coastal storms. This is not new. It is just being frequently and constantly reported with no convincing alternative explanation.

During the typical Atlantic hurricane season, storms develop in the warm, tropical waters off the western coast of Africa. These storms gather heat and energy as they pass over this band of warm seawater across the Atlantic known as the hurricane highway. This is the west coast of Africa. Here is South America. Here is the United States. There is Florida. And here is the hurricane highway leading to the Caribbean. Whether these storms become devastating category 4 and 5 hurricanes or weaken and disperse along the way depends on atmospheric conditions and on this ocean heat that powers up those hurricanes.

A typical Atlantic hurricane season used to generate roughly six hurricanes, three of which reached category 3 or higher. That was then. Typical is no longer typical. During August of 2017, this hurricane highway that I showed you reached 9 degrees Fahrenheit hotter than the 30-year average. This exceptional warming supercharged storms into hurricanes bearing catastrophic damage.

The superheated 2017 hurricane highway fueled not 6 but 10 named hurricanes, and 6—not 3—reached category 3 strength or higher, including Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, Jose, and Maria. What is more, all 10 of the season's hurricanes occurred in a row—the greatest number of consecutive hurricanes in the satellite era.

Typically, what happens is that a storm will churn up cooler water in its wake. So during typical years, a following storm will weaken over the cooler waters left in a preceding storm's wake. That is the way it ordinarily works. This should have been the case for Hurricane Irma as it charged northwest through the Caribbean just days after Harvey. But as I said, hurricanes are powered up by sea surface temperatures, particularly sea surface temperatures above 82 degrees Fahrenheit. And by September 7, as Irma moved over the coast of Cuba and up into the Bahamas and Florida, the hurricane highway surface temperature Harvey had left behind measured up to 87 degrees Fahrenheit. The result of that onslaught was that the entire island of Puerto Rico is still recovering. The Virgin Islands were also slammed. Houston saw epic, widespread flooding. Welcome to the new typical, thanks to ocean warming, which comes to us thanks to climate change, which comes to us thanks to carbon pollution, which still comes to us in such a polluting flood, thanks to a generation of industry lying that has not stopped to this day.

At the Southern New England Weather Conference earlier this month, University of Rhode Island Professor Isaac Ginis presented his worst-case scenario models for a "Hurricane Rhody," which would bring levels of destruction to Rhode Island not seen since we were hit by the Great Hurricane of 1938, the destruction of which is seen here in downtown Providence, or Hurricane Carol, which brought similar destruction in 1954. That is Providence City Hall. This is the roof of a streetcar. Another streetcar is half-flooded. And this is water in a river pouring in downtown Providence through the streets. Essentially, this is white water in downtown Providence.

The flooding that Providence endured in Hurricane Carol caused us to build a hurricane barrier across what is called Fox Point to protect downtown. However, even with the hurricane barrier in place, Professor Ginis's simulations show 3 feet of flooding in downtown Providence if a category 3 hurricane were to hit us at high tide. And, he proposed, if our "Hurricane Rhody" were to swing back around and make a second landfall, as Esther did in 1961—he modeled it based on the previous experience of Hurricane Esther—then if it came back, even in a weakened category 2 state, Providence could see up to 14 feet of flooding.

But wait, there is more. Fast forward a few decades and several feet of projected sea level rise, and then Providence doesn't stand a chance. The Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration put 9 to 12 projected vertical feet of sea level rise riding up Rhode Island's shores by the end of the century. According to CRMC—our Coastal Resources Management Council—at 10

feet of sea level rise, Rhode Island would lose 36 square miles of total land area. Good-bye to much of Newport, Warwick, Barrington, Block Island, Point Judith, and other coastal communities Rhode Islanders hold dear. This is the present projection by our State agencies, our State University, and NOAA.

As the Senate prepares a third disaster relief funding package, we can't just fund immediate hurricane recovery. We must also help coastal communities look ahead to the next storm. We need better coastal flood mapping and risk modeling. We need to prepare for damage to natural and engineered coastal infrastructure. We need research and modeling to understand what coastal populations face from the new typical: stronger hurricanes, sea level rise, heavy precipitation, disrupted fisheries, and increased storms and storm surges.

We have to prepare for this. It would be stupid not to put a small percentage of what we are spending in cleanup and recovery into prevention, protection, and preparation. It is just common sense.

The Trump administration does not represent American views on climate change. It has been captured by an industry that has been dishonest about this issue for a generation, and it now represents the falsehoods of that industry. For that reason, it also no longer represents American determination to tackle this challenge. That determination is now found in State Houses, in corporations, in our great universities, and with the American people. Americans know that we can pull together to avoid some of these worst-case scenarios. Coastal communities, in particular, are keenly aware of the special risks they face.

In the Senate, I remain eager to work with my colleagues on all of the above. You know where to find me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this evening to talk about the tax bill, which will come to the floor very soon. We have started debate, and we will be debating it the next couple of days. There is a lot to talk about, a lot of numbers, and a lot of data. I will try to limit the numbers as best I can, but it is important to review some of the numbers.

For tonight's purposes, I start with just two numbers. The first number is 59,456, and the second number is 7. What do I mean when I say 59,456? It is in dollars. The average annual tax cut for those making over \$1 million a year in 2019 is \$59,456. As many people know who have been following the debate,

the Senate bill delayed a corporate tax cut by 1 year so most of the analysis starts in the year 2019 not 2018. So there is \$59,456 of a tax cut for those making over \$1 million in the first year of the bill, 2019.

What does 7 mean? Seven is also a dollar number. Seven dollars is the average monthly tax cut for Americans making between \$20,000 and \$30,000 a year in that same year, 2019.

If you wanted to compare the annual number of \$59,456 to the annual average tax cut for that income category for the same year, it would be about \$84. No matter which way you look at it, there is a basic unfairness there. Even when you apply percentages, it is very clear that folks in those lower income brackets don't get the benefit the richest among us—the superrich people making more than \$1 million—get. Even if you drop down the number to over one-half million dollars and up, those folks are getting sometimes double, even triple, the tax cuts for people in the broad middle.

The one I just cited might be the most egregious example, people making \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year getting just \$7 a month in a tax cut.

One of the reasons the bill is so stingy and so unfair when it comes to folks in the lower income brackets or even the middle-income brackets is because so much has been given in the bill to big corporations. Right? There is only a certain amount of revenue you can move around in a bill like this.

Because the corporate—and I should say the permanent corporate tax cut. The tax cuts for families is not permanent, but the permanent corporate tax cut is \$1.5 trillion, and by one estimate it is \$1.414 trillion over 10 years. When you allocate that much to big corporations and make it permanent, obviously, it limits your ability to help the middle class in a robust or substantial way.

I think most Americans will ask: Why don't we limit any kind of corporate tax break and apply, potentially, hundreds of billions—with a “b”—of dollars to a bigger middle-class tax cut? But the majority so far, starting with the Finance Committee, has decided not to do that.

I just leave that for people to consider. Is it fair, when you are doing a tax bill, so-called tax reform, for the first time in three decades, that people making over \$1 million who don't need \$59,456—does it make sense to give them that and give the store away to corporations in a permanent fashion and give folks making \$20,000 to \$30,000 just 7 bucks a month or 84 bucks over the course of a year, on average?

It gets worse. The numbers get even more egregious, even more insulting. That same year, in 2019, 572,000 of our country's richest households would get \$34 billion worth of tax cuts. You heard that right. In 1 year, a rather small group of Americans—572,000 of the richest households—get \$34 billion of a tax cut in just that 1 year. That \$34 billion

in that 1 year for the richest among us gets even higher if you add in other provisions, other tax cuts, but I will be conservative and just limit it to the \$34 billion.

Some people might ask: Well, what about the rest of the country or most of the country? What is left? Well, if you compare that \$34 billion for a relatively small group of the wealthiest, if you compare that to 90 million—my arms don't stretch out far enough to compare 572 taxpayers with 90 million. What happens to 90 million taxpayers who happen to make under \$50,000? A couple of minutes ago I talked about \$20,000 to \$30,000. Now we are talking about everyone below \$50,000 in a year. That is about 90 million people. What happens to them? Well, they get a grand total of \$14 billion, and some even see a tax increase. So let's leave the tax increase for people making less than \$50,000 off the table for now because some will get a tax increase, and some will get a benefit. So it is hard to comprehend that 90 million people divvy up \$14 billion, but a tiny fraction of that—572,000 people—get \$34 billion just in 2019. Then you have 2020 and 2021, and they keep getting those dollar amounts.

Some people might say: Well, you know, everyone should get a tax cut in a bill like this, and even if the wealthy get a tax cut, that is the way Washington works. I have described this bill this way over and over again, and I will keep describing it this way. It is a giveaway. It is a giveaway to the superrich. It is certainly a giveaway to big corporations. They get \$1.5 trillion, and it is permanent.

There have been a lot of analyses done of this bill, and there are lots of stories to point to. I just point to one that came out just yesterday. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities came out with a report that is a little more than seven pages' worth. They do reports like this on a regular basis, sometimes more than one report in a week. I know folks can't read it from a distance, but here is what the headline says: “JCT Estimates”—Joint Committee on Taxation, that is the acronym—Joint Committee on Taxation estimates “Amended Senate Tax Bill Skewed to Top, Hurts Many Low- and Middle-Income Americans.” That is what the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities said yesterday. So what they are analyzing is not the original proposal folks in the Senate Republican caucus offered. This is the amended Senate bill.

Here is what they say, in pertinent part. I will just read maybe two sentences.

Under the amended bill, in 2025 (when most of its provisions would be in place), high-income households would get the largest tax cuts as a share of after-tax income, on average, while households with incomes below \$30,000 would on average face a tax increase. By 2027, when many of its provisions would have expired, those at the top would still get large tax cuts, but every income group below—

I will read that again.
—every income group below \$75,000 would face tax increases, on average.

You heard that right—tax increases on average. So whether you look at it in the year 2019 for people making \$20,000 to \$30,000 or 2019 for people making under \$50,000 and compare that to the wealthiest among us or whether you look at it in terms of what happens just a few years later in 2025, you can see the basic unfairness of this.

Just at a time when we have this great opportunity to do a number of things which would not only turbocharge the economy and potentially lift families out of poverty—and certainly lift children out of poverty—just when we have the opportunity to simplify the code, to help middle-class families in a substantial and robust way, not the stingy way the bill does it, to the point where some might get a tax break one year that is very limited and then that goes away and their taxes go up and others are losing healthcare because of the repeal of the individual mandate—what is most egregious here is maybe not even the giveaways. That is egregious enough. What is outrageous is, the giveaways happen, and the debt is run up to do that. Then, on top of all that, we miss an opportunity, as Washington often does. There is an old expression that Washington never misses an opportunity to miss an opportunity. This is an opportunity to give the middle class maybe a record tax cut, but the majority has chosen not to do that. This is also an opportunity to lift a lot more children out of poverty with a much more generous child tax credit, a much more substantial commitment to lifting kids out of poverty, because we have a bill that allows us to do that, a big tax bill that only comes around once every couple of decades, potentially. The last time this was done was 31 years ago. So this is a critically important moment for the middle class, a critically important moment for children—middle-income children but also children from low-income families who don't get a lot of help under current policy.

Now, some people might ask: Well, how have the rich done over the last number of years? Maybe some might want to make the argument—the ridiculous argument, but they might want to make it—that somehow the rich need a little help. Well, let's see what has happened since 1980. Since 1980, the richest 1 percent have seen their share of national income almost double—double—from 11 percent to 20 percent in 2014, the last time this was measured. So the richest 1 percent, in about 35 years, have seen their share of all national income almost double. So the richest 1 percent have been doing pretty well over the decades since 1980. Do they really need yet another tax cut? Do they really need tens of billions of dollars split or divvied up among a very small number of Americans? I don't think so, and I think most Americans would agree with me.

According to the New York Times, no other nation in the 35-member Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—the so-called OECD countries, 35 countries, and we are one of them—no other country has seen this widening of the gap between the richest and everyone else. You could see it in the other example. The richest small number in America get \$34 billion, and then 90 million people have to split a number that is less than half that. That is really an insult to who we are as Americans.

That same JCT—the Joint Committee on Taxation—their estimate of the Republican bill shows that households earning over \$1 million would get an average tax cut about 73 times larger than households earning between \$50,000 and \$75,000 in 2019, that same year, the first year.

We can go on and on with these comparisons, but I want to go back to the number I started with, that \$59,000 number. If you keep the dollar sign on it, and use it for another purpose, you have just arrived at roughly the median household income for the United States of America. So the median household income is about \$59,000. That is the median household income all across the country. That number happens to be roughly the same number as the \$59,456, the average annual tax cut for those making over \$1 million in 2019.

There are lots of other ways to describe the bill. The bill raises \$134 billion on the backs of hard-working Americans by changing how the Tax Code measures inflation. Not many people are paying attention to this, but the measurement is going to change if the bill passes. This number only grows over time.

For someone who is just starting out in their professional life, they would see this change haunt their paychecks for the next 50 years. So they are going to change how the Tax Code measures inflation. Not many people know that, and I think they are starting to find out.

If all of that wasn't enough, this bill would do a number of other things which are particularly destructive. It will reward companies that have outsourced jobs, it will increase healthcare premiums by an average of an additional 10 percent a year, and it is going to give, at the same time, obscene tax cuts to the superrich by, at the same time, increasing taxes on the middle class.

So when I described this bill last week in the Finance Committee as a thief in the night, I didn't choose those words casually; I meant every word of it. It is a thief in the night because of what the adverse impact on middle-class families and lower income families trying to get to the middle class would be, compared to what happens to the wealthiest among us. So it is robbing people of an opportunity to get a better tax cut for the middle class and giving away the store to the rich.

I will have more to say about this, but I see the majority leader is on the floor.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-55, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Poland for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$250 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-55

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Poland.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment: * \$249 million.

Other: \$1 million.

Total: \$250 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Up to one hundred fifty (150) AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM).

Non-MDE: Also included are missile containers, weapon system support, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (PL-D-1AE).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: PL-D-YAE.
 (vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: November 28, 2017.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Poland—AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM)

The Government of Poland has requested to purchase up to one hundred fifty (150) AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM). Also included are missile containers, weapon system support, spare and repair parts, support and test equipment, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The estimated cost is \$250 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a NATO ally. Poland continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in Central Europe.

This potential sale would support Poland's F-16 fighter program and enhances Poland's ability to provide for its own territorial defense and support coalition operations. Poland previously purchased the AIM-120C-7 missile and will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Raytheon Missile Systems, Tucson, AZ. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Poland.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-55

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AIM-120C-7 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) is a guided missile featuring digital technology and micro-miniature solid-state electronics. The AMRAAM capabilities include look-down/shoot-down, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic countermeasures, and interception of high- and low-flying and maneuvering targets. The AMRAAM is classified CONFIDENTIAL. The major components and subsystems range from UNCLASSIFIED to CONFIDENTIAL and technical data and other documentation are classified up to SECRET.

2. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

3. A determination has been made that Poland can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary to fur-

ther the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

4. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Poland.

DEFENSE SECURITY
 COOPERATION AGENCY,
 Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
 Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
 U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-64, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Poland for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$250 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
 Lieutenant General, USA, Director.
 Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-64

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Poland.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
 Major Defense Equipment * \$215 million.
 Other \$35 million.
 Total \$250 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: High Mobility Artillery Rocket System (HIMARS)

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
 Sixteen (16) Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GMLRS) M31A1 Unitary.

Nine (9) Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GMLRS) M30A1 Alternative Warhead.

Sixty-one (61) Army Tactical Missile Systems (ATACMS) M57 Unitary.

Non-MDE: Also included are eight (8) Universal Position Navigation Units (UPNU), thirty-four (34) Low Cost Reduced Range (LCRR) practice rockets, one thousand six hundred forty-two (1,642) Guidance and Control Section Assemblies for GMLRS, Missile Common Test Sets and Devices, testing Precision, Lightweight GPS Receivers (PLGR), support equipment, U.S. Government and contractor services, training, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (PL-B-UDD, PL-B-UDE).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: November 28, 2017.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Poland—High Mobility Artillery Rocket System (HIMARS)

The Government of Poland has requested to purchase sixteen (16) Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GMLRS) M31A 1 Unitary, nine (9) Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GMLRS) M30A1 alternative warheads, sixty-one (61) Army Tactical Missile Systems (ATACMS) M57 Unitary. Also included are eight (8) Universal Position Navigation Units (UPNU), thirty-four (34)

Low Cost Reduced Range (LCRR) practice rockets, one thousand six hundred forty-two (1,642) Guidance and Control Section Assemblies for GMLRS, Missile Common Test Sets and Devices, testing Precision, Lightweight GPS Receivers (PLGR), support equipment, U.S. Government and contractor services, training, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated cost is \$250 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a NATO ally which has been, and continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe. This sale is consistent with U.S. initiatives to provide key allies in the region with modern systems that will enhance interoperability with U.S. forces and increase security.

Poland intends to use these defense articles and services to modernize its armed forces and expand its capability to strengthen its homeland defense and deter regional threats. This will contribute to Poland's military goals of updating capability while further enhancing interoperability with the United States and other allies. Poland will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin in Grand Prairie, TX. This FMS case will support the parallel Direct Commercial Sale (DCS) between Lockheed Martin and Polska Grupa Zbrojenjowa (PGZ), the prime contractor for this effort in Poland. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require U.S. Government or contractor representatives to travel to Poland for program management reviews to support the program. Travel is expected to occur approximately twice per year as needed to support equipment fielding and training.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-64

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The High Mobility Artillery Rocket Systems (HIMARS) is a highly mobile, all-weather indirect area fire artillery system. The HIMARS mission is to supplement cannon artillery to deliver a large volume of firepower within a short time against critical time-sensitive targets. At shorter ranges, HIMARS complements tube artillery with heavy barrages against assaulting forces as well as in the counter-fire, or defense suppression roles. The highest level of classified information that could be disclosed by a proposed sale, production, or by testing of the end item is SECRET; the highest level that must be disclosed for production, maintenance, or training is CONFIDENTIAL. Reverse engineering could reveal SECRET information. Launcher platform software, weapon operational software, command and control special application software, and command and control loadable munitions module software are considered UNCLASSIFIED. The system specifications and limitations are classified SECRET. Vulnerability data is classified up to SECRET. Countermeasures, counter-countermeasures, vulnerability/susceptibility analyses, and threat definitions are classified SECRET.

2. Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GMLRS) Unitary M31A1 uses a Unitary High

Explosive (HE) 200 pound class warhead along with GPS aided IMU based guidance and control for ground-to-ground precision point targeting. The GMLRS Unitary uses an Electronic Safe and Arm Fuze (ESAF) along with a nose mounted proximity sensor to give enhanced effectiveness to the GMLRS Unitary rocket by providing tri-mode warhead functionality with point detonate, point detonate with programmable delay, or Height of Burst proximity function. GMLRS Unitary M31A1 end-item is comprised of a Rocket Pod Container (RPC) and six GMLRS Unitary Rocket(s). The RPC is capable of holding six (6) GMLRS Unitary Rockets and can be loaded in a M270A1 launcher (tracked), HIMARS M142 launcher, or European M270 (203 configuration that meets the GMLRS interface requirements) launcher from which the GMLRS rocket can be launched. The highest classification level for release of the GMLRS Unitary is SECRET, based upon the software, sale or testing of the end item. The highest level of classification that must be disclosed for production, maintenance, or training is CONFIDENTIAL.

3. Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System Alternative Warhead (GMLRS-AW) M30A1. The GMLRS-AW, M30A1, is the next design increment of the GMLRS rocket. The GMLRS-AW M30A1 hardware is over 90% common with the M31A1 GMLRS Unitary hardware. Operational range is between 15-70 kilometers. Accuracy of less than 15 meters Circular Error Probability at all ranges, when using inertial guidance with Global Positioning System (GPS) augmentation. Uses a proximity sensor fuze mode with a 10 meter height of burst. The Alternative Warhead carries a 200 pound fragmentation assembly filled with high explosives which, upon detonation, accelerates two layers of pre-formed tungsten fragments optimized for effectiveness against large area and imprecisely located targets. The GMLRS-AW provides an area target attack capability that is treaty compliant (no un-exploded ordnance). It provides a 24 hour, all weather, long range attack capability against personnel, soft and lightly armored targets, and air defense targets. The GMLRS-AW uses the same motor, guidance and control systems fuze mechanisms, and proximity sensors as the M31A1 GMLRS Unitary. The highest classification level for release of the GMLRS-AW is SECRET, based upon the software, sale or testing of the end item. The highest level of classification that must be disclosed for production, maintenance, or training is CONFIDENTIAL.

4. The highest classification level for release of the ATACMS Unitary M57 FMS Variant is SECRET, based upon the software. The highest level of classified information that could be disclosed by a sale or by testing of the end item is SECRET; the highest level that must be disclosed for production, maintenance, or training is CONFIDENTIAL. Reverse engineering could reveal CONFIDENTIAL information. Fire Direction System, Data Processing Unit, and special Application software is classified SECRET. Communications Distribution Unit software is classified CONFIDENTIAL. The system specifications and limitations are classified CONFIDENTIAL. Vulnerability Data, countermeasures, vulnerability/susceptibility analyses, and threat definitions are classified SECRET or CONFIDENTIAL.

5. The GPS Precise Positioning Service (PPS) component of the HIMARS munitions (GMLRS Unitary, Alternative Warhead, and ATACMS Unitary) is also contained in the launcher Fire Direction System, is classified SECRET, and is considered SENSITIVE. The GMLRS M30A1, M31A1, ATACMS M57 and HIMARS M142 launchers employ an inertial

navigation system that is aided by a Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) equipped GPS receiver.

6. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software, the information could be used to develop countermeasures, which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

7. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the enclosed Military Policy Justification. A determination has been made that Poland can provide the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government.

8. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Poland.

INDIAN EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING AND RELATED SERVICES CONSOLIDATION BILL

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a bill that has been worked on for years. H.R. 228 will help tribes streamline what are called 477 programs. Recently, a question was raised about the Head Start program and its possible inclusion in 477 plans. I do not think that Head Start services are eligible for incorporation into 477 plans. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Congressman DON YOUNG and me to the Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke be printed in the RECORD.

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

NOVEMBER 27, 2017.

Hon. RYAN ZINKE,
Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY ZINKE, We write today to provide information about our legislation, the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Consolidation Act (H.R. 228 as passed the House / S. 91 as reported by committee in the Senate). Our legislation has bipartisan backing and the support of a broad coalition of tribes and tribal organizations.

During consideration of the legislation, a question was raised as to whether any Head Start services would be eligible for incorporation into a tribal "477 Plan" under H.R. 228 / S. 91. The answer is no—Head Start is an early childhood education program, and does not fit into any of the categories of eligible programs' purposes that are listed in Section 6 of the bills. Head Start services are not eligible under current law for incorporation into tribal 477 plans, and will not be eligible under our legislation.

We wanted to take the opportunity to provide this background should it be helpful in the future.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Congressman for All
Alaska.

LISA MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following letters from Senator HOEVEN and me to the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Committee on Health, Education,

Labor, and Pensions, and from Margaret Zientek to Senator MURKOWSKI and Congressman YOUNG.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, November 28, 2017.

Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Chairman.
Senator PATTY MURRAY,
Ranking Member,
Committee Health, Education, Labor & Pensions, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

SENATORS: As the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee of jurisdiction, we affirmatively state for the record our agreement with the Tribal Working Group's analysis dated November 27, 2017 that Head Start program administered by the Department of Health and Human Services is not a program that is eligible under Public Law 102-477 or H.R. 228/S. 91.

Sincerely,

JOHN HOEVEN,
Chairman.
TOM UDALL,
Vice Chairman.

PUBLIC LAW 102-477,
TRIBAL WORKGROUP,
November 27, 2017.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI AND CONGRESSMAN YOUNG: A question has arisen whether Public Law 102-477, or either H.R. 228 or S. 91, reaches the Headstart program administered by the Department of Health and Human Services. It is our understanding that neither the current law nor either bill authorizes the inclusion of the Headstart program in a "477" plan.

Thank you for your continued advocacy on these critical bills.

Sincerely,

MARGARET ZIENTEK,
Co-Chair P.L. 102-477 Tribal Work.

NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I wish to call attention to the more than 112,000 foster children in our Nation who are waiting to be adopted. Of these, more than 14,000 are in California.

These are children with no permanent place to call home, who have experienced severe neglect or abuse. Through no fault of their own, these kids are uprooted from their lives, separated from everything they know, and unable to be safely reunited with their biological families. Many are moved from home to home with their few belongings in a garbage bag.

These are children who are waiting for a family, wanting to belong, and needing our help. Of these children, more than 20,000 age out of the foster care system every year without a place to call home. We can and must do better.

What happens to children who age out of the foster care system? They are shown the door and expected to suddenly be self-sustaining, successful adults. Unfortunately, this is not the case for the majority of our foster youth. I say "our" because these kids are all of our responsibility. They are in every community, and we are failing

them. For those who age out of the system, 20 percent become homeless. Only half are employed by age 24. Seventy percent of young women who age out of the system are pregnant by age 21. Less than 3 percent complete a college degree. Foster youth are also at higher risk of being victims of child sex-trafficking.

We can do better. Our children deserve better. Every child is meant to be in a family. In America, families come in all sorts of wonderful shapes and sizes, and every foster child waiting to be adopted deserves the love, safety, and support that only a permanent family can provide. No child is unadoptable.

During the month of November, our Nation celebrates National Adoption Month, and recognizes the families that have opened their hearts and homes to children in need of a family and the joy that adoption brings. I encourage anyone interested in building their family through adoption to visit www.adoptuskids.org.

It is also important to recognize the efforts of the volunteers and mentors who provide a positive, stable relationship for a child whose entire world is changing. In addition, programs that provide comprehensive resources—from mental health services to tutoring—help foster kids succeed. There may not be a simple solution, but we do know what gets us closer. There are programs in California and across the Nation that have shown improved permanency rates, nearly universal high school graduation rates, and success in college and employment. There is hope and not a second to waste.

As National Adoption Month comes to a close, we must remember our foster youth year-round and strive to ensure that each one is connected with a permanent, loving home. I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure a better future for foster youth in our Nation.

Thank you.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO PETE SELLECK

• Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to recognize and congratulate Mr. Pete Selleck, chairman and president of Michelin North America, who is retiring next month. Mr. Selleck is concluding a 6-year tenure in the role. After 26 years of Active and Reserve U.S. Army service, Selleck started his career with Michelin in 1982 as an industrial engineer at Michelin's first U.S. plant. Selleck's career included various roles in North America and Europe, before accepting his final assignment as chairman and president of Michelin North America. As chairman and president for Michelin Group's largest global operating unit, Selleck was responsible for coordinating Michelin North America's business activities across the United States, Can-

ada, and Mexico, which together comprise more than 22,000 employees.

Outside the company, Selleck has been recognized broadly by leaders in the community, in business and in industry, across the local, State, and national levels. In recent years, Selleck played a key role advocating for road improvements across South Carolina; advocating for fiscal reform in the Federal Government; promoting dialogue and understanding on matters of diversity and inclusion; developing technical education to support industrial careers in South Carolina; and active support for the community of West Point alumni, the Boy Scouts of America, and the United Way. Congratulations, Mr. Selleck.●

REMEMBERING TJ MCGARVEY

• Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I wish to honor the life of Vietnam veteran TJ McGarvey of Upper St. Clair, PA. Mr. McGarvey passed away at age 74 on November 13, 2017. He is survived by his loving family and the countless friends and neighbors whose lives he touched during a lifetime of service and commitment to his country and community.

As a member of "The Walking Dead," 1st battalion, 9th Marines, Cpl TJ McGarvey served in Vietnam from March 1967 to April 1968. Only a month after deploying to Vietnam, Corporal McGarvey was wounded. However, he refused to accept the Purple Heart medal he earned because he did not want to upset his mother with the news.

For many, having served their country in war fulfilled a selfless act of duty—not so for Corporal McGarvey. His service to his country and fellow vets would remain a constant for his entire life. TJ was cofounder of the Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program, a member of the Friends of Danang, and a fierce advocate for soldiers exposed to Agent Orange, and their families.

Just days before his death, his hometown of Upper St. Clair held a Veterans Day ceremony at the town's Veterans Monument Park. Much of the ceremony would honor TJ, whom a fellow veteran called "the ultimate Marine." The park was the brainchild of TJ, who served as its president and key fundraiser. It honors every branch of the military and serves as both a monument to veterans and an educational instrument for visitors and local students.

TJ was known as a man of deep faith, committed to his family, and a leader in his community. As a longtime football coach at St. Louise de Marillac, generations of students looked to TJ as a mentor.

Ultimately, TJ's legacy will be forever linked to his efforts to ensure that veterans of the U.S. military will never be forgotten. In the 1980s, TJ tirelessly fought to erect a Vietnam veterans monument in Pittsburgh. The monu-

ment was dedicated on Veterans Day 1987.

The beautiful dedication to the soldiers who fought, died, and went missing in America's war with Vietnam lies peacefully along the banks of the Allegheny River on Pittsburgh's north side. A fitting tribute to the heroes of southwestern Pennsylvania ploughed by a man who lived a life quiet and humble, yet loud enough to help spark a change in the hearts of many. Here, at the confluence of three rivers which defines a community, TJ's poem defines the ethos of the monument—a tribute, but more so a fulfillment of a commitment to ensure our soldiers will never again be denied these two words: "Welcome Home."

It is with these words, etched in brass for all to see, that TJ adopted the voice of a remorseful community to right a wrong and fittingly honor a generation of heroes:

Welcome home to proud men and women
We begin now to fulfill promises
To remember the past
To look to the future
We begin now to complete the final process
Not to make political statements
Not to offer explanations
Not to debate realities
Monuments are erected so that the future
might remember the past
Warriors die and live and die
Let the Historians answer the political questions
Those who served—served
Those who gave all—live in our hearts
Those who are left—continue to give
As long as we remember—
There is still some love left.

TJ McGarvey's lasting legacy will not die, fade away, or be forgotten. As a small token of a grateful nation, I ask that the U.S. Senate stand with me to salute Cpl TJ McGarvey for a life dedicated to God, family, and his brothers in arms, reflecting great credit upon himself and the U.S. Marines.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to section 4(b) of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Public Law 112-272), the Minority Leader appoints Ms. Maria Zoe Dunning, of San Francisco, California, to the World War I Centennial Commission; Ms. Maria Zoe Dunning to replace Mr. Robert Dalessandro appointed in 2013 who resigned from the Commission.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER
COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3466. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tebufenozide; Pesticide Tolerance Actions" (FRL No. 9966-10-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3467. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Departmental Offices, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Office of Thrift Supervision Regulations" (10 CFR Chapter V) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3468. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Yemen that was declared in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3469. A communication from the Administrator and Chief Executive Officer, Bonneville Power Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Annual Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3470. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Delaware; State Implementation Plan for Interstate Transport for the 2008 Ozone Standard; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule" (FRL No. 9970-83-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3471. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; 2011 Base Year Inventory for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard for the Maryland Portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City Nonattainment Area; Withdrawal" (FRL No. 9970-82-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3472. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Direct Final Rule for the Approval of an Alternative Volatile Organic Compound Emission Standard; Withdrawal" (FRL No. 9970-69-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3473. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Removal of Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Trading Programs; Withdrawal of Direct

Final Rule" (FRL No. 9970-80-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3474. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS); Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule" (FRL No. 9970-98-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3475. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "State of Iowa; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS)" (FRL No. 9970-99-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3476. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "State of Iowa; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule; Elements of the Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 Annual Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS)" (FRL No. 9971-05-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3477. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule; Air Quality Implementation Plans; Nebraska; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide and Sulfur Dioxide and the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9970-97-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3478. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule; Approval of Kansas Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Construction Permits and Approvals Program" (FRL No. 9971-00-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3479. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of the Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation Fish and Wildlife Mitigation Project, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3480. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Treatment of Amounts Paid to Section 170(c) Organizations under Employer Leave-Based Donation Programs to Aid Victims of the California Wildfires that Began on October 8, 2017" (Notice 2017-70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3481. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting." (Rev. Proc. 2017-59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3482. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Departmental Offices, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Department of the Treasury Employee Rules of Conduct" (RIN1505-AB89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3483. A communication from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Departmental Offices, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Age in Programs and Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance From the Department of the Treasury" (RIN1505-AC51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3484. A communication from the Deputy Director, Directorate of Construction, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cranes and Derricks in Construction; Operator Certification Extension" (RIN1218-AC96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 16, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3485. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department of Labor's 2016 FAIR Act Inventory of Inherently Governmental Activities and Inventory of Commercial Activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3486. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3487. A communication from the Acting Director and General Counsel, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Financial Report for the Office of Government Ethics for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3488. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the period from April 1, 2017 through September 30, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3489. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3490. A communication from the Chairman of the Board, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's consolidated report addressing the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA or Integrity Act) and the Inspector General Act of 1978 (IG Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3491. A communication from the President and CEO, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Foundation's Annual Management Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3492. A communication from the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Performance and Accountability report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3493. A communication from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3494. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Labor's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3495. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, Department of the Treasury's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3496. A communication from the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's Annual Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3497. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Labor's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3498. A communication from the Acting Chairman of the Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3499. A communication from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3500. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism" ((RIN3060-AF85)(FCC 17-139)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3501. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rules and Policies Regarding Calling Number Identification Service—Caller ID; Waiver of Federal Communications Commission Regulations at 47 C.F.R. section 65.1601(b) on Behalf of Jewish Community Centers" ((CG Docket No. 91-281)(FCC 17-132)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3502. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amend-

ment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, (Anchorage, Alaska)" ((DA 17-1062)(MB Docket No. 17-187)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3503. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Access to Telecommunication Equipment and Services by Persons with Disabilities; Amendment of the Commission's Rules Governing Hearing Aid-Compatible Mobile Handsets; Comment Sought on 2010 Review of Hearing Aid Compatibility Regulations" ((CG Docket No. 13-46)(FCC 17-135)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 15, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3504. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to accomplishments made under the Airport Improvement Program for fiscal years 2014 through 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3505. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department's Agency Financial Report for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1885. A bill to support the development of highly automated vehicle safety technologies, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-187).

By Mr. ENZI, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. 1. An original bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1928. A bill to establish a review of United States multilateral aid.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CRAPO for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Suzanne Israel Tufts, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

*Brian D. Montgomery, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

*Robert Hunter Kurtz, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ENZI:

S. 1. An original bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018; from the Committee on the Budget; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. BURR, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2162. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that it is unlawful to knowingly distribute a private, visual depiction of an individual's intimate parts or of an individual engaging in sexually explicit conduct, with reckless disregard for the individual's lack of consent to the distribution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 2163. A bill to expand school choice in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 2164. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 respecting the scoring of preventive health savings; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2165. A bill to provide additional disaster recovery assistance for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2166. A bill to maintain annual base funding for the Upper Colorado and San Juan fish recovery programs through fiscal year 2023, to require a report on the implementation of those programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2167. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to make certifications with respect to United States and foreign financial institutions' aircraft-related transactions involving Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 2168. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to include in the Veterans Choice Program all veterans enrolled in the patient enrollment system of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 343. A resolution to authorize testimony, document production, and representation in Arizona v. Mark Louis Prichard; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 109

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to provide for nonpreemption of measures by State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 251

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 251, a bill to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board in order to ensure that it cannot be used to undermine the Medicare entitlement for beneficiaries.

S. 261

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 261, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 629

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drugs, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety and effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials approved for use in the prevention, control, and treatment of animal diseases, in order to minimize the development of antibiotic-resistant bacteria.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 793

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 793, a bill to prohibit sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

S. 796

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 1034

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1034, a bill to improve agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security for aliens in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1364

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1364, a bill to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes.

S. 1539

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to protect victims of stalking from gun violence.

S. 1580

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1580, a bill to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes.

S. 1647

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1647, a bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain non-significant investments in the capital of unconsolidated financial institutions as qualifying capital instruments, and for other purposes.

S. 1693

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as

cosponsors of S. 1693, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking.

S. 1732

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1732, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to promote testing of incentive payments for behavioral health providers for adoption and use of certified electronic health record technology.

S. 1859

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1859, a bill to extend the moratorium on the annual fee on health insurance providers.

S. 1873

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1873, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program to establish peer specialists in patient aligned care teams at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1942

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1942, a bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 1996

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1996, a bill to require Federal agencies to address environmental justice, to require consideration of cumulative impacts in certain permitting decisions, and for other purposes.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2143

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the

Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2143, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to strengthen protections for employees wishing to advocate for improved wages, hours, or other terms or conditions of employment, to expand coverage under such Act, to provide a process for achieving initial collective bargaining agreements, and to provide for stronger remedies for interference with these rights, and for other purposes.

S. 2146

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2146, a bill to extend the full Federal medical assistance percentage to urban Indian organizations.

S. RES. 319

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 319, a resolution supporting the goals, activities, and ideals of Prematurity Awareness Month.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 343—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, DOCUMENT PRODUCTION, AND REPRESENTATION IN ARIZONA V. MARK LOUIS PRICHARD

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 343

Whereas, in the case of *Arizona v. Mark Louis Prichard*, Cr. No. 17-711443, pending in the Justice Court of Pima County, Arizona, the prosecution has requested the production of testimony from Julie Katsel, an employee in the Tucson, Arizona office of Senator Jeff Flake;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§ 288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent current or former employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Julie Katsel, an employee in the Office of Senator Jeff Flake, and any other current or former employee of the Senator's office from whom relevant evidence may be necessary, are authorized to testify and produce documents in the case of *Arizona v. Mark Louis Prichard*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent current and former Mem-

bers, officers, and employees of the Senate in connection with the production of evidence authorized in section one of this resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1587. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BOOZMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1892, to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1587. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BOOZMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1892, to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty; as follows:

On page 3, lines 6 through 8, strike "section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b)" and insert "section 1204 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10284)".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I have 6 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 28, 2017, at 9:45 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Brian D. Montgomery, of Texas, Robert Hunter Kurtz, of Virginia, and Suzanne Israel Tufts, of New York, each to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nomination of Jerome H. Powell, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 28, 2017, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Christopher Ashley Ford, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary (International Security and Non-Proliferation), and Yleem D. S. Poblete, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Verification and Compliance), both of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on Tuesday, November 28, 2017, at 10 a.m. in room SD-430 to conduct a hearing entitled "Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Examining Proposals to Simplify the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA)".

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 28, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226, to conduct a hearing entitled "S. 1241: Modernizing AML Laws to Combat Money Laundering and Terrorism Financing".

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 28, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-219 to hold a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, November 28, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-406 to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Kenneth E. Allen, of Kentucky, A. D. Frazier, of Georgia, Jeffrey Smith, of Tennessee, and James R. Thompson III, of Alabama, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 100-458, sec. 114(b)(2)(c), the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Board of Trustees of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development for a six-year term: the Honorable ROGER WICKER of Mississippi.

The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to the provisions of 2 USC Sec. 1151, as amended, reappoints the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center: the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. WICKER.

The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 115-77, appoints the following individuals to the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission: Kay Cole James of Virginia and Star Parker of California.

The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 115-77, appoints the following individuals to the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission: Senator CHRIS VAN HOLLEN of Maryland and Dr. David Anderson of New York.

HONORING HOMETOWN HEROES ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged

from further consideration of H.R. 1892 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1892) to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Boozman amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1587) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To make a technical correction)

On page 3, lines 6 through 8, strike “section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b)” and insert “section 1204 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10284)”.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1892), as amended, was passed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon tomorrow, Wednesday, November 29; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator CASEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to go back to a point I made earlier when I was describing—both in terms of the substance of the bill and the process

that has been undertaken to pass the bill—why, the week before Thanksgiving, I used the expression that the bill was, in fact, “a thief in the night” and what I meant by that. In the same bill, we have these inequities that I just described where the wealthiest are getting \$34 billion in a tax cut—a giveaway, really, just in the first year, and then that continues—and 90 million Americans get less than half of that. That is, in my judgment, robbing those families of an opportunity to get a bigger tax cut and to have the wealthiest among us sacrifice a little bit for the middle class and for those trying to get to the middle class. It gets worse from there because, in addition to that, repealing of the individual mandate has a healthcare consequence.

We know that the Congressional Budget Office told us that because of what would happen as a result of the repeal of the individual mandate, 4 million people would lose their healthcare in the first year and 13 million over the course of 10 years. So it is entirely possible—we don’t know the exact number, but it is entirely possible—that lots of Americans would, in the same year or certainly over time, have two adverse consequences. One, they would either not get much of a tax cut or their tax cut or any tax change would turn into a tax increase, and they would lose their healthcare because of the effects of one part of the bill. So, at the same time, in the same bill, some will lose their healthcare because of the bill and others will see their taxes go up, or worse, maybe the same thing will happen to the same individual, the same family. All that is happening in a bill that is speeding through this Chamber.

Here is how defective the process has been. The Senate bill was introduced on a Thursday, and then voted out of the Finance Committee the following Thursday, and now the majority is trying to pass the bill this Thursday. So from Thursday to Thursday to Thursday is the entire consideration of a bill that has not had one hearing—not a single hearing. Oh, yes, we had time in the committee the week before Thanksgiving to pose questions to the Joint Committee on Taxation—tax experts—or to staff, and that is part of the process. But a tax bill like this, which comes around every three decades and will have an impact, by one estimate, of \$9 trillion to \$10 trillion, doesn’t have a single hearing and doesn’t have the kind of due consideration that would allow people to examine it and allow taxpayers to examine the detail of this bill and the consequences that would flow from that—the adverse consequences—and be able to say: Hey, wait a minute. Maybe I am one of those people. Maybe I am one of those individuals whose taxes will go up or I don’t get much of a tax cut and, on top of that, I lose my healthcare. I think any American who would be so adversely affected should have the time and the opportunity to examine

this legislation, either themselves or through the debate that is undertaken by Senators or through reading news accounts.

The only good news here is that newspapers across the country, especially, and think tanks who are analyzing this bill are providing the American people information. But the debate is so limited that very little of the debate here in the Senate will land on the kitchen tables of Americans who will be affected.

So when I say that this is a thief in the night, I mean it by way of the substance of the bill where people are robbed of healthcare, potentially, and certainly robbed of an opportunity to either get a substantial middle-class tax cut or, in some cases, they get no tax cut at all because their taxes go up and, at the same time, they are losing healthcare.

This whole process has been cloaked in darkness and has been infused with secrecy. I got a letter the other day from a taxpayer who said to me: I am worried about the impact on—it was from a mom talking about her family—on my family and my children. She said: I don’t know enough about this. I can sympathize with her because Democratic Senators were in a committee 2 weeks ago when this bill was presented to us, with not a single hearing on the bill.

My colleagues may recall what happened in 1985 and 1986. President Reagan came up with a proposal that was almost 500 pages in length. There was a lot of detail about his administration’s priorities on tax reform. His proposal got 27 hearings in the Finance Committee. Later, when the House passed a bill in—I guess it was in the beginning of 1986—they passed a tax reform bill that went to the Senate, and that House bill in 1986 got six hearings in the Finance Committee. So if you add the review of the detailed Reagan proposal—almost 500 pages—to the actual hearings on a specific bill, we are talking about 33 hearings. That is the kind of review one would expect. I would settle for 10 or 15 hearings on something this substantial.

So we are basically saying that we are supposed to accept a bill that has gotten very little review and no hearing, and then wait for 20 years from now or 30 years from now to have another opportunity.

This is a joke. This is an insult to the American people, when we have a bill that will have such an impact on every American and is getting very little in the way of scrutiny.

I know the hour is late. I will just make a few more points, especially when it comes to our children. There has been a lot of talk about what this bill could do to help children. A lot of Americans know about the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit. Those two provisions alone in our law have lifted more children out of poverty than almost anything we have ever done in the Congress in decades,

literally. It has had that kind of an impact. So shouldn't we use these two vehicles that have lifted millions of children and families out of poverty—the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit—and strengthen them? Shouldn't we make them more robust so that more children could be lifted out of poverty? The answer is yes.

We have an opportunity here. Senator BROWN and Senator BENNET introduced a bill that then became an amendment in the debate, which I and so many other Democratic Senators joined them on, to strengthen the child tax credit, as well as the earned income tax credit.

Here is the basic information about where we are with the child tax credit. The proposal by some Republican Senators to strengthen the child tax credit in the bill is also woefully deficient and woefully short of what families should expect from a big tax reform bill that is supposed to help folks with the child tax credit.

The Senate Republican plan increases the maximum child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$2,000 per child. It sounds pretty good so far—\$1,000 up to \$2,000. It sounds pretty good so far, but because the bill limits refundability, a mom working full time at minimum wage will only see an additional \$75 in the child tax credit, while a married couple earning \$500,000 would become newly eligible. So in the Republican bill, wealthy families earning up to \$500,000 of income are newly eligible for help, with the child tax credit, for the maximum credit of \$2,000 per child. The working mom who has a low income gets a child tax credit of \$75, which is not much help, but the family making \$500,000 would be getting a \$2,000 child tax credit. Anyone knows that is woefully short.

We can do better than that. We are a great country. We have the greatest economy in the world, we have the strongest military in the world, and we have a lot of good tax policies that have helped lift families out of poverty. Both parties have helped support those provisions over the years. This isn't just a Democratic priority; a lot of Republicans make this a priority as well.

This is the moment to do it. This is a big tax bill. We could make the child tax credit so generous and so substantial that you could turbocharge—use any word you want—you could turbocharge the effort to get young children out of poverty. But the Republicans won't do it because they are stingy on the child tax credit changes, just as they are stingy on the middle-class tax cut.

The source I cited earlier for the November 27 report, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities—you can go to their website. It is easy. Just type in four letters—CBPP—and you can find these reports. What do they say about the child tax credit provisions? The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities says that 10 million children live in

families who would get \$6.25 or less per month in additional child tax credit help—less than 1 hour of work at the minimum wage. So for 10 million children, this brandnew proposal on the child tax credit adds up to \$6.25 or less per month. Even in a very low-income family, \$6.25 a month doesn't get you much in terms of help for your children.

We have a lot to do in a short time-frame to let the American people know what is in this bill. Whether it is very limited tax relief for a lot of middle-class families or whether it is the outrage that so many Americans' taxes will go up—over time, especially—or whether it is the giveaways to the richest among us, there are so many outrages and so many insults in one bill, it is difficult to catalog all of them.

I hope that if we have a vote on the Senate floor, this bill will be defeated. Guess what can happen then. We can get to a different chapter on tax reform, just like we started to get to on healthcare. After the healthcare bill was voted down in July, everyone said that somehow there would be no engagement on healthcare after that, that the two sides would go into their corners and there would be no discussion. Within hours, if not days, of that happening, Democrats and Republicans came together on healthcare. On that topic on which there is supposed to be very little, if any, consensus or cooperation or bipartisanship, they came together and then had hearings in early September. People forget this, but it happened. In the first 2 weeks of September, we listened to Governors from both parties, insurance commissioners, and healthcare policy experts. Guess what we got. We got a bipartisan bill to help stabilize the market, to make sure we were coming together to try to solve at least one substantial problem in our healthcare system—not to cure every problem but to come together in a bipartisan way to fix the problem.

We could undertake a similar process on tax reform. We could start in December or January—whenever the majority wants to start—have lots of hearings, examine these issues, and figure out whether there is a bipartisan way to make the child tax credit more generous.

We have a moment here. We have a big bill. We could lift a lot more children out of poverty. Isn't there a way to make the middle-class tax relief much more robust and substantial? Instead of giving a \$300 or \$400 tax cut, maybe we could say: Let's come together on a bipartisan bill and give a tax cut that is worth \$1,000—or maybe several thousand dollars—to the middle class and to middle-class families. We could do that. Democrats and Republicans could come together.

We could even come together on providing corporate relief. No one on our side doesn't believe that corporations should get a break, but when you reduce a corporate tax rate from 35 to

20—just do the math. It is \$100 billion per point, so that is \$1.5 trillion. That forecloses the option of making middle-class tax cuts even more generous. It limits the options to help families who are struggling to get into the middle class, who are going to work every day, sometimes working two jobs, making the minimum wage or higher than minimum wage, and they need a little bit of help with the child tax credit or other provisions.

We have an opportunity here to do tax reform the right way—not in the dark of night, not a one-party fiat or a one-party bill that gets rushed through and then we are supposed to accept this as good tax policy for the next 10, 20, 30 years. That is not the way to do tax reform. That is not the way it was done when Ronald Reagan was here, working with Democrats and Republicans. That is not the way we should do it.

We will have more to say later in the week.

At this time, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:18 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, November 29, 2017, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate on November 27, 2017:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHRISTOPHER G. CAVOLI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. STEPHEN J. TOWNSEND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

NATHELE J. ANDERSON

BRIAN R. HORTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

THOMAS W. GREEN

KENNETH M. KOOP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

ADAM R. LIBERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL E. STEELMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

GERALD D. GANGARAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531, 716, AND 3064:

To be major

BRIAN R. JOHNSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

SCOTT T. AYERS
JAMES A. BARKEI
TONYA L. BLACKWELL
CHRISTOPHER B. BURGESS
MATTHEW A. CALARCO
REBECCA K. CONNALLY
RYAN B. DOWDY
JOSEPH M. FAIRFIELD
DANYELE M. JORDAN
FANSU KU
SEAN C. MCMAHON
STEVEN M. RANIERI
RUNO C. RICHARDSON
JAVIER E. RIVERAROSARIO
SARA M. ROOT
LESLIE A. ROWLEY
ROBERT L. SHUCK
SHAWN D. SMITH
TYESHA L. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

PETER J. ARMSTRONG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

ALI S. ZAZA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

PHILLIP T. BUCKLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

VERNICE K. FAVOR-WILLIAMS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

EDWARD M. CROSSMAN

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER OF THE COAST GUARD PERMANENT COMMISSIONED TEACHING STAFF FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTIONS 189 AND 276:

To be commander

MEGHAN K. STEINHAUS

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate November 28, 2017:

THE JUDICIARY

GREGORY G. KATSAS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE DISCOVERY OF HERNANDO DE SOTO'S 1539 ENCAMPMENT AND THE LOST NATIVE AMERICAN TOWN OF POTANO

HON. TED S. YOHO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the discovery of Hernando de Soto's 1539 Encampment and the lost Native American town of Potano, by the University of Florida professors, Dr. Fred White and Dr. Michele White, and University of Florida Anderson Scholar Ethan White. This newly discovered archaeological site is the oldest confirmed New World contact site in the United States.

In one of the most important events in U.S. history, de Soto was the first European to discover the Mississippi River and explore an area that today would hold 10 States. Until this incredible archaeological discovery, there was no physical evidence of de Soto's 4,000-mile journey. The collection of artifacts recovered near Orange Lake, Florida, includes very rare King Ferdinand Queen Isabella coins, and a King Enrique IV of Castile coin that is the oldest dated European artifact ever unearthed in the United States.

Other rare items include Murano glass beads and Spanish weapons and armor dated from the early 1500s. The artifacts were excavated in the lost ancient Native American town of Potano. Also discovered in the town of Potano were the remains of the first location of the San Buenaventura Franciscan mission built there in the 1580s. Within the floors of the 16th century mission, the team discovered the largest cache of medieval coins found in the American mainland so far.

Acknowledgment for confirmation and identification of the artifacts goes to a large and diverse group of scholars throughout the country, including these distinguished University of Florida researchers: Dr. Jerald T. Milanich, Curator Emeritus in Archaeology of the Florida Museum of Natural History, Dr. Gifford Waters, Historical Archaeology Collections Manager of the Florida Museum of Natural History, Dr. Kathleen Deagan, Distinguished Research Curator of Archaeology for the University of Florida and Dr. Michael Gannon, Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus of History, University of Florida.

The recent scientific findings were published in the peer-reviewed *International Journal of Archaeology* and with the Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, Bureau of Archaeological Research in Tallahassee, Florida. The collection of artifacts is at the Florida Museum of Natural History on the campus of my alma mater, the University of Florida.

HONORING MRS. CYNTHIA MORRIS-SAPP FOR HER DEDICATED SERVICE TO THE MISSOURI DIVISION OF TOURISM

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the upcoming retirement of Mrs. Cynthia Morris-Sapp from her over 24 years of dedicated service to the Missouri Division of Tourism.

Mrs. Morris-Sapp grew up in the Warrensburg, Missouri area where she graduated from Warrensburg High School and Central Missouri State University with a Bachelor's degree in Recreation. During her college years, Mrs. Morris-Sapp worked as an intern for Loretta Lynn's Ranch in Waverly, Tennessee and continued to work there after graduation.

In 1986, Mrs. Morris-Sapp moved back to Missouri where she began working at United MO Bank until 1990, when she began her work in public service at the Missouri Department of Natural Resources as a Missouri State Capitol Tour Guide. Her knowledge of and appreciation for the beauty of the Missouri State Capitol made her a perfect fit for the Missouri Department of Tourism where in 1996 she became the Group Tour Market Manager. Throughout the next years, Mrs. Morris-Sapp took over supervision and management of the Visitors Centers on the Interstate Highways and oversight of the affiliate Visitor Centers in the State of Missouri. She has played a vital role in the way tourists and even residents of Missouri experience our great state including the many state parks, historical sights, fantastic streams and rivers, museums, wineries, delicious restaurants, zoos, farmers markets, and sports teams, just to name a few.

I had the privilege of working with Mrs. Morris-Sapp during my tenure as Missouri Director of Tourism. Her commitment to the Show-Me State was inspiring to me and encourages those around her. During our time working together, Mrs. Morris-Sapp exhibited exemplary character and energy to the Division of Tourism. Our state, the people who live here, and the many past and future tourists who visit us are better off because of her great service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in thanking this distinguished public servant, Mrs. Cynthia Morris-Sapp and congratulating her on a well-deserved retirement. She can now enjoy more time with her loving husband, Michael, with whom she recently celebrated her 24th Wedding Anniversary.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF MEMPHIS CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL MARCHING BAND

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the accomplishments of Memphis Central High School Marching Band that, on November 5, 2017, won the 2017 National High School High Stepping Marching Championship.

High Stepping Nationals was founded on the principles of promoting academic excellence through music education and the performing arts. The Memphis Central High School Warriors exemplify these laudable goals. Despite having to buy their uniforms from another school and having their instruments handed down from musicians before them, the Warriors' talent and dedication shines through.

Because of the Central High School Warriors' devotion to music and the arts they practiced for several hours nearly every day to before the competition. Under the leadership of Band Director Ollie Liddell, the Central High School Warriors' commitment is remarkable. The Warriors competed against more than a dozen other finalists from across the country to win the National Championship.

Memphis Central High School was one of the first high schools in Memphis, TN, built in 1909. Shortly after, Memphis High School was renamed Central High School. One of Central's most notable assets is the diversity of its student body which derives from representation of various ideas, talents, and cultural influences and which provides the fertile environment for educationally challenging and enriching experiences.

Congratulations to the Central High School Warriors for their commitment, hard work and perseverance in winning the National High School High Stepping Marching Championship and to Director Liddell and Principal Gregory McCullough for their commendable leadership.

H.R. 228

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to include in the RECORD the following letter which provides information about my bill, H.R. 228, the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Consolidation Act.

November 27, 2017.

HON. RYAN ZINKE,
Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY ZINKE: We write today to provide information about our legislation, the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Consolidation Act (H.R. 228 as

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

passed the House/S. 91 as reported by committee in the Senate). Our legislation has bipartisan backing and the support of a broad coalition of tribes and tribal organizations.

During consideration of the legislation, a question was raised as to whether any Head Start services would be eligible for incorporation into a tribal "477 Plan" under H.R. 228/S. 91. The answer is no—Head Start is an early childhood education program, and does not fit into any of the categories of eligible programs' purposes that are listed in Section 6 of the bills. Head Start services are not eligible under current law for incorporation into tribal 477 plans, and will not be eligible under our legislation.

We wanted to take the opportunity to provide this background should it be helpful in the future.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
*Congressman for All
Alaska.*

LISA MURKOWSKI,
United States Senator.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF STATEN
ISLAND FOUNDATION

HON. DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Staten Island Foundation on its 20th anniversary.

Seeking to better their community, the Board of Directors of the former Staten Island Savings Bank, led by Harry P. Doherty, created the Staten Island Foundation in December 1997. Their goal was to improve Staten Island for all its inhabitants by providing grants to local projects. Specifically, the Foundation's mission aims to better Staten Island's education, health, community services, and arts and culture. Its impact on our community over the past 20 years has been nothing short of incredible. The Foundation's countless grants have made a tremendous impact on Staten Island.

One project in which the Staten Island Foundation participates is the Tackling Youth Substance Abuse Initiative. Through partnerships with other organizations, the Foundation's involvement in the Initiative is crucial to fighting alcohol and prescription drug abuse by Staten Island's children and teens. Furthermore, with the opioid epidemic ravaging our community, I commend the Foundation for stepping up to combat this tragic problem. It is up to all of us to do what we can to prevent and combat addiction, and the Staten Island Foundation is doing its part to rid this scourge from our community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Staten Island Foundation on its 20th anniversary. It has helped numerous Staten Islanders over the years, and I wish to thank everyone involved for their tireless efforts in making the Foundation successful.

HONORING ANDREA DEUTSCH

HON. DWIGHT EVANS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a hard-working and influential woman,

Andrea Deutsch, a dedicated attorney, small business owner, former Narberth Councilwoman and now Mayor of Narberth, Pennsylvania.

Andrea Deutsch was born in Philadelphia on September 20, 1967 to Judy and Mike Deutsch and grew up in the local suburb of Wynnewood. She attended Friends' Central school for high school and then went to Franklin & Marshall College, where she graduated in 1989. Thereafter, she went to Temple University School of Law, where she received her JD in 1992. She practiced law for 10 years, the majority of which was at Deutsch, Larrimore, Farnish & Andersson, in Philadelphia. After 10 years of being an attorney, she decided to leave the practice of law to open small business in 2003, called Spot's—The Place for Paws in Narberth, where she sells healthy food, treats, toys and accessories for dogs and cats. She has always had a passion and love for dogs and helping people. Spot's has allowed her to combine these passions by helping customers keep the pets in their life happy and healthy.

She has led an interesting life, filled with great adventures and challenges. At the age of 15 months, she was diagnosed with Type 1 Diabetes and has taken multiple injections of insulin a day to stay alive since that time. When she was younger, she was involved in advocacy work for the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation. Later on, she became involved with the American Diabetes Association through its annual Tour de Cure Bike Ride, where she was the Volunteer Chair of the Event for the last 3 years. More recently, her experience as a Type 1 diabetic and small business owner has led her to be an outspoken advocate for expanded healthcare for as many people as possible. She has done so through her work with such organizations as the Pennsylvania Health Access Network and the Small Business Majority.

She has had a longstanding and profound interest in politics and government, as it combined her love of helping people with her knowledge of the law. In 2012, she was appointed to fill the unexpired term of a councilman who had stepped down from his position. As a councilwoman, she served on multiple committees, including serving as the Chair of both the Finance and Economic Development Committees. She served on the Narberth Council through the end of 2013 when the term ended. In 2017, the current, longtime Mayor of Narberth announced his retirement, and she felt the time was right for her to run for the position. She believed with her legal and business background, combined with her love for Narberth that she would be the right person to lead. On November 7, 2017, she was officially elected to fulfill this role, and became the first woman and the first Jewish person to be Narberth's Mayor since its incorporation in 1895.

As evidenced through Andrea Deutsch's experience, she has dedicated her life and career towards advocating and improving the lives of others. The 2nd Congressional District of Pennsylvania extends gratitude to Andrea Deutsch for her dedicated support to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

PROCLAMATION FOR REVEREND
DR. CHEVIENE JONES

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following proclamation for Reverend Dr. Cheviene Jones:

Whereas, Reverend Dr. Cheviene Jones is celebrating forty-four (44) years in ministry this year and has provided stellar leadership to his church on an international level; and

Whereas, Reverend Dr. Cheviene Jones, under the guidance of God has pioneered and sustained Saint Paul AME Worship Center, as an instrument in our community that uplifts the spiritual, physical and mental welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the hungry and is a beacon of light to those in need. He has been an active advocate in my district as an ambassador of goodwill; and

Whereas, Reverend Dr. Cheviene Jones is a spiritual warrior, a psalmist, a man of compassion, a fearless leader and a servant to all, but most of all a visionary who has shared not only with his Church, but with our District and the world his passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Reverend Dr. Cheviene Jones as he celebrates forty-four years in ministry and to salute him as he retires from pastoral leadership; A true Man of Excellence;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim June 3, 2017 as Reverend Dr. Cheviene Jones Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 3rd day of June, 2017.

RECOGNIZING THE MAHOMET-SEYMOUR
BOYS CROSS COUNTRY
TEAM

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Mahomet-Seymour High School Boys Cross Country Team, who are the 2017 Class 2A Illinois team cross country champions.

Mahomet-Seymour won the meet with 91 points, easily outdistancing its nearest competitor, as its three top-ten finishers, Mathias Powell (4th), Riley Fortune (6th), and Ryan Hodge (9th), powered the team to victory. But this was a team effort and a team victory as the outstanding efforts by Bryson Keeble, Evan Burge, Kaelan Davis, and Nate Douglas also contributed to the win.

I would like to congratulate the entire Mahomet-Seymour Boys Cross Country Team on their victory: Evan Burge, Joe Churm, Riley Fortune, Ryan Hodge, Kyle Sheehy, Garrett Williams, Kaelan Davis, Nate Douglas, Bryson Keeble, Keil Ledin, Caleb Mason, Jack McHale, Mathias Powell, David Wilcoski,

Gaven Williams, Caleb Dowers, and Joe Taylor, as well as Head Coach Neal Garrison, on a superb end to a great season.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of the Mahomet-Seymour High School Boys Cross Country Team in winning the 2017 state cross country title, and I wish the team and their coach all the best in the future.

HONORING DR. ANDREA CODDETT

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a pillar of the Yonkers community, Dr. Andrea Coddett, who this year will be the keynote speaker at the Luther V. Garrison Sr. Masonic Foundation Inc. Annual Scholarship Luncheon.

Dr. Coddett is the Deputy Superintendent for the Yonkers Public Schools. In her role, she oversees the Division of Teaching and Learning, ensuring that all curriculum is aligned to the New York State Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS), and that all instruction is aligned to 21st Century learning skills, so students are prepared for college and/or careers. Dr. Coddett previously served as the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction K–12 for the East Ramapo Central School District. Dr. Coddett began her career in education as a Special Education teacher after which she became a building-level Math Specialist. In her administrative career, Dr. Coddett has worked as a District Math Specialist, an Early Childhood Principal, a K–5 principal, and Director of Secondary Special Education.

Dr. Coddett is a graduate of Fordham University where she earned a doctorate in Executive Leadership. She holds Masters Degrees in Curriculum and Instruction with a Reading Specialization and Educational Administration from Pace University and a Bachelor degree in Psychology from Mercy College. Dr. Coddett also holds administrative certifications in School District Administration and School Building Administration and Supervision, as well as teaching certifications in Special Education, birth through 21, and General Education, N–6.

Dr. Coddett considers herself a global citizen and believes that, as an educational leader, each and every child deserves an excellent education. As a learning leader and lifelong learner, Dr. Coddett's personal motto is, "Empowered for Learning, Empowered for Life."

Dr. Coddett is an accomplished professional in the education world, and as a former educator myself, I am very appreciative of the work she has done and continues to do. She will do an excellent job as this year's keynote speaker at the Annual Scholarship Luncheon and I wish to congratulate her on the honor.

IN RECOGNITION OF SHARON
LEVINE

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Dr. Sharon Levine, an exceptional healthcare

leader who has strived every day of her career to move our healthcare system forward to provide better access, quality and coverage. I've known Dr. Levine for many years and had the great honor to work with her. Dr. Levine was often the voice of Kaiser as the sponsor or supporter of major health care legislation I offered while in the California State Assembly and Senate. When it came to reproductive health issues, Dr. Levine offered compelling testimony on why the bills were necessary. I often marveled at the ability Dr. Levine had at dispelling myths and misperceptions Members had on particular issues without making them look ignorant.

Dr. Levine recently retired from a remarkable, more than 40-year-long career with Kaiser Permanente. She had served in an executive leadership role for the Permanente Medical Group since 1991. In 2015, Dr. Levine accepted the role of Executive Vice President for External Affairs for the Permanente Medical Group, a position she held until her retirement.

Dr. Levine graduated from Tufts University School of Medicine and began her medical career in pediatrics at the Georgetown University Community Health Plan. In 1977, she joined the Permanente Medical Group as a pediatrician and spent the next four decades serving residents of northern California.

In addition to being an invaluable doctor to her patients, Dr. Levine has educated physicians and clinicians throughout California and the Kaiser Permanente system, inspiring and coaching them to deliver better care and about ways to improve our healthcare system. One of her important responsibilities was to ensure that Kaiser Permanente's prescribing and pharmacy policies were patient-centered and that they were rooted in common sense, with physicians closely involved in promoting both excellent quality and sound clinical management. Her leadership on this issue greatly benefited Kaiser Permanente members, patients and customers.

Dr. Levine's contributions have had an impact beyond California through her service on numerous boards of directors, including serving on the Patient Centered Outcomes Research Institute, the Medical Board of California, the Institute for Medical Quality and the Insure the Uninsured Project. She has passionately advocated for public policy that ensures physicians are at the center of critical decisions that affect patients, whether in the exam room, in the board room, in the hearing room or in the auditorium, where the next generation of health care leaders learn about what works in American health care and what still needs to be improved.

Dr. Levine will continue to play an important role in the medical community. She was recently selected to serve as board member of the newly established Kaiser Permanente School of Medicine. In that role she will ensure that the curriculum of this medical school will be of the highest quality. She will also be a mentor to many aspiring physicians who share her lifelong commitment to medicine.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor Dr. Sharon Levine, a remarkable doctor, educator and advocate whose leadership and friendship I deeply value. While she will be missed by her Kaiser Permanente family, we can all feel assured that her contributions have permanently improved our current system. If we had more leaders like Dr. Levine in

our communities we would no doubt have a better healthcare system and healthier Americans.

PROCLAMATION FOR MS. DONNA
RAPOSA

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following proclamation for Ms. Donna Raposa:

Whereas, forty-two years and eleven months ago a virtuous woman of God accepted her calling to serve in the Social Security Administration; and

Whereas, Ms. Donna Raposa began her career in government as a Clerk Typist in the VA Regional Office in 1974 before transferring to the Social Security Administration Regional Office as an Aide in the Field Service section; and

Whereas, she educated and mentored throughout her many years of service as a Field Service Assistant, Service Representative and finally, after providing stellar leadership and outstanding service to our community, retiring as a Claims Service Representative in the Gwinnett Office; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents by giving the citizens of our District a fearless leader and servant that strived to ensure that the system worked for everyone; and

Whereas, Ms. Donna Raposa is a mother and friend; she is also a cornerstone in our community who enhanced the lives of thousands for the betterment of our District and Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Donna Raposa on her retirement and to wish her well in her new endeavors;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim March 31, 2017 as Ms. Donna Raposa Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 31st day of March, 2017.

COMMEMORATING THE FIFTIETH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIFE AND
SACRIFICE OF MR. PRIMITIVO
GARCIA

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the 50th Anniversary of Primitivo "Tivo" Garcia's ultimate sacrifice for another. Primitivo's selfless act of valor and history are well known in Missouri's Fifth Congressional District, which I proudly represent. In 1943, Primitivo Garcia Loya was born in Chihuahua, Mexico to Antonio Garcia Garcia and Gregoria Loya Lerma. At the age of twenty-two, Primitivo migrated to the United States with his family in search of the American Dream.

Primitivo was like many other immigrants who come to the United States; he wanted to

work hard, have a family, pursue his passions and buy a home for his mother. He understood that in America, hard work could yield all of those things and began his career as a shipping clerk. He had hoped this job would allow him to marry his fiancé and earn enough money to make a down payment on a home for his mother. Between he and his brother's pay, they soon put a down payment on a house for their mother, but Primitivo wanted to earn his citizenship before marrying his bride-to-be.

There was nothing more that Primitivo wanted than to become an American Citizen, so he and his brother enrolled in English classes at Westport High School to meet the necessary qualifications for citizenship. It was in this class that Primitivo and his brother, Alfredo, would meet someone who would change their life forever, Mrs. Margaret Kindermann (now Margaret Kelso).

Fifty years ago, on November 15, 1967, Primitivo Garcia, and his brother Alfredo Garcia walked out of their night English class and heard a scream. They both realized that a woman was being accosted outside of their school and as Mrs. Kindermann recalled, Primitivo and Alfredo were not "going to let this happen." That night, both Garcia brothers would save their English teacher, Mrs. Kindermann, from impending doom. After rushing to their teacher's aide, the Garcia brothers immediately fought off the attackers, but one of the attackers drew a gun and shot Primitivo.

As Mrs. Kindermann recalls, she feared for her life and the life of her 5-month-old, unborn child. Primitivo's and Alfredo's bravery saved two lives that night, but tragically, Primitivo succumbed to his wounds three days later.

Primitivo Garcia would become the first local, Hispanic hero in Kansas City because of his benevolent act of sacrifice for his teacher and her unborn child. Former Missouri Governor Warren Hearnes declared Primitivo an honorary citizen of the state as well as declared December 1st to be Primitivo Garcia Day in Kansas City. Parks would later be named in honor of Primitivo's story, memorials dedicated to his legacy, but in 1992, Joe Arce, a local television reporter, did a two-part feature story that continued Primitivo's story.

It was this story that sparked community support within the Historic Westside neighborhood to urge the Kansas City, MO School Board to name their newly constructed West Magnet School as the Primitivo Garcia World Language School. A year after Mr. Arce's story, the school was named in Primitivo's honor.

It is through the actions of Alfredo and the sacrifice of his brother, Primitivo, that should remind us of our country's legacy of immigrant sacrifice in pursuit of the American Dream. Primitivo simply stood up for what he knew to be right, helping the helpless in their time of need. Primitivo's spirit and legacy will live on through our community's eternal willingness to commemorate this valiant act and I am honored to share his story with you today.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in expressing our heartfelt appreciation to Primitivo Garcia's family. I urge my colleagues to please join me in conveying our gratitude to his family and community for sharing this great man with us, and to allow us to honor his legacy. He is, and will forever be, an inspiration to current and future generations.

TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. MIKE BISHOP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 16, 2017

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, you see, tax reform is about giving hardworking Americans—of all walks of life—the confidence they need to make their dreams a reality.

So the question that needs to be asked is whether or not the current tax code—and all of its targeted credits—really increases people's paychecks. . . . Does it treat people fairly? Does it put American workers first? What about fostering economic growth, does it help to create more good-paying jobs?

Michigan is a great case study.

You see, I'm from the Motor City, where we're known for our blue collar work ethic. Our families come from humble beginnings. They get up every morning and go to work to make ends meet, and to build a better future for their kids. And we've persevered through some of the most serious economic death spirals. Take 2008, for example.

At that time, I was Senate Majority Leader in Michigan under the last administration, overseeing the only Republican branch of government. I saw firsthand how that administration pursued one targeted tax credits after another that favored one industry over the other. It was the classic example of the government picking winners and losers—and, as expected, it failed miserably.

As we see at the federal level today, in Michigan many of these targeted tax benefits were paid for by everyone else: in the form of tax increases. And not only did it fail to attract growth in emerging sectors as they hoped, but it caused our economy to tailspin.

Michigan quickly became the only state in the country experiencing zero economic growth. Per capita income went from one of the highest, to one of the lowest in a matter of just a few years.

By 2009, unemployment hit nearly 15 percent. (Neighboring states with more hospitable environments for job growth attracted our family and neighbors.)

More than 800,000 people left our state. Just think about that. . . . We were the only state to lose population—and we would have lost even more had people been able to sell their homes.

But as the Senate Majority Leader of the only Republican branch of government, we didn't just say "no" to the government's failed policies, we offered solutions and loaded up the pipeline with legislation to help the newly-elected Republican legislature and Governor Rick Snyder get to work on day one.

What did we do? Exactly what we're doing here today: tax reform.

While balancing budgets, we found ways to lower rates on individuals. Reduced baseline rates for job creators, and eliminated the credits that favored certain industries over others. We created an environment that would grow the economy, and help families get ahead.

And sure enough, just two months after these reforms, job growth turned positive again in Michigan.

In 2017, Michigan is now a top 10 pro-business state, ranked 12th among all states for

overall business tax climate. Unemployment in Livingston County, in my district, is at 3.3 percent as of this September. And the comeback continues.

Detroit is re-emerging again as an economic powerhouse. The streets are alive with entrepreneurs and young people, who live downtown. The future looks great for the Comeback City.

You see, the moral of the story is that tax policy matters.

Getting tax reform done right means delivering real relief. I've seen it work in Michigan, and I know we can do it at a national level. It's not hard. It's about allowing people to keep more of what is rightfully theirs. It's about freeing up more capital to create more jobs, increase wages, and compete at a global level. This is how you grow an economy from the ground up.

Let's vote for our constituents today—do it for that middle-income family of four, or the single mother of three—and pass this bill today. All of us have an obligation to simplify the tax code for every American—with lower rates—so it's easier for hardworking people to file their taxes and have the peace of mind they deserve.

It's been 31 years, and the relief can't come soon enough.

PROCLAMATION FOR DAISAKU AND KANEKO IKEDA

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following proclamation for Daisaku and Kaneko Ikeda.

Whereas, August 24, 1947 is the day a young Daisaku Ikeda joined the Soka Gakkai and began his unerring pursuit of global peace with his revered teacher Josei Toda, and in these succeeding 70 years has created a global, grass-roots network of 12 million peace building citizens in 192 countries and territories, conducted peace building citizen-diplomacy with world leaders during the Cold War, authored hundreds of books providing hope and encouragement, conducted dialogues on substantive issues of the day with thousands of leaders around the world, submitted annual peace proposals to the United Nations for 35 years, and established numerous research institutes aimed at conflict resolution and intercultural dialogue and understanding; and

Whereas, Dr. Daisaku Ikeda, in his roles as philosopher, educator, peace-builder and author, has dedicated his life to constructing bridges of understanding between people of different nations and cultures, and between diverse philosophical and faith traditions, and personified this philosophy in his own activities as a firm advocate for dialogue as the basis for resolving conflicts and building peace; and

Whereas, Dr. Ikeda has established the Soka education schools around the world, including Soka University of America (SUA) in Orange County, California, to promote humanistic education that stimulates and encourages each student's unique potential for learning, and empowers their lifelong growth and development toward contributive living and peacebuilding; and

Whereas, Kaneko Ikeda's partnership has been foundationally integral to her exceptionally capable husband's accomplishments over these seven decades, serving as confidant, scheduler, doctor, nurse, advisor and, most importantly, as a loving wife; and

Whereas, Kaneko Ikeda is an outstanding scholar with honorary degrees from more than 20 academic institutions around the world, a peace activist with honors from more than 25 international cultural institutions, and has received more than 75 honorary citizenships worldwide and is a model of inspiration for millions of women; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the efforts of Daisaku and Kaneko Ikeda, in firm recognition of their lifetime efforts toward enabling each and every individual to live courageous and contributive lives as the means to foster a harmonious and peaceful society;

Now therefore I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim August 24, 2017 as Daisaku and Kaneko Ikeda Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 24th day of August, 2017.

HONORING SYMRA BRANDON

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to honor a dear friend and wonderful public servant in the Yonkers community, Symra Brandon, who this year is being honored by the Luther V. Garrison Sr. Masonic Foundation Inc. as their 2017 Woman of the Year. I have known Symra for many years and cannot think of a more deserving honoree.

Symra was born in New York City, and raised in Yonkers, New York. She graduated from the same high school I did, Evander Childs High School in the Bronx, and went on to receive a degree in Sociology at Morgan State College, followed by a Master's of Social Work degree from Hunter College School of Social Work and in Public Administration from Pace University.

Throughout her distinguished professional career, Symra was employed by the Westchester County Department of Social Services, Cornell University's Family Life Development Center, UAW/General Motors Skills Transition Center, the Westchester County Youth Bureau, where she served as Acting Director for the Youth Bureau, and the Office of Affirmative Action/EEO and Office for the Disabled. She retired from Westchester County in 2006 from the position of Assistant to Westchester County Executive Andrew J. Spano/Director of the Office of African American Affairs.

Symra was also a dedicated public servant, serving six terms as a Yonkers City Council Member for the First District where she was the first African American Woman to serve in the Council. During her twelve year tenure, Symra worked diligently on behalf of her constituents by sponsoring important legislation including mandating carbon monoxide detectors, landlord payment of Emergency Tenant Protection act fees, Senior Citizen, Veteran and Gold Star Parent property tax exemptions, and consistently supported development on

the Yonkers Waterfront in addition to the creation of jobs and contracts for local residents on major projects throughout the City. As a community leader, Symra was a conscientious advocate for improving the quality of life for residents in her district, especially to children and the elderly.

Today, Symra continues to serve the community as a role model and through her participation on many boards and organizations including Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Terrace City Chapter No. 26, Black Democrats of Westchester, the NAACP, National Council of Negro Women and The Westchester Black Women's Political Caucus.

Symra has always been an amazing partner to me in Yonkers, and an even better friend. It is my privilege to honor and congratulate her here today.

TRIBUTE TO LES CLARK

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleague Congressman DAVID VALADAO, to recognize and pay tribute to Les Clark on his retirement this month as Executive Vice President of the Independent Oil Producers' Agency (IOPA) after 37 years of dedicated service to the "mom and pop" oil producers in Kern County.

Les began his career in the very heart of California's Central Valley. After graduating from Taft High, he played football for Taft College and later baseball at California State University, Fresno. Shortly after leaving for school in Fresno, Les found himself back in the Kern oil patch, where he was first introduced to the oil business that he would go on to leave an incredible impact upon. Les had taken drafting classes at Taft College and was subsequently recommended by the school when Belridge Oil Company, in need of draftsmen, offered him a position where he gained a wealth of technical knowledge and hands-on experience.

With this experience and a well-established reputation as a down-to-earth, no-nonsense communicator, Les became the Executive Vice President of IOPA. In this position, he worked not only to move IOPA members' crude oil to refineries across the state, or as he would say to the "majors," but he also doggedly and passionately pursued their public policy interests at the Federal, state and local levels of government—in our state, that's no easy task. With a myriad of Federal regulations layered on top of byzantine state regulations that oil producers come up against daily, Les quickly became a regulatory expert learning complex issues and government procedures to advocate for his members.

One just has to walk into Les' office and see the stacks of paper-filled boxes and files piled on his desk—not to mention the giant model wooden oil derrick—to recognize his wealth of knowledge accumulated over a lifetime of dedicated service to the Kern oil patch. Sitting in those old wooden chairs across from his desk as we discussed the important issues facing Kern County's small oil producers, Les knew where every file was while answering his flip phone that rang nearly constantly to close a deal or put out a fire for one of his members.

In addition to his work for IOPA, Les is an active member of the Bakersfield and Kern County communities. Whether it was serving as a Taft Union High School Trustee to being a president of the Kern County Fair or the Taft Chamber of Commerce to chairing the West Side Hospital Foundation to being a board member of the Fresno State Alumni Association or Cal State Bakersfield Foundation, in addition to the many state and local advisory boards he participated on, he always made sure to focus on his family.

Les founded the Ponytail Softball League enabling the girls of Taft—including his daughters—to learn and enjoy softball. He is also in the Little League Hall of Fame for his service in coaching Taft little league teams, something he did for more than 30 years. Les coached baseball for Taft College and was a football referee for over 20 years. Many people may not know, but Les played competitive fast-pitch softball and semi-pro baseball for the Kern County League.

From my time working for former Congressman Bill Thomas, to when I served in the California State Assembly and now in the United States House of Representatives, I have always sought and appreciated Les' counsel, wisdom, and friendship. His larger-than-life personality and dry wit always made our conversations engaging and memorable. He always cut right to the crux of an issue and had a clear vision of where he wanted things to go. And, Les never shied away from telling me when he thought I was wrong or why some new Federal or state regulation was hurting his members, all the while leaning back in his chair, arms folded in front of his chest.

As Les enters this new chapter of his life, I'm sure he's looking forward to spending more time with his family, including his wife of 52 years, June, two daughters, Tessa and Kerrie, son "Little Les," ten grandchildren, Arizona, Ayana, Cash, Darius, Easton, Keelan, Logun, Sierra, Tanisha, and Willow, and great granddaughter, Zaria.

Les exemplifies how one can serve their community and become a living legend through that service—everyone in Bakersfield and the Taft community knows him and appreciates his passion and leadership for our region. We all wish him the best in his retirement.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PERMIT COMMERCIAL FILMING AND PHOTOGRAPHY ON THE GROUNDS OF THE U.S. CAPITOL

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce a bill to permit commercial filming and photography on the grounds of the U.S. Capitol, east of Union Square, the only area where such filming is currently authorized. This bill would permit commercial filming and photography outside of the Capitol and congressional office buildings by permit, so long as both the House and Senate are not in session. In today's world, where many societies are facing upheavals, our country should be the first to encourage commercial filming and photography of the Capitol, which symbolizes U.S.

democracy at work. Hollywood and other commercial filmmakers should not have to go to other or fake capitol buildings for movies and films about the U.S. Capitol. The current policy permitting filming near the United States Botanic Garden shows that the Capitol police can handle filmmaking on Capitol grounds, especially when Congress is not in session. However, filming from that vantage point captures the least familiar view of the Capitol. At a time when the reputation of Congress is particularly low, filming of the Capitol, a building that represents American democracy, could bolster its image. Keeping filmmakers from standing in front of the Capitol is neither business-friendly nor true to the nation's democratic traditions. Encouraging commercial filming and photography at the Capitol would help spread the story of our national legislature around the world. The time is overdue to allow commercial filming and photography of the exterior of the historic 19th century Capitol building.

There is no good reason why commercial filming and photography should be confined to Union Square. Specifically, my bill gives the Capitol Police the discretion, depending on the circumstances in and around the Capitol, to issue a permit authorizing commercial filming and photography under the same conditions as those in Union Square. Such areas might include, for example, Independence Avenue on the House side and Constitution Avenue on the Senate side. No policy or security reason exists to justify limiting commercial filming and photography of the Capitol complex to only one location, Union Square, particularly considering that permits are necessary. People are regularly seen on East Capitol Street (east of 2nd Street) taking pictures, where they get a full view of the Capitol building, demonstrating how arbitrary it is to limit commercial filming and photography to Union Square.

Capitol Police would also have authority to charge a fee to cover any costs incurred by the Architect of the Capitol as a result of the issuance of the permit, to be deposited into the Capitol Trust Account. The Capitol Trust Account was established to accept proceeds from any fees collected for commercial filming and photography permits for Union Square. Amounts in the Capitol Trust Account would be available without fiscal year limitation for such maintenance, improvements, and projects with respect to the Capitol grounds as the Architect of the Capitol considers appropriate, subject to the approval of the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

Views of the U.S. Capitol are among America's most iconic. Limiting commercial filming and photography of the Capitol, an important vehicle for telling the nation's story, does not serve the American people. Indeed, most of the world knows our country and reveres our system of government largely through commercial films and photos of the Capitol, which symbolizes our democracy at work. Commercial films and photographs of the Capitol, the seat of our democracy, are perhaps the best modern vehicles for telling the nation's story and showcasing its democratic system of government. Republicans and Democrats alike revere the image as a symbol of patriotism. My bill would enable appropriate, permitted commercial filming and photography of the Capitol, and would create economic benefits for the nation, the city, and private business.

PROCLAMATION FOR DR. CEDRIC
ALEXANDER

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following proclamation for Dr. Cedric Alexander:

Whereas, Dr. Cedric Alexander is celebrating forty (40) years in law enforcement this year, and has provided stellar leadership as a Police Chief and Deputy Chief Operating Officer for Public Safety to DeKalb County and beyond; and

Whereas, Dr. Alexander, has served passionately as a servant leader while pioneering and sustaining community policing, using his talents and skills as a vessel to ensure that justice and liberty finds its way to citizens from all walks of life; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man has been recognized by his colleagues in law enforcement, he is president of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, as well as, a national advocate for better policing; and

Whereas, Dr. Alexander is an accomplished author who has published "The New Guardians: Policing in America's Communities for the 21st Century," which outlines the roles of police officers as guardians of public trust while providing the partnership needed to build communities; and

Whereas, he retires today from his post as Deputy Chief Operating Officer for Public Safety, we are thankful that Dr. Alexander has utilized his leadership, education and talents to make a difference in the lives of countless people across our nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Dr. Cedric Alexander, as he celebrates his retirement after 40 years in law enforcement, and wish him well as he embarks upon his new endeavors;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim March 15, 2017 as Dr. Cedric Alexander Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 15th day of March, 2017.

HONORING CHRISTOPHER KUI

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the outstanding leadership and achievements of Mr. Christopher Kui, Executive Director of Asian American for Equality (AAFE) on the occasion of his retirement after 31 years of public service. AAFE is a non-profit organization dedicated to social justice and community development. It was founded in 1974 in New York City's Chinatown community in response to a local developer's refusal to hire Asian-American workers for the federally financed towering apartment complex known today as Confucius Plaza.

Chris immigrated to New York from Hong Kong at the young age of 10. As a newcomer, he witnessed early in life the injustice and dis-

crimination faced by the Asian immigrant community in the areas of housing, education, employment practices and more. This experience helped shaped his life and career path. In 1986, he joined AAFE where he helped strengthen the organization's approach to advocacy and community development. In 1991, he assumed the position of Executive Director where he has served for the last twenty-five years. His vision, leadership and comprehensive approach to community planning has been extraordinary and has served as a model for other organizations. In this capacity, Chris successfully raised more than \$100 million to build more than 800 housing units for low-income and homeless families and individuals. In his efforts to promote homeownership opportunities, he secured \$378 million in mortgage financing.

In addition to his leadership role at AAFE, Chris is also the founder and board chair of Renaissance Economic Development Corporation (REDC). REDC is an AAFE-affiliate that provides counseling to small businesses and has loaned more than \$44 million to over one-thousand businesses during the past ten years. During Hurricane Sandy, it assisted 200 small businesses and awarded a citywide total of \$3.5 million dollars in loans and grants.

There is no doubt that Chris has been responsible for AAFE's growth and success. His breadth of knowledge, understanding of social policy, small business and housing have greatly contributed to the public and private partnerships that have fueled job creation and community development in Manhattan's Chinatown community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing Christopher Kui for his 31 years of exemplary service and dedication to the Asian-American and diverse immigrant communities of New York City. My district is enriched by his vision and lasting legacy. I wish him a healthy and enjoyable retirement.

HONORING CONGREGATION BETH
TIKVAH

HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an important member of South Jersey's religious community, Congregation Beth Tikvah led by Rabbi Nathan Weiner, and to denounce the hate speech that was inflicted upon the congregation.

Recently, Congregation Beth Tikvah's synagogue was defamed by vandals who wrote out homophobic and racial slurs on the roof. This type of hate has no place in South Jersey's community or any community across our country. Anti-Semitism—and all types of hate speech—is un-American and a direct betrayal of the values on which this nation was founded.

We must call out prejudice, intolerance and violence wherever it exists and whoever perpetrates it. And we must all have the courage to protect the persecuted and speak out against bigotry and hatred.

Congregation Beth Tikvah is a welcoming place that teaches the values of joy, community building, and peace. Under Rabbi Nathan Weiner's dynamic leadership, this community

and their members have spread these values throughout South Jersey and I'm proud to represent them in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, places of worship, like Congregation Beth Tikvah, are vital to our communities. They provide people comfort in times of need, care for those less fortunate, and enable people to come together and express their faith. I'm grateful for the impact Congregation Beth Tikvah has made on South Jersey. And I know many of my constituents feel the same way.

PROCLAMATION FOR MS.
BRIDGETTE DIXON THURMAN

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following proclamation for Ms. Bridgette Dixon Thurman:

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals who are called to contribute to the needs of our community through leadership and service; and

Whereas, Ms. Bridgette Dixon Thurman has answered that call by giving of herself as an Assistant Principal at Dunaire Elementary, and as a beloved daughter, mother and friend; and

Whereas, Ms. Thurman has been chosen as the 2017 Administrator of the Year, representing Dunaire Elementary school; and

Whereas, Ms. Thurman is a graduate of the DeKalb County Schools, a mother of children in the DeKalb County Schools, a former teacher in the DeKalb County Schools, and for the past 25 years continues to make a difference in the lives of children as an Administrator in the DeKalb County Schools System; and

Whereas, Ms. Thurman is a virtuous woman, a courageous woman and a fearless leader who has shared her vision, talents and passion to help ensure that our teachers and administrators have the tools, support and resources needed to promote and produce an educational product that the community will find desirable; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Bridgette Dixon Thurman for her leadership and service for our District and in recognition of this singular honor as 2017 Administrator of the Year at Dunaire Elementary School;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim May 22, 2017 as Ms. Bridgette Dixon Thurman Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 22nd day of May, 2017.

THE RETIREMENT OF JIM RUANE,
MAYOR OF SAN BRUNO, FROM
PUBLIC OFFICE

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary public service of

Jim Ruane, the Mayor of San Bruno, California, who is leaving office after 22 years of unparalleled leadership, eight of them as Mayor. His wisdom, eloquence, and devotion to civic leadership will be sorely missed by the 43,000 residents of his beloved community by the bay.

Jim was first elected to the city council in 1995 after previously serving on the planning commission. Since he joined the council, and under his leadership and that of colleagues, San Bruno has undergone a transformation. A deactivated Navy base was transformed into a vibrant, mixed use community. Tanforan Shopping Mall has been revitalized and San Bruno's downtown core is poised for revitalization. Jim's service also includes the contentious period leading to the establishment of BART service to the San Francisco Peninsula, through San Bruno.

The creation of an elevated right of way for Caltrain above San Bruno Avenue was decades in the making. Today, traffic in San Bruno moves smoothly and without interruption from the 92 daily commuter trains that serve the Peninsula. Personally, I love trains, but it would take a true romantic to love being stuck on San Bruno Avenue in a long line of traffic as the trains go by on a hot summer day.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most solemn duty that any of us undertake as elected representatives is to defend our community's interests after a fatal assault. On September 9, 2010, San Bruno was fatally assaulted by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company when a 30 inch high pressure natural gas pipeline ruptured, killing eight innocent people, destroying 38 homes, and damaging dozens more. The fire was so enormous that fire equipment from throughout the Bay Area and beyond responded.

From the beginning, and for years afterwards, Jim Ruane was, without question, one of the finest public servants I have ever witnessed. Literally in the heat of the moment, he offered accurate and comforting information to his community and also to the world. In the days and months after the explosion, Mayor Ruane led his community in endless meetings, forcing PG&E to answer tough questions about its role in the explosion and deaths. Throughout that time, I joined him and witnessed his steady hand in both quieting traumatized crowds and reassuring tearful neighbors that justice would be done and answers delivered.

Mr. Speaker, San Bruno didn't have to pursue justice by suing PG&E, but it did. San Bruno didn't have to pursue justice by exposing corruption at a state agency known as the California Public Utilities Commission, but it did. San Bruno did not have to issue subpoenas and release documents to the world exposing the cozy relationship of PG&E and its regulators, but the city did because doing so was part of the process of justice needed to demonstrate that no entity—including PG&E—is above the law. The utility was subsequently found guilty in federal court of multiple felonies. It was fined \$3 million by the court, after earlier being penalized \$1.6 billion by a reconstituted California Public Utilities Commission.

I am firmly convinced that the leadership of San Bruno—and importantly all of its councilmembers during these years—did our nation a public service by independently seek-

ing justice in this case. Notably, Jim Ruane was the ever-present face of conviction. He remained absolutely convinced that America's legal system would allow a mouse to roar. And roar it did. We as a Congress have failed to learn the lessons of San Bruno, and have repeatedly failed to cure the defects in federal statutes that contributed to the San Bruno catastrophe. However, the actions of the City of San Bruno have made America safer by forcing management to consider safety in pipeline operations.

Jim Ruane is the loving father of Jim Jr. and Stephanie, and the proud grandfather to Gavin, Patrick, Brendan and Ryan. He is also the devoted husband of Noreen, his partner in life and fellow resident of San Bruno for over 40 years. He is a veteran of the Vietnam War era.

Today, I rise to celebrate Mayor Jim Ruane, a man like few others. He is quiet and wise in normal times, but imbued with a natural command presence during times of exigency. In my book, he is one of our local heroes. With his departure, we thank him for bringing justice to us all, crafted like the best plaster ornamentation his company creates in its daily work, an enduring beauty for every citizen to behold.

INTRODUCTION OF THE REDUCING
LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYMENT ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Reducing Long-Term Unemployment Act to address one of the lingering workforce tragedies in today's economy—our long-term unemployed—and to keep the economy growing. Although the overall unemployment rate has fallen to approximately four percent, Americans who have remained unemployed for longer than 27 weeks have not enjoyed a similar recovery. In October 2017, the number of long-term unemployed (those jobless for 27 weeks or more) was 1.6 million, which accounted for 24.8 percent of the total unemployed population.

To make matters even worse, the long-term unemployed now face employment discrimination as employers show reluctance to hire these job-seekers because of the length of their unemployment. Therefore, my bill provides a necessary incentive to hire the long-term unemployed—a \$5,000 tax credit for employers against their payroll tax liability for each (net) new long-term unemployed person they hire. This tax credit is large enough to give employers an incentive to increase the hiring and wages of those who have been unjustifiably left behind, while ensuring that the economy benefits from their participation. The credit would be available to the broadest base of employers because every employer, including nonprofits, pays payroll taxes, and employers could claim the credit on a quarterly, rather than annual, basis. According to the independent, non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, the proposal would "increase both output and employment" through four mechanisms: (1) with lower employment costs, employers would reduce the costs of their products and services, which, in turn, would first

boost sales and then hiring and hours worked; (2) employers would pass on some of the tax savings to employees in the form of higher wages or other compensation, which, in turn, would increase employees' purchasing power; (3) higher profits would lead to higher stock prices for public companies, increasing shareholders' wealth and therefore their willingness to spend; and (4) with lower employment costs, employers would increase hiring. The bill has safeguards to prevent employers from gaming the system, including denying a credit to an employer that fires one employee and hires a replacement in order to take advantage of the incentive.

For some time, it has been clear that targeted policies are necessary to address today's stubborn long-term unemployment rates. Without significant targeting, the long-term unemployed are in danger of becoming permanently unemployed. This group of competent and experienced Americans deserves better.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

PROCLAMATION FOR BASICS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following proclamation for BASICS:

Whereas, in 1976, the State Bar of Georgia began its Bar Association Support to Improve Correctional Services (BASICS), answering a Supreme Court challenge to attorneys to have a more active role in reducing recidivism rates. Since that time BASICS has been a worthy instrument for good in the state of Georgia; and

Whereas, the State Bar of Georgia is the only Bar Association that continues to have a BASICS World of Work program and we celebrate their forty years of service and making a difference in the lives of many; and

Whereas, this organization is a champion for facilitating self-rehabilitation through education throughout our state, ensuring the rights and liberties of our returning citizens into our communities, and making our society safer and stronger; and

Whereas, its members tirelessly and unconditionally serve our community by providing their time and talents to deliver a powerful, positive impact that results in productive citizens, enhanced community safety and reduced prison costs; and

Whereas, the lives of many in our district are influenced by the leadership and service given by the staff and members of BASICS. My district and our state is a better place due to their commitment to excellence in all of their endeavors; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize BASICS for its outstanding service to our state and to wish its members well on their 40th anniversary;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim March 4, 2017 as BASICS Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 4th day of March, 2017.

CELEBRATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROYAL STUDIOS IN MEMPHIS

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate with my constituents and the entire music-loving world the 60th anniversary of Willie Mitchell's Royal Studios in my hometown of Memphis, Tennessee. Everyone knows a song mixed in the iconic South Memphis recording studio—whether it's last year's Grammy Award Record of the Year, Mark Ronson and Bruno Mars' "Uptown Funk," Al Green's classic "I'm Still in Love With You," Boz Skaggs' album full of tunes called "Memphis," or Bobby "Blue" Bland's "Touch of the Blues." Royal Studios, started in 1957 by the late Willie Mitchell, was the home of Hi and the Hi Rhythm Section and produced chart-topping hits throughout the 1960s and '70s. One of the oldest continuously operating recording studios, it remains a place of pilgrimage under a second generation of Mitchell leadership, hosting such stars as the Rolling Stones' Keith Richards and Led Zeppelin's Robert Plant, among many others. I recently attended the electrifying 60th anniversary celebration for Royal Studios at the historic Orpheum Theatre and heard Tony Joe White play "A Rainy Night in Georgia," Syl Johnson's meditative version of Al Green's and the late Mabon "Teenie" Hodges' "Take Me to the River," and Anthony Hamilton's soulful version of Green's signature "Tired of Being Alone." Grammy Award winning saxophonist Kirk Whalum opened the show, which featured Ronnie Brooks doing Otis Clay's "Trying to Live My Life Without You" and Natalie Stovall's memorable version of "I Can't Stand the Rain." Bluesman Robert Cray and Dave Stewart of the Eurythmics also charmed the crowd. The show, emceed by Willie's son Lawrence "Boo" Mitchell, who engineered "Uptown Funk" and saw it stay at No. 1 on Billboard's Hot 100 for 14 weeks, paid tribute to a Memphis institution still going strong into its seventh decade. I want to congratulate all the Royal family of musicians and technicians and encourage my friends to find the time this holiday season to sit and listen to Boz Skaggs' version of "So Good to Be Here," or any of the hundreds of songs on the Royal Studios discography. We're so glad Royal Studios continues to bring Memphis music to the world and help it dance to a Memphis beat. I wish it many more years of success.

IN RECOGNITION OF KEN IBARRA

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the accomplishments of an uncommonly generous man who has donated countless hours to his community in both public and private life. Ken Ibarra, the Vice Mayor of the City of San Bruno, is leaving public office after 21 years. To say that Ken will be missed is an understatement.

To imagine Ken Ibarra, you must first imagine a version of the Energizer Bunny, except that this bunny has an enormous smile and is crowned with beautiful, jet black hair. As to Ken's energy, let me offer you just one example. The San Bruno Lions Club is one of the most active clubs on the Peninsula. At civic events in San Bruno Park, the club's BBQ is often set up. Now, imagine the Energizer Bunny, sweating from all-day exposure to the heat, slinging hamburgers right and left, shouting out to hundreds of friends, tossing hot dogs onto hot platters, and all the while downing an extraordinary amount of unidentified, but undoubtedly healthy, liquid refreshment.

Obviously, Ken puts the bunny to shame.

In addition to these and other volunteer tasks, Ken has served in multiple leadership positions in the Lions Clubs, up to the district level where he served as District Governor in 2009. He has always embodied the slogan of the Lions: We Serve. He has also devoted his leadership skills to the American Cancer Society Relay for Life and the Bay Area Special Olympics Lions Club.

Ken Ibarra was originally appointed to serve an unexpired term on the city council, and from that day forward he never ceased his dedication to the betterment of San Bruno. During his years in office, he's represented the City of San Bruno on so many local and countywide boards and commissions that they are too numerous to mention. Importantly, Ken has served on the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, the San Mateo County Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART) Board, the Grand Boulevard Steering Committee, and the San Francisco Airport Community Roundtable.

During his time in office, Ken and his council colleagues reshaped the face of San Bruno, dealing with many longstanding community challenges including the grade separation of the Caltrain right of way, the renovation of Tanforan Shopping Mall, the construction of new housing at the Crossings/San Bruno, and water and wastewater improvements that only an architect and civic improvement aficionado like Ken Ibarra could truly appreciate. I can honestly say that it takes a really special person to get excited by wastewater improvement projects. Well, thankfully for San Bruno, Ken Ibarra is that kind of guy.

On September 9, 2010, San Bruno was rocked by the explosion of a high pressure natural gas transmission pipeline. Eight residents were killed, 38 homes destroyed outright and dozens more severely damaged. In the aftermath of the explosion, Ken Ibarra stood in alliance with his council colleagues in seeking justice for those killed and for the entire city. Over hours in the intervening years, Ken helped lead his community through the painful discovery of malfeasance by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, wrongdoing that culminated in felony convictions for the company's actions, \$1.6 billion in penalties, and \$3 million in court-ordered fines.

It takes a special type of person to file for re-election in the years after the trust of your fellow citizens has been rocked to its core by fatal corporate wrongdoing. Always, you must ask yourself, "Is it worth it?" Ken filed, and was re-elected. However, as a local government official under these circumstances, you lose sleep, shed tears, publicly and privately grieve, and try to help your community focus on tomorrow and its possibilities while its citizens are constantly haunted by the past. Ken

Ibarra is a true leader, as demonstrated by the enormous empathy and devotion that he showed to his neighbors and constituents through numerous public meetings, private deliberations, and policy choices leading to recovery in San Bruno.

Ken Ibarra is leaving civic life, but we who know him well know that civic engagement will never leave Ken Ibarra. He is a skilled architect of both structures and civic pride. We wish him well as he enters another phase of his life where he will undoubtedly pursue both crafts for years to come.

PROCLAMATION FOR REVEREND
DR. DERRICK R. RHODES

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following proclamation for Reverend Dr. Derrick R. Rhodes:

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals who are called to contribute to the needs of our community through Pastoral leadership and service; and

Whereas, Reverend Dr. Derrick R. Rhodes has given of himself to lead Kelly Chapel United Methodist Church these past ten years as Senior Pastor and under the guidance of God has pioneered and sustained Kelly Chapel United Methodist Church as an instrument in our community that uplifts the spiritual, physical and mental welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man of God has given hope to the hopeless by ministering the word of God, he educates the masses as an author and counselor, he is engaged in the civic affairs of our community as the founder and first president of the West Georgia Ministerial Alliance, a member of Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc., and as a member of the Prince Hall Masonic Order; and

Whereas, Reverend Dr. Derrick R. Rhodes is a spiritual warrior, a man of compassion, a fearless leader and a servant to all, but most of all a visionary who has shared not only with his Church, but with our District and the world his passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Reverend Dr. Derrick R. Rhodes as he celebrates his 10th Pastoral Anniversary at Kelly Chapel United Methodist Church;

Now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, Jr. do hereby proclaim May 21, 2017 as Reverend Dr. Derrick R. Rhodes Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 21st day of May, 2017.

HONORING ROBYN KRUEGER ON 40 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE TO COMMUNITY MISSIONS OF NIAGARA FRONTIER, INC.

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Community Missions, Inc. (CMI) of Niagara Frontier's Executive Director, Ms. Robyn Krueger on the occasion of her 40th Anniversary of dedicated service to those in need throughout the City of Niagara Falls and beyond its borders.

Since 1925, Community Missions' guiding principle to provide "Compassion in Action" remains a clarion call to all those who lead, work, volunteer and engage with individuals and families to reach their full potential. This organization has expanded its reach beyond its initial population of homeless individuals to now include 19 programs within four divisions known as Crisis & Community Services, Mental Health Housing Services, Mental Health Recovery Services and Youth Services, reflecting the changing needs of the community throughout the decades.

Community Missions' vision to help people find their place in the world is certainly personified in its long-time Executive Director, Robyn Krueger. Hired in 1977, she began her career with CMI as a live-in houseparent to six adolescent males in the City of Niagara Falls. She graduated from SUNY at Buffalo with a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology in 1985 and completed several selected graduate studies in the Counseling and Educational Psychology Department. Ms. Krueger was named Executive Director of CMI in September of 1994. For the more than two decades since she assumed this role, CMI continues to open its doors to better reflect the changing needs of the community. As CMI provides almost 50 percent more meals than it did 10 years ago, it is clear those needs are growing. In 2016 alone, Community Missions provided 11,104 nights of shelter, 89,366 meals, 6,744 individuals with clothing, 2,295 care days in Youth Services, 46,888 care days in Recovery Services, 73,994 care days in Housing Services and 182 opportunities for Faith Development.

Ms. Krueger's extensive professional and community involvement spreads beyond her duties as Executive Director as she serves on a variety of local, county and state committees, boards and associations in leadership and active roles. These include the Association for Community Living, Homeless Alliance of Western New York, Juvenile Detention Association of NYS, Niagara Behavioral Healthcare Network, Niagara County Juvenile Justice Taskforce and NYS Association for Psychiatric Rehabilitation Services, Inc.

A member of the Who's Who among Outstanding Business Executives, this determined administrator is a graduate of Leadership Niagara's Class of 2004. Her achievements have earned her the 2006 Anthony J. Cucurullo Award from the New York State Juvenile Detention Association, the 2011 Niagara Award for Management from the YWCA of Niagara Frontier, and the 2013 Killian Vetter Individual Achievement Award given by the Homeless Alliance of Western New York. Other well deserved recognitions include the

Woman Vanessa Scott Ministries "I Shall Wear a Crown" Award given for Ministry Service, the Dominion Life Christian Center "Lion of Judah" Award for longevity of service to the community, and the 2016 Niagara University President's Award—St. Vincent de Paul.

Ms. Krueger's commitment to service clearly includes putting others first as her heart, humanity and deep faith are integral to her leadership style. She publicly proclaims so often that "operating such a diverse organization would not be possible without the help of our dedicated staff, along with the unwavering support of our community." These are more than mere words as for 25 years CMI recognizes their volunteers and supporters for their countless hours of commitment, care and concern for their neighbors in need with its Annual Compassion in Action Awards Brunch.

CMI continues to strengthen its public, private and non-profit partnerships, with institutions such as United Way of Niagara County and Niagara University, as it is actively engaged in the planning, programs and intervention strategies presented at the Annual Poverty Conference. The leadership of Community Missions and the Niagara Falls Memorial Medical Center have joined forces to increase recovery and understanding with a focus on the annual Interfaith Community Prayer Service. Under Ms. Krueger's direction, these works and other ongoing collaborative efforts have earned Community Missions the Catholic Charities 2003 Community Partner and the 2009 Niagara USA Chamber Community Advocate of the Year Award. On Wednesday, November 29th, 2017, the Community Missions family including staff, board members, volunteers, supporters and friends will gather to observe 92 years of service to the Niagara Frontier. The highlight of this event will be the heartfelt acknowledgement of Robyn Krueger's 40 years of helping countless families and individuals reach their full potential.

It should be noted that the 40th is traditionally known as the ruby anniversary, as the symbolism behind that crimson stone rests in its inner flame that represents a living and vibrant love. It should be said that Ms. Robyn Krueger possesses that inner flame as her professional career and personal commitment represents a living and vibrant love for Community Missions, her faith and her fellow human beings.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the significant contributions and good works of Ms. Robyn Krueger as her 40th Anniversary is recognized during this "Season of Thanks" celebration, and to thank her and Community Missions of Niagara Frontier, Inc. for making a real difference in our world.

HONORING KENNETH LEE

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a pillar of the community, Kenneth Wayne Lee, who this year is being honored by the Luther V. Garrison Sr. Masonic Foundation Inc. as their 2017 Man of the Year. Kenny has always been active in his community and is most deserving of this honor.

Kenny was educated in the Greenburgh Central 7 School District where he excelled

both in the classroom and on the athletic field. Kenny graduated Woodlands High School with honors in 1981 and after graduation, he accepted a baseball scholarship to attend Tulane University in New Orleans, LA.

In 1985, Kenny completed his degree from Tulane and signed a Letter of Intent with the Cincinnati Reds of Major League Baseball. He also completed two years of AA Baseball in Birmingham, Alabama and one year in Yasu, Japan.

In 1989, Kenny became a Master Mason and member of The Bright Hope Lodge No. 62 in White Plains, New York. Kenny elevated to Worshipful Master in 2003 and has held a number of appointed Grand Lodge offices for MWPHGL of New York, including Grand Librarian (2004 to 2009) and DDGM (2010 to Present). He is also affiliated with Bright Hope Chapter No. 46, Pentecost Consistory No. 98 and A.E.A.O.N.M.S. Elejmal Temple No. 185.

Professionally, Kenny was employed by IBM for 28 years, where he moved up the corporate ladder, and today serves as Corporate Security Supervisor for Century Protective Services. He is also a member of Trinity United Methodist Church in White Plains, NY, where he is involved in several activities sponsored by the church. In addition, Kenny was involved in many community activities such as: Feeding the Less Fortunate, Widows Mother's Day Breakfast, Thanksgiving Food Basket Giveaway, and coaching youth baseball.

Kenny has always been willing to lend a helping hand, which is why he is receiving this great honor. I want to congratulate and thank him for all he has done to better our community.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY AND CONNIE
BUTTLER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Terry and Connie Buttler of Guthrie Center, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on September 30th.

Terry and Connie's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies our Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

HONORING AFRICAN EPISCOPAL
CHURCH OF ST. THOMAS

HON. DWIGHT EVANS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a devoted and inspirational church, the

African Episcopal Church of St. Thomas (AECST), of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

This year AECST celebrates 225 years of dedicated ministry and service to the community of Philadelphia. AECST has provided 225 years of "Legacy, Faith, and Hope". AECST was founded in 1792, by Reverend Absalom Jones and stands as the first Black Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. It is also recognized as one of two oldest black churches in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Historically, AECST was founded to provide religious support, foster personal and religious freedoms, and self-determination for persons of African descent. The original African Church was an outgrowth of the Free African Society, a mutual aid organization established in 1787 by Absalom Jones, Richard Allen and others to assist the Black population in Philadelphia. The early religious services were held in private homes and in a school. Within the congregation were many who, because of growing racial tension and insults had followed the lay preachers, Absalom Jones and Richard Allen, broke away from the St. George's Methodist Church. Affiliation with the Episcopal Church was ratified in 1794. The Reverend Absalom Jones became the first Episcopal priest of African American descent and the first rector of St. Thomas' Church.

AECST has been in the vanguard of action to sustain the legacy of humanitarianism and community outreach passed down from its founders. Admirably, AECST's clergy and parishioners have played key roles in the abolition, anti-slavery and Underground Railroad movements and the early equal rights movement of the 1800's. Over the past fifty years, AECST has figured prominently in the civil rights movement, The NAACP, Union of Black Episcopalians, Opportunities Industrialization Center, Philadelphia Interfaith Action and The Episcopal Church Women. Paramount, however, has been the movement to uphold the knowledge and value of the Black presence in the Episcopal Church. Today, that tradition continues with an ever-growing membership and through a host of ministries such as Christian Formation, the Chancel Choir, Gospel Choir, Jazz Ensemble, Men's Fellowship, Young Adult and Youth Ministries, a Church School, Health Ministry, Caring Ministry, and a Shepherding Program.

Today, AECST flourishes as an open, Christ-centered community of faith where the Gospel is taught, lived and spread. As evidenced through AECST's history, they have a longstanding dedication toward advocating and improving the lives of others.

The 2nd Congressional District of Pennsylvania extends gratitude to the African Episcopal Church of St. Thomas for its dedicated support to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

TRIBUTE TO IRENE STIMSON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Irene Stimson of Blanchard, Iowa on the very special occasion of her 100th birthday. Irene was born on October 19, 1917.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Irene's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Irene has lived through eighteen United States Presidents and twenty-five Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Irene in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 100th birthday. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Irene on reaching this incredible milestone, and in wishing her even more health and happiness in the years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during Roll Call votes held on November 28, 2017, I was inescapably detained handling important matters related to my District and the State of Alabama. Had I been present, I would have voted YES on H.R. 2768, and NO on H.R. 3115.

TRIBUTE TO THE 2017 NODAWAY
VALLEY BOYS CROSS COUNTRY
TEAM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Nodaway Valley High School Boys Cross Country team for winning the Iowa Class 1A State Cross Country Championship for the third consecutive year. In addition to the championship, the team set a program record with an average time of 16:56 for their seven varsity runners.

I would like to congratulate each member of the team:

Runners: Brycen Wallace, Skyler Rawlings, Austin Lundy, Joel Blazek, Joshua Baudler, Tyler Breheny and Ben Breheny

Head Coach: Darrell Burmeister

Assistant Coaches: David Swanson, Phyllis Eshelman, Alyse Herr Dreher

Mr. Speaker, the example set by these students and their coaches demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent them in the United States Congress. I ask that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating these young men for their achievements in this rigorous competition and wishing them all nothing but continued success.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO MEL TILLIS

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to country music's stellar singer-songwriter Mel Tillis, the Country Music Association's entertainer of the year in 1976, who overcame a lifetime of stuttering through song. Lonnie Melvin Tillis died earlier this month at 85. He had six No. 1 country singles as a singer, including "Good Woman Blues" in 1976 and "Southern Rains" in 1981 and wrote such memorable tunes as "I'm Tired" for Webb Pierce, "The Snakes Crawl at Night" for Charley Pride and, with Danny Dill and Carl Perkins, the Patsy Cline hit "So Wrong." Mel's songs explored the dark caverns of deep emotion typified by his somber ballad "Ruby, Don't Take Your Love to Town," about a cheating wife, which was a big hit for Kenny Rogers in 1969. Mel was also inducted into the Nashville Songwriters Hall of Fame in 1976 and to the Country Music Hall of Fame in 2007. I want to extend my condolences to his family, particularly my friend and Mel's singer-songwriter daughter Pam Tillis, who recorded a tribute disk for her father in 2002: "It's All Relative: Tillis Sings Tillis." Although he was born and died in Florida, Tennesseans and all Americans will remember and cherish forever his lovely baritone and haunting lyrics. America has lost a true original.

TRIBUTE TO MARY AND LARRY HARRISON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mary and Larry Harrison of Council Bluffs, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They were married on September 9, 1967 at St. Patrick's Catholic Church in Corning, Iowa.

Mary and Larry's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 50th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them nothing but the best.

PANCREATIC CANCER

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, November has been dedicated as Pancreatic

Cancer Awareness Month. As such, I would like to help acknowledge all those affected by this type of cancer and to bring more awareness to the medical research needed to help fight this disease.

In June 2017, the Pancreatic Cancer Action Network reported that pancreatic cancer is ranked the ninth most commonly diagnosed cancer among women and the 11th among men, and is the third leading cause of cancer-related death in the United States.

In fact, I have been contacted by several constituents who have lost loved ones to pancreatic cancer.

According to the Pancreatic Cancer Action Network, pancreatic cancer is often found in its advanced stages and is both difficult to detect and to treat. Unfortunately, major symptoms of pancreatic cancer, which include nausea, diabetes, abdominal or back pain, and loss of appetite, among others, are often overlooked as symptomatic of more common health conditions. The organization stated that about 71 percent of individuals will not live past the first year of diagnosis and the disease is projected to move from the third leading cause of cancer-related death to the second by 2020.

Tragically, the five-year survival rate for those with pancreatic cancer is nine percent—the lowest survival rate among major forms of cancer. We must utilize all federal resources available to meet this devastating disease head on and ensure better outcomes for patients and their families. That is why I have consistently advocated for an increase in funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to ensure that projects—including those which seek to find cures, improve treatments and gain a better understanding of the complex causes of cancers that affect millions of Americans—are well funded. This fall, I supported an increase in funding for NIH in the FY 2018 Omnibus Appropriations Act, which includes \$5.5 billion for the National Cancer Institute.

I also urged the House Appropriations Committee to include pancreatic cancer as an eligible research category in the Peer Reviewed Cancer Research Program (PRCRP)—and the House bill, which passed on June 16th, maintained this eligibility. The Department of Defense conducts high-impact innovative research through the PRCRP that has been used to improve early detection of pancreatic cancer, to better understand the prognosis of pancreatic cancer patients, and to improve the well-being of individuals with a pancreatic cancer diagnosis.

While these resources for pancreatic cancer are an important investment, we know that so often laudable initiatives and innovative research projects sit idle because of funding limitations. Therefore, we must continue to work to ensure that these research projects receive sufficient resources.

Those suffering from pancreatic cancer, as well as their loved ones and caregivers, need vocal advocates on Capitol Hill to ensure access to quality care and treatments. We have a duty to see that programs which research detection and treatment are supported appropriately at a federal level. It is my hope that, by recognizing Pancreatic Cancer Awareness Month, we can raise awareness of the risks of pancreatic cancer and the urgency to treat it.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in Congress and with advocates across the nation as we move forward in this fight against cancer.

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA AND ARLIN BELL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Barbara and Arlin Bell of Council Bluffs, Iowa on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. They celebrated their anniversary on September 15, 2017.

Barbara and Arlin's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them nothing but the best.

TRIBUTE TO DALE SUNDERMAN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Dale Sunderman of Atlantic, Iowa, who recently celebrated 40 years of service in the Cass County Auditor's office. Dale has served as County Auditor since 1984.

Dale began employment in the Cass County Auditor's office on October 10, 1977. Dale said, "I was hired because of my background in mathematics and accounting. Logic is a good part of the job, too." His first role was to assist with the elections. Dale said he has seen many changes in the Auditor's office over the years from a manual record keeping process to the modern computer technology of today. He said he has worked with many different county supervisors, and he felt he always had a great working relationship with them, and focused on serving the citizens of Cass County.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Dale Sunderman for the 40 years of service he has provided to the citizens of Cass County, Iowa. He is a shining example of how hard work and dedication can make a difference in so many lives. I am proud to represent him in the United States Congress. I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in congratulating Dale and wishing him nothing but continued success in all his endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO BERTA AND CHARLIE KORDICK

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Berta and

Charlie Kordick of Winterset, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 65th wedding anniversary. They were married on October 25, 1952 at the Assumption Catholic Church in Granger, Iowa.

Berta and Charlie's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies our Iowa values. As they reflect on their 65th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 65 years together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join

me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO JEANIE AND BOB DAY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 2017

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jeanie and Bob Day of Creston, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anni-

versary. They celebrated their anniversary on October 19, 2017.

Jeanie and Bob's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies our Iowa values. As they reflect on their 60th anniversary, may their commitment grow even stronger, as they continue to love, cherish, and honor one another for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this great couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I ask that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion and in wishing them both nothing but continued success.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7337–S7365

Measures Introduced: Eight bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1, 2162–2168, and S. Res. 343. **Page S7360**

Measures Reported:

S. 1885, to support the development of highly automated vehicle safety technologies, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 115–187)

S. 1, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

S. 1928, to establish a review of United States multilateral aid, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7360**

Measures Passed:

Authorizing Legal Counsel in Arizona v. Mark Louis Prichard: Senate agreed to S. Res. 343, to authorize testimony, document production, and representation in *Arizona v. Mark Louis Prichard*. **Page S7337**

Honoring Hometown Heroes Act: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1892, to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the flying of the flag at half-staff in the event of the death of a first responder in the line of duty, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7362–63**

McConnell (for Boozman) Amendment No. 1587, to make a technical correction. **Page S7362**

Measures Considered:

National Defense Authorization Act: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1519, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year. **Pages S7351–55**

Appointments:

Board of Trustees of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 100–458, sec. 114(b)(2)(c), the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Board of Trustees of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development for a six-year term: Senator Wicker. **Page S7362**

Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. Sec. 1151, as amended, reappointed the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the Open World Leadership Center: Senator Wicker. **Page S7362**

Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 115–77, appointed the following individuals to the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission: Kay Cole James of Virginia, and Star Parker of California. **Page S7362**

Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission: The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 115–77, appointed the following individuals to the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission: Senator Van Hollen, and Dr. David Anderson of New York. **Page S7362**

Nominations Received: On Monday, November 27, 2017, Senate received the following nominations: 2 Army nominations in the rank of general. Routine lists in the Army, Coast Guard, and Navy. **Pages S7364–65**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 50 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. EX. 283), Gregory G. Katsas, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit. **Page S7351**

Messages from the House: **Page S7358**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S7337**

Executive Communications: **Pages S7359–60**

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S7360
 Additional Cosponsors: Pages S7361–62
 Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:
 Additional Statements: Page S7358
 Amendments Submitted: Page S7362
 Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S7362
 Record Votes: One record vote was taken today.
 (Total—283) Page S7351

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12:02 p.m. and adjourned at 7:18 p.m., until 12 noon on Wednesday, November 29, 2017. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7363.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Brian D. Montgomery, of Texas, Robert Hunter Kurtz, of Virginia, and Suzanne Israel Tufts, of New York, each to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

NOMINATION

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Jerome H. Powell, of Maryland, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Budget: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, "Tax Cuts and Jobs Act".

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Kenneth E. Allen, of Kentucky, who was introduced by Senator McConnell, A. D. Frazier, of Georgia, Jeffrey Smith, of Tennessee, who was introduced by Senators Alexander and Corker, and James R. Thompson III, of Alabama, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, after the nominees testified and answered questions on their own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Christopher Ashley Ford, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary (International Security and Non-Proliferation), and Yleem D. S. Poblete, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Verification and Compliance), who was introduced by Senator Boozman and Representative Ros-Lehtinen, both of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

PROPOSALS TO SIMPLIFY FAFSA

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on examining proposals to simplify the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), after receiving testimony from Justin S. Draeger, National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, and Kim Rueben, Urban Institute, both of Washington, D.C.; Nancy J. McCallin, Colorado Community College System, Denver; Judith Scott-Clayton, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York; and Elaine Genise Williams, YWCA of Richmond, Richmond, Virginia.

COMBATING MONEY LAUNDERING, TERRORIST FINANCING, AND COUNTERFEITING ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 1241, to improve the prohibitions on money laundering, after receiving testimony from Kenneth A. Blanco, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Department of Justice; Matthew C. Allen, Assistant Director, Investigative Programs, Homeland Security Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security; Jennifer Fowler, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes; Charles Davidson, Hudson Institute, John Cassara, Foundation for Defense of Democracies Center on Sanctions and Illicit Finance, and Douglas Farah, IBI Consultants LLC, all of Washington, D.C.; and Kathryn Haun Rodriguez, Coinbase Global, Inc., San Francisco, California.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 4458–4475; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 630, 632, and 633 were introduced.

Pages H9467–68

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H9468–69

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

Supplemental report on H.R. 4182, to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify probationary periods with respect to positions within the competitive service and the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–415, Part 2);

H.R. 3312, to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 115–423);

H.R. 3758, to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–424);

H.R. 1645, to amend the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 to provide a temporary exemption for low-revenue issuers from certain auditor attestation requirements (H. Rept. 115–425);

H.R. 3093, to amend the Volcker Rule to permit certain investment advisers to share a similar name with a private equity fund, subject to certain restrictions, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–426);

H.R. 995, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to amend regulations for racial appropriateness, with amendments (H. Rept. 115–427, Part 1);

H.R. 2228, to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–428); and

H. Res. 631, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3017) to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to reauthorize and improve the brownfields program, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3905) to require congressional approval of any mineral withdrawal or monument designation involving the National Forest System lands in the State of Minnesota, to provide for the renewal of certain mineral leases in such lands, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 115–429).

Pages H9466–67

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Marshall to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H9437**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:16 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H9439**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:13 p.m. and reconvened at 4:30 p.m. **Page H9441**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Fowler and Boskoff Peaks Designation Act: H.R. 2768, to designate certain mountain peaks in the State of Colorado as “Fowler Peak” and “Boskoff Peak”, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nays vote of 409 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 638; **Pages H9441–42, H9454–55**

Gulf Islands National Seashore Land Exchange Act of 2017: H.R. 2615, to authorize the exchange of certain land located in Gulf Islands National Seashore, Jackson County, Mississippi, between the National Park Service and the Veterans of Foreign Wars; **Pages H9442–43**

Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians Land Affirmation Act of 2017: H.R. 1491, amended, to reaffirm the action of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for the benefit of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians; **Pages H9443–45**

Superior National Forest Land Exchange Act of 2017: H.R. 3115, amended, to provide for a land exchange involving Federal land in the Superior National Forest in Minnesota acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Weeks Law, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nays vote of 309 yeas to 99 nays, Roll No. 639; **Pages H9445–48, H9455**

21st Century Respect Act: H.R. 995, amended, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to amend regulations for racial appropriateness; and **Pages H9448–49**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to modernize terms in certain regulations.”. **Page H9449**

Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017: H.R. 2228, amended, to provide support for law enforcement agency efforts to protect the mental health and well-being of law enforcement officers. **Pages H9449–54**

Recess: The House recessed at 5:52 p.m. and reconvened at 6:29 p.m. **Page H9454**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two ye-a-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H9454–55 and H9455. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12 noon and adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

Committee Meetings

BROWNFIELDS ENHANCEMENT, ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT, AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017; MINNESOTA'S ECONOMIC RIGHTS IN THE SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 3017, the “Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act of 2017”; and H.R. 3905, the “Minnesota’s Economic Rights in the Superior National Forest Act”. The Committee granted, by record vote of 7–3, a closed rule for H.R. 3017. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. 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 115–40 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. In section 2, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3905 under a structured rule. The rule provides one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115–41 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. Testimony was heard from Representatives Gosar, Grijalva, McKinley, and Tonko.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Barry Lee Myers, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, 10:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: business meeting to consider the nominations of Kathleen Hartnett White, of Texas, to be a Member of the Council on Environmental Quality, Andrew Wheeler, of Virginia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and 19 General Services Administration resolutions, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Alex Michael Azar II, of Indiana, to be Secretary of Health and Human Services, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Stuart Kyle Duncan, of Louisiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, David Ryan Stras, of Minnesota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, and Andrei Iancu, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, “Caring for Our Veterans Act of 2017”, 2:30 p.m., SR–418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 3 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “USDA’s Role in Disaster Recovery”, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, oversight hearing on the Forest Service, 10 a.m., 2007 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, oversight hearing on the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 11 a.m., 2362 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, oversight hearing on the Small Business Administration and the General Services Administration, 2 p.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, hearing entitled “Financial Challenges Facing the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation: Implications for Pension Plans, Workers, and Retirees”, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled “Powering America: Examining the Role of Financial Trading in the Electricity Markets”, 10:15 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Communications and Technology; and Subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection, joint hearing entitled “Algorithms: How Companies’ Decisions About Data and Content Impact Consumers”, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance, hearing entitled “Sustainable Housing Finance: The Role of Ginnie Mae in the Housing Finance System”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit; and Subcommittee on Terrorism and Illicit Finance, joint hearing entitled “Legislative Proposals to Counter Terrorism and Illicit Finance”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa, hearing entitled “The Latest Developments in Saudi Arabia and Lebanon”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled “A Global Update on Alzheimer’s Disease”, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 38, the “Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017”; legislation on the Fix NICS Act of 2017; and H.R. 2666, the “AMBER Alert in Indian Country Act of 2017”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Modernizing NEPA for the 21st Century”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Full Committee, begin markup on H.R. 1778, to provide that an order by the Secretary of the Interior imposing a moratorium on Federal coal leasing shall not take effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted, and for other purposes; H.R. 2630, the “La Paz County Land Conveyance Act”; H.R. 3117, the “Transparency and Honesty in Energy Regulations Act of 2017”; H.R. 3607, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish fees for medical services provided in units of the National Park System, and for other purposes; H.R. 3979, the “Keep America’s Refuges Operational Act”; H.R.

4299, to provide for the indefinite duration of certain military land withdrawals, to improve the management of lands currently subject to such withdrawals and to make the management of such lands more transparent, and for other purposes; and H.R. 4300, the “Admiral Lloyd R. ‘Joe’ Vasey Pacific War Commemorative Display Establishment Act”, 4 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on the Interior, Energy and Environment; and Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Affairs, joint hearing entitled “Regulatory Reform Task Forces Check-In: Part III”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Information Technology; and Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Affairs, joint hearing entitled “Cybersecurity of Voting Machines”, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1699, the “Preserving Access to Manufactured Housing Act of 2017”; and H.R. 4182, the “Ensuring a Qualified Civil Service Act of 2017”, 3 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled “The Future of WOTUS: Examining the Role of States”, 10:15 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Highway to Headache: Federal Regulations on the Small Trucking Industry”, 11 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing entitled “Unmanned Aircraft Systems: Emerging Uses in a Changing National Airspace”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “Examining VA’s Failure to Address Provider Quality and Safety Concerns”, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Joint Meetings

Joint Economic Committee: to hold hearings to examine the economic outlook with Federal Reserve Chair Janet Yellen, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Wednesday, November 29

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, November 29

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will be in a period of morning business.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 3905—Minnesota's Economic Rights in the Superior National Forest Act (Subject to a Rule). Begin consideration of H.R. 3017—Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Re-development, and Reauthorization Act of 2017 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bishop, Mike, Mich., E1604
 Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E1603
 Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1601, E1608, E1611
 Donovan, Daniel M., Jr, N.Y., E1602
 Engel, Eliot L., N.Y., E1603, E1605, E1609
 Evans, Dwig, Pa., E1602, E1610
 Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1609

Johnson, Henry C. "Hank", Jr., Ga., E1602, E1603,
 E1604, E1606, E1607, E1608, E1609
 Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E1601
 MacArthur, Thomas, N.J., E1606
 McCarthy, Kevin, Calif., E1605
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia,
 E1605, E1607
 Sewell, Terri A., Ala., E1610
 Shimkus, John, Ill., E1602

Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1611
 Speier, Jackie, Calif., E1603, E1607, E1608
 Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E1606
 Yoho, Ted S., Fla., E1601
 Young, David, Iowa, E1610, E1610, E1610, E1611, E1611,
 E1611, E1611, E1612
 Young, Don, Alaska, E1601



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.